

IMAGE AND DEVOTION

IN DURHAM CATHEDRAL PRIORY AND YORK MINSTER, c.1300-c.1540:

NEW CONTEXTS, NEW PERSPECTIVES

Volume 1 of 2

PHILIPPA MARGARET TURNER MA (Hons.) MA (Dist.)

PhD

UNIVERSITY OF YORK

HISTORY OF ART

SEPTEMBER 2014

ABSTRACT

Religious images in various media, especially three-dimensional sculpture, were usually an important component of the physical topographies and devotional practices within ecclesiastical institutions during the period c.1300-c.1540. So far, discussion of these images has largely focused on continental contexts and on the English parochial context. This thesis addresses the English cathedral context in detail, providing a close reading of the images at two contrasting institutions in the north of England: Durham cathedral priory and York Minster. Unlike the continent, where there are rich survivals of medieval images, investigation of the English context is rendered more difficult by the lack of extant objects. Part One therefore uses primarily documentary sources to build up the image-topographies of both institutions. Part Two analyses aspects of these images comparatively, incorporating further comparison with those in other English cathedrals, great abbeys, and the parochial context, as well as continental cathedrals. It explores the connections between images and those who worshipped in these cathedral churches, the relationships that could be constructed between images, and between images and other sacred objects, especially saints' shrines. This thesis therefore presents a new art-historical reading of these interiors and their users, and demonstrates the importance of the religious image in the physical and imaginative spaces within the late medieval English cathedral.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract.....	2
List of Illustrations.....	6
A Note on Transcriptions.....	23
Acknowledgements.....	24
Author’s Declaration.....	25
Introduction.....	26
i. The (‘Devotional’) Image: Scope, Terms, and Definitions.....	30
ii. Previous Scholarship: Themes, Issues, and Methodologies.....	36
iii. A Framework of Difference: Durham Cathedral Priory and York Minster.....	40
iv. Structure and Content of This Study.....	44
 <u>Part One: Discussion</u>	
1. Durham Cathedral Priory: Sources and Methodology.....	47
1.i Outline.....	47
1.ii The Sacrists’ Account Rolls.....	47
1.iii Inventories from the Sacrists’ Account Rolls, and the Feretrar’s <i>Liber de Reliquiis</i>	51
1.iv <i>The Rites of Durham</i>	54
2. The Topography of Images in Durham Cathedral Priory.....	58

2.i The High Altar.....	58
2.ii St Cuthbert's Feretory.....	59
2.iii The Choir Ambulatory.....	62
2.iv The Choir Screen.....	65
2.v The Transepts.....	68
2.vi The Nave.....	72
2.vii The Galilee Chapel.....	80
2.viii Images in Unknown or Uncertain Locations.....	85
3. York Minster: Sources and Methodology.....	89
3.i Outline.....	89
3.ii Wills.....	90
3.iii Fabric Rolls.....	93
3.iv. Inventories.....	95
3.v James Torre's Manuscript.....	97
4. The Topography of Images in York Minster.....	98
4.i The High Altar.....	98
4.ii The Lady Chapel and St Stephen's Chapel.....	104
4.iii The Crossing and Transepts.....	108
4.iv The Nave.....	121
4.v Images in Unknown or Uncertain Locations.....	122
4.vi Conclusion to Part One.....	124

Part Two: Analysis

5. Images of Christ.....	126
5.i Introduction.....	126
5.ii The York Minster High Altar Rood.....	127
5.iii The <i>Triumphkreuz</i> or ' <i>Magna Crux</i> '.....	137
5.iv The Black Rood of Scotland.....	157
5.v Nave Images.....	165
5.vi The Crucifix Within Our Lady of Boulton.....	172

5.vii Conclusion.....	177
6. Images of Mary.....	179
6.i Introduction.....	179
6.ii High Altar Images of the Virgin.....	180
6.iii Lady Chapels and their Images.....	190
6.iv Threshold Virgins.....	203
6.v Conclusion.....	214
7. Images of the Saints.....	217
7.i Introduction.....	217
7.ii Patronal Images.....	218
7.iii Head Relics and Head Reliquaries.....	232
7.iv Conclusion.....	255
Conclusion.....	257
Appendix 1.....	265
Tables of Collection Box Receipts from Durham Cathedral Priory	
Appendix 2.....	266
Inscriptions under images of kings and bishops on the Choir Screen at Durham Cathedral Priory	
List of Abbreviations.....	268
<u>Bibliography</u>	271
i. Primary Sources: Unpublished.....	271
ii. Primary Sources: Published.....	272
iii. Secondary Sources (Unpublished and Published)	279

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

Images are reproduced from the sources given in brackets at the end of each caption. Where no source is given, credit for the image lies with the author. Internet collection source details have been given a shortened form in Volume II; the full URL is given in the list below. CVMA Numbering System has been used for stained glass windows throughout the thesis, unless stated otherwise.

1. University Museum, Bergen.

2. Cloisters, Metropolitan Museum, New York.

3. West Front of Neville Screen, c.1380, Caen Stone, Durham Cathedral (J. Hillson).

4. Central Niches of the Neville Screen, c.1380, Durham Cathedral (J. Hillson).

5. East Front of Neville Screen, c.1380, Caen Stone, Durham Cathedral (J. Hillson).

6. Niche with filled-in dowl hole for securing statue, East Front of Neville Screen, Durham Cathedral (J. Hillson).

7. Wear in floor, possibly from reliquary cupboard door, and square sockets, possibly for metal grilles, south end of St Cuthbert's shrine platform, Durham Cathedral (J. Hillson).

8. Reliquary Cupboard, Selby Abbey (St John Hope, 1907: pl. X).

9. High Altar Reliquary Cupboard, c.1520-1540, with painted panels from the interior, Cathedral of Sts. Stephen and Sixtus, Halberstadt, Germany. Oak, sheet metal, iron. 249x293x54cm (Photo Courtesy of the State Office for Heritage and Archaeology, Saxony-Arnhalt, Juraj Lipták).

10. Second pier from the east on the north side of the south choir ambulatory, and corresponding pier on the south side of the ambulatory, each showing three holes, possibly for beam holding Black Rood of Scotland. South choir ambulatory, Durham Cathedral (J. Hillson).

11. Hybrid furnishing incorporating painted panels of bishops, c. end of the fifteenth century, north side of the choir, Hexham Abbey (Luxford 2011b: 429, Fig 18).

12. Diagram of possible arrangement of figures of kings and bishops on the Choir Screen before that erected by Prior Wessington in the fifteenth century (J. Jago).

13. Corbels on south-west side of south-east crossing pier, and west side of third pier from the south, south transept, Durham Cathedral (J. Hillson).

14. Corbels on west sides of second and first pier from the south, and south wall, south transept, Durham Cathedral (J. Hillson).

15. *Vierge ouvrante*, a) closed and b) open. c.1300. German, Rhine Valley, now Metropolitan Museum, New York, Inv. No. 17.190.185. Oak, linen covering, paint, gesso. H: 36.8cm W: 12.7cm (closed), 34.6cm (open).

(<http://www.metmuseum.org/toah/works-of-art/17.190.185> (Accessed 29th July 2014)).

16. Site of Our Lady of Boulton's Altar, second bay from the south, south transept, Durham Cathedral (J. Hillson).

17. Corbel on west side of second pier from the south, with damage to pier above, south transept, Durham Cathedral (J. Hillson).

18. *Vierge ouvrante*, c.1390, West Prussia (probably Chapel of Roggenhausen at Graudenz), now Germanisches Nationalmuseum, Berlin, Inv. No. Pl.O.2397.

Limewood, paint, gilding. H: 126cm, W: 82cm (closed), 103cm (open); D: 34cm. (<http://objektkatalog.gnm.de/objekt/Pl.O.2397>).

19. Corbels incorporated into west side of first and second piers from the north, north transept, Durham Cathedral (J. Hillson).

20. Statues of (left to right) a) St Peter, b) a bishop (unidentified) and c) the Virgin and Child, c.1380, formerly St Mary's Church, Flawford, now Castle Museum, Nottingham. Alabaster with traces of polychromy. H: 83cm (St Peter); 96cm (bishop); 81cm (the Virgin and Child). (Jon F Hall: <https://www.flickr.com/photos/75827322@N00/4056195602/in/photostream/>).

21. Statues of saints Peter and Paul, c.1380. Church of Santa Croce in Gerusalemme, Rome. Alabaster. H: 128cm (Cheetham, 1984: 41, Fig.22).

22. God the Father with the Crucified Christ holding the souls of the Righteous, c.1375-85. Burrell Collection, Glasgow. Alabaster. H: 88.9cm (Cheetham, 1984: 42, Fig.23).

23. North-west and south-west crossing piers, with holes on south and north faces respectively (circled), Durham Cathedral (Russo, 1994: 262, Pl. 69).

24. Relief Panels of a) (left) Christ Appearing to the Two Marys (upper register) and *Noli Me Tangere* (lower register), and b) (right) The Transfiguration, c.1155-60. Sandstone, formerly rood screen, now Durham Cathedral Treasury (Russo, 1994: 252-53, Pls. 64 and 65).

25. West choir screen, with relief panels showing the Passion of Christ, c. 1250-55, Naumburg Cathedral, Germany (Jung, 2013: Pl. IV).

26. Crucifixion relief, mid-thirteenth century, formerly choir screen, Bourges Cathedral, France, now Musée du Berry, Bourges, Inv. No. D894.2.1 (Jung, 2013: Pl. XXIII).

27. Reliefs of *Mary Magdalen Encountering the Risen Christ* (a) and *The Three Maries Encountering the Risen Christ* (b). South choir enclosure c.1330-50, Notre-Dame Cathedral, Paris (Jung, 2013: Pls. XX and XXI).

28. Rood Group, c.1220, Cathedral of St Stephen and St Sixtus, Halberstadt, Germany.

29a. Alabaster reliefs of the Passion of Christ, English, early fifteenth-century, displayed in modern, purpose-built mount. Victoria & Albert Museum, London, Inv. Nos. A.171-1946; A.152-1946; A.172-1946; A.153.1946; A.154-1946. Alabaster, gesso, gilding, polychromy. (V&A Online Collection).

29b. The Betrayal. English, early fifteenth century. Alabaster, gesso, gilded. Victoria and Albert Museum, London, Inv. No. A.171-1946. 17.25x1075in. (V&A Online Collection).

29c. Christ bearing the Cross. English, early fifteenth century. Alabaster, gesso, gilding and polychromy. Victoria and Albert Museum, London, Inv. No. A.152-1946. 17.3x1075in. (V&A Online Collection).

29d. The Deposition. English, early fifteenth century. Alabaster, gesso, gilding, polychromy. Victoria and Albert Museum, London, Inv. No. A.153.1946. 44.2x27.8x5.5cm (V&A Online Collection).

29e. The Resurrection. English, early fifteenth century. Alabaster, gesso, gilding. Victoria and Albert Museum, London, Inv. No. A.154-1946. 17.5x10.75in (V&A Online Collection).

30. Altarpiece with the Passion of Christ, Brussels, c.1492-95, with later replacement figures of Christ, the two thieves, and attendant angels. Originally

Collegiate Church of Blainville-Crevon, Normandy; now Walters Art Museum, Baltimore, Acc. No. 61.57. Painted and gilded oak. 235x367.3x31.4cm (Walters Art Museum).

31. Mostyn Christ, fifteenth century, unknown provenance, now Cathedral of St D8iniol, Bangor, Wales. Oak. (<http://www.mostynestates.co.uk/about/history/>, Accessed 30th May 2014).

32. Drawing of Christ seated Awaiting the Crucifixion, fifteenth-century. Cabinet des Estampes, Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris (Mâle, 1949: 95, Fig. 45).

33. Possible location of St Saviour Altar, including remains of paint, north-west end of nave, Durham Cathedral (J. Hillson).

34. Benedetto Antelami, *Volto Santo*, early thirteenth-century, Cathedral of San Martino, Lucca, Italy

(JoanBanjo:http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Holy_Face_of_Lucca#mediaviewer/File:Volto_Santo_de_Lucca.JPG, Accessed 24 July 2014).

35. Initial for the Feast of the Exhaltation of the Cross, fol. 207v, The Litlington Missal, 1383-84 (Tudor-Craig, 1998: 111; Fig.74).

36. Our Lady in Gesyn, thirteenth century, St Mary's Church, Bolsover, Derbyshire. Freestone relief (Marks, 2004: 145, Fig. 99).

37. Doorway connecting the Galilee Chapel and the west of the nave, with altar and tomb of Cardinal Langleigh to its west, Durham Cathedral (J. Hillson).

38. North aisle doorway, first quarter of the fifteenth century, Galilee Chapel, Durham Cathedral.

39. South aisle doorway, first quarter of the fifteenth century, Galilee Chapel, Durham Cathedral.

40. Exterior, North Doorway into the Galilee Chapel, nineteenth-century copy of a twelfth-century original, Durham Cathedral (Harrison, 1994: 217, Pl. 53).

41. Painting of a Bishop, probably St Cuthbert, c.1175, south jamb of north central aisle altar, Galilee Chapel, Durham Cathedral (J. Hillson).

42. North central aisle altar with painted drapery in altar recess, Galilee Chapel, Durham Cathedral (J. Hillson).

43. Painting of a King, probably Oswald, c.1175, north jamb of north central aisle altar, Galilee Chapel, Durham Cathedral (J. Hillson).

44. St Cuthbert, with monk, possibly Bede, kissing his feet, BL MS Yates Thompson 26, fol.1v

(<http://www.bl.uk/catalogues/illuminatedmanuscripts/ILLUMIN.ASP?Size=mid&IllID=53088>, Accessed 4th June 2014).

45. Painting of the Coronation with bishop, probably St Cuthbert, to lower right side, wall above north central aisle altar, Galilee Chapel, Durham Cathedral (J. Hillson).

46. Paintings of Martyrdoms of Apostles, the Incredulity of St Thomas, and Benedictine Monks in Prayer, to the east of Crucifixion of Christ, south arcade of north central aisle, Galilee Chapel, Durham Cathedral (J. Hillson).

47. Paintings of Martyrdoms of Apostles to west of Crucifixion of Christ, south arcade of north central aisle, Galilee Chapel, Durham Cathedral (J. Hillson).

48. Remains of painting, probably Golgotha and a vertical cross shaft, wall above altar in south central aisle, Galilee Chapel, Durham Cathedral (J. Hillson).

49. Tomb of the Venerable Bede, c.1370, south aisle, Galilee Chapel, Durham Cathedral. Pubeck marble (J. Hillson).

50. Remains of possible collection box, north side of north central aisle altar, Galilee Chapel, Durham Cathedral (J. Hillson).
51. Saint Louis, c.1275-1325, Sainte-Chapelle, Paris, now Musée Cluny, Paris. Yew and polychromy. 69x22x14.5cm (RMN-Grand Palais, Franck Raux, <http://www.photo.rmn.fr/archive/01-004588-2C6NU0GRAEUO.html> , Accessed 1st August 2014).
52. James Torre, illustration of high altar wooden reredos, York Minster (Brown, 2003: 208, Fig.5.78).
53. Reliefs of a) St Peter and b) St Paul, c.1160, Ivychurch Priory, Wiltshire (*English Romanesque Art*, nos. 157a and b). Portland stone, 82x40x17cm (St Peter), 83x35x18cm (St Paul).
54. Hans von Reutlingen, St Peter, c.1510, Aachen. Cathedral Treasury of Aachen. Hammered and partially gilt silver, H: 72.5cm. (Lepie and Minkenber, 2010: 95).
55. Niches in Lady Chapel east wall, York Minster (Brown, 2003: 154, Fig.4.31).
56. Reredos (directly below east window) and former site of wall paintings (directly below reredos), Lady Chapel, York Minster, (Brown, 2003: 154, Fig.4.29).
57. John Browne, drawings of remains of *Arma Christi* wall-paintings, possibly fifteenth-century, east wall of the Lady Chapel, York Minster (Browne, 1847: II, Pl. CL).
58. *Sedes sapientiae*, second or third quarter of the twelfth century, east wall, north side, Lady Chapel, York Minster (Purey-Cust, 1907).

59. *Sedes sapientiae*, second or third quarter of the twelfth century, formerly east wall of Lady Chapel, now crypt, York Minster.
60. Virgin and Child, c. end of the twelfth century, Ranese, Møre og Romsdal County, Norway, now Vitenskapsmuseet, Trondheim. Willow. 102x45cm (Blindheim, 1988: cat. no. 30).
61. James Torre, plan of burials in east end of York Minster a) close-up view of north-east choir ambulatory and area around St Stephen's Chapel and b) general view (Torre, fol. 115v).
62. James Torre, plan of burials in the crossing and transepts of York Minster (Torre, fol. 98r).
63. Figures to south side, west side of choir screen, York Minster, with statues of Henry IV and Henry V, c. late 1430s-early 1440s; and statue of Henry VI, far south side, c.1830. (J. Jago).
64. James Torre, detailed view of plan of burials in the south transept of York Minster (Torre, fol. 98r).
65. South-west side of south-east crossing pier, York Minster.
66. Virgin and Child with tabernacle, c. 1230-35, Hove, Sogn og Fjordane County, Norway; now University Museum Bergen, Inv. No. MA 27. Oak, with polychromy. 45.5x33x35.5cm (Virgin), 124.5x52.2x50.7cm (Tabernacle) (Blindheim, 2004a: cat. no. 1).
67. St Peter painted on tabernacle door, c.1250, Fåberg, Oppland County, Norway; now Universitetets Oldsaksamling, Oslo, Inv. No. C 3006. Oak with polychromy. 184x74.5x4cm (Blindheim, 2004a: cat. no. 34).
68. Altarpiece, c.1475, Brekke, Sogn, Norway. University Museum Bergen, Inv. No. MA. 29 (Henrik von Achen).

69. Reliquary bust of St Thecla, c.1290-1300 (bust), 1325-50 (base), Upper Rhineland. Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam, Inv. No. RBK 16997. Bust: raised and gilded silver, with opaque champlevé enamel and glass stones; base: raised and gilded copper. H: 31.2cm (Husband, 2001: cat. no. 40).

70. Reliquary bust of St Ursula, c.1300-1320 (bust), 1325-50 (collar) Upper Rhineland, probably Basel. Historiches Museum Basel, 1955.207. Bust: raised, engraved, cased, chased, and gilded silver, with translucent and opaque base-taille enamel, translucent cloisonné enamel, glass, on raised and gilded copper collar. H: 35.5 cm. (Husband, 2001: cat. no. 41).

71. Reliquary bust of St Pantalus, c. after 1270, Upper Rhineland, possibly Basel. Historiches Museum Basel, 1882.87. Bust: raised and gilded silver, paint, and glass, with garnet, pearl, carnelian, amethyst, and chrysoprase; base: raised and gilded copper alloy, glass and semi-precious stones. H: 49cm. (Husband, 2001: cat. no. 39).

72. Virgin and Child reliquary, c.1324-1339, given to the Abbey of Saint-Denis by Jeanne d'Évraux in 1339. Musée du Louvre, Paris. Gilded silver, basse-taille enamels on gilded silver, precious stones and pearls (RMN/Martine Beck-Coppola, <http://www.louvre.fr/en/oeuvre-notices/virgin-and-child-jeanne-devreux>, Accessed 28th July 2014).

73. Niche on south-east side of south-west crossing pier, containing statue of St Cuthbert c.1907, York Minster (J. Jago).

74. Arms of Walter Skirlaw, south-west side of south side of central tower, York Minster, early fifteenth-century (Brown, 2003: 205, Fig.5.70).

75. James Torre, plan of burials in the nave of York Minster (Torre, fol. 75v).

76. Niches in north side of screen-arch, c.1415, entrance to north choir ambulatory, York Minster.

77. Virgin and Child, c.1275-1300 with later restorations, exterior trumeau of entrance to the Chapter House, York Minster. Stone, with traces of gilding.
78. Niches in spandrels to left and right of entrance to the Chapter House, York Minster.
79. Niches above doorway, Chapter House, York Minster.
80. Pedestal and canopy, interior trumeau of west door, housing statue of St Peter, unknown date, York Minster.
81. Niches in gable above west door, c.1330s, holding modern statues of the Virgin and Child, St Etheldreda, and St Helen, York Minster.
82. Remains of Statues of St Mary, flanked by Two Censing Angels, c.1340, second bay from the west, north aisle, York Minster.
83. Our Lady of Pity, c.1400. a) general view b) detailed view. Liebfrauenkirche, Halberstadt, Germany.
84. St Margaret of Antioch, c.1475, possibly Toulouse, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, Acc. No. 2000.641. Alabaster with traces of gilding. 39x24.5x16.7cm. (<http://www.metmuseum.org/collection/the-collection-online/search/469836>, Accessed 11th July 2014).
85. High altar screen, probably last quarter of the fifteenth century, Winchester Cathedral (Ross McIntire).
86. High altar screen, last quarter of the fifteenth century, St Albans Cathedral and Abbey Church, St Albans, (https://www.flickr.com/photos/dmitry_shakin/400601922/in/photostream/, Accessed 21st April 2014).

87. Abbot John Islip's hearse in front of the high altar, Westminster Abbey. Obituary Roll of John Islip, 1532, Westminster Abbey, London. Pen and Ink (St John Hope, 1899: Pl. XIII).
88. Reconstruction of high altar Rood Group and high altar screen, York Minster, by Pat Gibbs and Christopher Norton (Norton, 2005: 178, Fig.12).
89. Window I (east window), c.1405-08, York Minster (Inv. No. 003636, CVMA Picture Archive).
90. Plan of Constantinian complex in Jerusalem, including the Church of the Holy Sepulchre and the site of Golgotha. Adomnán, *De Locis Sanctis*. Vienna, Osterreichisches National Bibliothek, Codex 458 (ninth century), fol. 4v (Biddle, 1999: 27).
91. Apse mosaic, Santa Pudenziana, Rome, early fifth century.
(http://employees.oneonta.edu/farberas/arth/Images/109images/early_christian/sta_pudenziana_apse.jpg, Accessed 21st April 2014).
92. Apse mosaic, Sant'Apollinare in Classe, Ravenna, sixth century.
(<http://www.bluffton.edu/~sullivanm/italy/classe/santapollinare/santapollinare.html>, Accessed 21st April 2014).
93. Plan of high Altar and eastern end of St Augustine's, Canterbury in Thomas Elmham, *Speculum Augustinianum*, c.1410. Cambridge, Trinity Hall, MS 1, fol. 77r. (<https://oldlibrarytrinityhall.files.wordpress.com/2013/03/ms1.jpg>, Accessed 21st April 2014).
94. King Canute and Queen Emma Placing a Cross on an Altar at New Minster, *Liber Vitae*, New Minster, Winchester, c.1031. London, British Library, MS Stowe 944, fol.6r
(http://www.bl.uk/manuscripts/Viewer.aspx?ref=stowe_ms_944_f006r, Accessed 21st April 2014).

95. Apse Mosaic, Old St Peter's, (original date unknown; renovated c.1198-1216) from Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Cod. Barb. lat. 2733, 158-159 (Kessler, 2002, Fig.1.2).
96. Wall Painting of St Faith, with painted retable of the Crucifixion below. c.1300, St Faith's Chapel, Westminster Abbey, London (<http://www.westminster-abbey.org/visit-us/highlights/saint-faiths-chapel>, Accessed 3rd June 2014).
97. Gero Crucifix, c.970, High Cathedral of St Peter, Cologne, Germany. Oak, polychromy, and gilding, with Strahlensonne behind, c.1683.
98. Cross column, Essen Minster, tenth-century, incorporating late-antique spolia (Haussherr, 1979: 137, Fig. 49).
99. Detail of Cross altar and other nave altars, Codex Sangallensis 1092, Stiftsbibliothek Sankt Gallen, early ninth century (Haussherr, 1979: 135, Fig. 48).
100. Triumphal Arch mosaic, San Paolo fuori le Mura, Rome, middle of the fifth century (https://www.flickr.com/photos/save_rome/4584087197/ (American Institute for Roman Culture), Accessed 21st April 2014).
101. East side of Rood Group and Rood Beam, c.1220, Choir, Cathedral of St Stephen and St Sixtus, Halberstadt, Germany.
102. Reconstruction of Neville's Cross Monument, Neville's Cross, Durham (Roberts, 1998: 105, Ill.12).
103. Crucifixion, with Virgin and Child below, c. middle of the thirteenth century, west side of north nave pier, St Albans Cathedral (James Clark, <http://www.flickr.com/photos/cathedralcityguide/8450246804/in/photostream>, Accessed 30th August 2014).

104. Christ in Judgement, flanked by the Virgin, St John, and Angels carrying Instruments of the Passion, c.1210-1215. Tympanum of central portal, south transept, Chartres Cathedral

(http://www.oneonta.edu/faculty/farberas/arth/images/109images/Gothic/Chartres/sport_lastjudg.jpg , Accessed 23rd August 2014).

105. The Visitation, c.1310-1320, attributed to Master Heinrich of Constance, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York. Walnut, paint, gilding, rock-crystal cabochons inset in gilt-silver mounts. 59.1 x 30.2 x 18.4 cm.

106. Virgin and Child, St Cuthbert's Coffin, c.698 (Jane Hawkes).

107. Virgin and Child, c.1350, St Edmund's Church, Blunham, Bedfordshire; alabaster (Marks, 2004: Pl. IX).

108. 'Doppelrelief' of a) the Virgin (top) and b) St Stephen (below), early fifteenth century, Cathedral of saints Stephen and Sixtus, Halberstadt, Germany. Oak with polychromy and gilding. H: 82cm; W: 57cm. (Meller et. al., 2008: cat. no. 103).

109. Leroux, Notre-Dame-Sous-Terre, Chartres Cathedral, c.1690. Chartres, Bibliothèque municipale, MS NA 29. (Lautier, 2009: 177, Fig.11.2).

110. Pilgrim badge of Notre Dame, twelfth century, Chartres Cathedral (Forsyth, 1972: 107-08, Fig.27).

111. Seal of Bishop Anthony Bek, obverse and reverse (Hunter-Blair, 1922: Pls. 1, no.15 and 3, no.7).

112. *Madonna del Voto*, c.1261, Siena Cathedral, Italy

([http://www.shafe.co.uk/art/Madonna del Voto- Siena Cathedral- C- 1270.asp](http://www.shafe.co.uk/art/Madonna_del_Voto- Siena_Cathedral- C- 1270.asp), accessed 26th January, 2014).

113. Henry Johnson, Sketch of the East Window of Holy Trinity Church, Goodramgate, York, c.1670. (Sheppard Routh, 1986: Pl. 4).
114. The Saved, c.1405-08, Panel 2d, Window I (east window), York Minster (Inv. No. 018828, CVMA Picture Archive).
115. The Last Judgement, c.1405-08, Panel 2e, Window I (east window), York Minster, (Inv. No. 022721, CVMA Picture Archive).
116. The Dammned, c.1405-08, Panel 2f, Window I (east window), York Minster (Inv. No. 018855, CVMA Picture Archive).
117. The Assumption of the Virgin, c.1450, roof boss over door of the choir screen, York Minster.
118. Virgin and Child, c.1220-40, trumeau of south portal, west façade, Amiens cathedral, France (Murray, 2004: Pl. 11).
119. Virgin and Child (possibly *Notre-Dame-Sous-Terre*), window 113a, junction of north transept and north ambulatory, Chartres Cathedral (Painton Cowen <http://www.therosewindow.com/pilot/Chartres/ChoirNbay1.htm>, Accessed 30th August 2014).
120. *Notre Dame de la Belle Verrière*, twelfth century. Window 30a, south choir ambulatory, Chartres Cathedral (Stuart Whatling, http://www.medievalart.org.uk/Chartres/030a_pages/Chartres_Bay030a_key.htm, Accessed 30th August 2014).
121. Belt buckle depicting the the meeting of Peter and Paul; fifth century. Antiquarium Stabiano, Castellammare di Stabia, Italy. Ivory. (Kessler, 2002: Fig.6.2).
122. St Peter, c. 1415. Panel no. B1 (tracery), Window NIX, choir, clerestory, north window. York Minster (Inv. No. 019726, CVMA Picture Archive).

123. Reliquary Bust of St Yrieix a) front view b) from above, second quarter of the thirteenth century, with later grill. Church of Saint-Yrieix-la-Perche, Limousin, France. Metropolitan Museum, New York, Inv. No. 17.190.352a,b. Gilded silver with rock crystals, gems, and glass. 38.1 x 23.4 x 26.1cm (<http://www.metmuseum.org/toah/works-of-art/17.190.352a,b>, Accessed 30th August 2014).

124. Reliquary bust of St Baudime, c.1146-78, Church of Saint Nectaire, Auvergne, France. Copper gilt over walnut core, ivory, and horn. 73x43x46cm (*Treasures of Heaven*: cat. no. 105).

125. Nicolas Fabri de Peirsec, sketches of Head Reliquary of St Maurice, c.1612, showing crown commissioned by King Boson of Burgundy (879-87), left, and crown commissioned by King Hugh of Italy (926-47), right. (Hahn, 2011, Fig. 65).

126. Initial for the Feast of the Relics, fol. 254r, Litlington Missal, 1383-84 (Tudor-Craig, 1998: 108, Fig.70).

127. R.F. Burckhardt, diagram showing display of relics on the high altar at Basel Cathedral on major feast days according to c.1500 instructions (Husband, 2001: 16, Fig. 5, and Burckhardt, 1933: Abb. 263).

128. The Opening of St Hedwig's Tomb (top) and Translation of the Relics of St Hedwig (bottom). Vita of St Hedwig, 1353. Los Angeles, J. Paul Getty Museum, MS Ludwig XI 7, fol. 137v (*Treasures of Heaven*: cat. no.103).

129. Translation of the head of St Martin of Tours, c.1340-50, Tours, Bibliothèque Municipale, MS 1023, fol. 101r (Hahn, 2011: Fig. 68).

130. Canonization of St Brigitta of Sweden, before 1460, Ulrich von Richenthal, *Chronicle of the Council of Constance*, New York Public Library (Boehm, 1990: Fig. 70).

131. a) Window I (east window), c.1405-08, York Minster, showing locations of panels b) A13 c) A17 and d) A18, all unidentified abbesses. (Inv. No. 003636 (a); 019059 (b) CVMA Picture Archive; N.Teed (c and d)).

132. Diagram of distribution of figures in tracery lights of Window I (east window), York Minster (Norton, 2005: 177, Fig.11).

133. Window I (east window), c.1350-60, Gloucester Cathedral (Inv. No. 023543, CVMA Picture Archive).

134. Reliquary of St Oswald. Substructure: last third of the twelfth century; head: first half of the thirteenth century; crown, c.1200 and later alterations. Cathedral of Hildersheim, Germany. Silver and gold plate over oak core; crown with stones and pearls. H:47.5cm (Falk 1991-93: Pl. XVI).

PLANS

1. Images in Durham Cathedral Priory, c.1300-1350.

2. Images in Durham Cathedral Priory, 1350-1400.

3. Images in Durham Cathedral Priory, 1400-1450.

4. Images in Durham Cathedral Priory, 1450-1500.

5. Images in Durham Cathedral Priory, 1500-c.1540.

6. York Minster c.1181, showing choir built under Archbishop Roger de Pont l'Évêque (crypt below).

7. Images in York Minster, c.1300-1350.
8. Images in York Minster, 1350-1400.
9. Images in York Minster, 1400-1450.
10. Images in York Minster, 1450-1500.
11. Images in York Minster, 1500-c.1540.
12. Positions of windows at Durham Cathedral Priory (CVMA Numbering System; Haselock and O'Connor, 1980: Fig.1).
13. Positions of windows at York Minster (CVMA Numbering System, Brown 2003: Plan 7).
14. York Minster, unstratified plan of Altars, Chapels, Screens and Shrines (Brown, 2003: Plan 6).
15. York Minster before 1726, showing sites of extant screens (drawn by E. Barker, engraved by J. Nutting. YMLA; Brown, 2003: Plan 3).
16. York, Minster Area, showing layout of Anglo-Saxon and later buildings (Norton, 1998a: Fig.2).
17. Scrope Chapel, York Minster, showing burials, known and suggested (Norton, 2007: 164, Fig.6).

A NOTE ON TRANSCRIPTIONS

In transcriptions from manuscript sources, contractions and superscriptions have been expanded and made uniform to the body of the text. Personal and place names are given as spelt. Numerical values are given in Arabic numerals within the main text, with any commodity given before or after the number as appropriate (i.e. ‘iiij s. iij d.’ is given as ‘4 s. 3d.’), but the original Roman numerals are preserved in quotations within the footnotes.

These criteria have also been applied to printed transcriptions where the above handwritten conventions have been replicated; these frequently occur in nineteenth and early twentieth century publications. Where such publications have used capitals other than at the beginning of a sentence or for proper nouns, they have been rendered into small letters. Abbreviations, usually an editorial invention (for example, B.M. for ‘beate Marie’) have been expanded. In Latin quotations, the ‘ae’ diphthong (a post-medieval invention) has been silently removed.

Fowler’s edition of the *Rites of Durham* includes alternative wording from one or more different manuscripts of the *Rites*, which he gives in square brackets along with an abbreviated form of the name of the manuscript. These alternative readings have been enclosed within curly brackets ({ }) in order to differentiate them from my authorial interpolations, which are indicated throughout the thesis by square brackets. The curly brackets have also been used elsewhere in the thesis to indicate an editor and/or translator’s interpolations within a text, in order to differentiate from my own.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Foremost thanks goes to my supervisor in the History of Art Department, Dr Tim Ayers, whose patience, keen eye, and wise counsel has been constant throughout the production of this thesis. I am also grateful to Dr Anthony Geraghty and Dr Jane Hawkes for their comments on my work, and Professor Christopher Norton, Dr Michele Vescovi, Sarah Brown, Amanda Daw, and Izzy Armstrong-Frost for sharing knowledge with me. The staff at York Minster Library, Durham Cathedral Library, and Durham University Special Collections have been unfailingly helpful, as was the late Alan Piper. Laura Spiers Freeburn and Siobhan Gorrie provided translations from German scholarship (errors in interpretation lie with me alone).

I am very grateful to the Arts and Humanities Research Council, who funded this PhD, and the British Archaeological Association, whose Ochs Scholarship assisted in the process of writing up. Several of the BAA's study day and conference scholarships were also of great help in introducing me to the wider world of medieval art and architecture and its experts.

I would also like to thank my family and friends for their support, especially my parents. This thesis is dedicated to the memory of Dr Robert Guthrie. Without his research I would not be able to do my own.

AUTHOR'S DECLARATION

I declare that this thesis is entirely my own work and has not been previously submitted for examination at the University of York or any other university. Parts of Chapters Four and Seven pertaining to St Everilda are to be published within 'Everilda: Evidence for A Saint's Cult in Transition' in M. Boulton, M. Hearn and J. Hawkes (eds.), *Art, Literature and Material Culture in the Middle Ages: Transition, Transformation and Taxonomy* (4 Courts Press, forthcoming, 2015).

INTRODUCTION

The rich survivals of medieval religious images in continental Europe - especially those in three dimensions and made of various materials from painted wood to jewel-encrusted gold - can exert a powerful and even disconcerting effect on the twenty-first century viewer. This holds true whether they are encountered within their original ecclesiastical environments, or in the increasingly ecclesiastical-like settings of art galleries and museums (Figs.1 and 2).¹ Post-Reformation, post-Council of Trent, post-Enlightenment and even post-Vatican II, the mix of '[self] conscious materiality'² and otherworldliness of three-dimensional objects in particular demands an exertion of the intellect and imagination regarding their place(s) within medieval society, both in relation to their physical locations and their uses in church or chapel interiors.³ This is especially so within the English context, where so many of these images no longer survive due to sixteenth- and seventeenth-century historical circumstances as well as later disregard or abuse.⁴

This thesis will examine the devotional image within the context of the late medieval English cathedral, primarily focusing on those in the medium of three-dimensional sculpture. Specifically, it will provide a comparative analysis of images within the church interiors of Durham cathedral priory and York Minster, concentrating on the period c.1300-c.1540. These dates have been chosen as they represent the chronological bracket for the relevant primary

¹ For Scandinavian examples see Andersson, 1949 and Thordeman and Andersson, 1964-75; Blindheim, 1952; 1988; 2004a and 2004b (the latter on the objects' post-Reformation survival and use). For German examples, and those from elsewhere now exhibited in Germany, see Meurer, 1989; Bergmann, 1984 and 1989; Guillot de Suduiraut, 1991, Netzer and Reinburg, 2000; Karrenbock, 2001. For French examples, see Donzet and Siret, 1981. For primarily continental examples now exhibited in New York, see Wixom, 2005 and 2007. For English survivals, see in particular the exhibition catalogues by Deacon and Lindley, 2001, and Boldrick, Park, and Williamson, 2002. Extant sculpture from England and examples from elsewhere with an English influence can be found in the catalogues from two major exhibitions: *Age of Chivalry: Art in Plantagenet England 1200-1400* (1987) and *Gothic: Art for England* (2003-04): see particularly *Chivalry*, cat. nos. 99, 100, 278-89, 290, 699-701, 702, 707 and *Gothic*, cat. nos. 234-35, 239, 268, 278, 279-84, 287. For overviews of medieval Gothic sculpture, see Williamson, 1988 (on the North European context specifically) and Williamson, 1995.

² Kessler, 2004: 19; Bynum, 2011: 53-65; 66-101.

³ This was not necessarily a positive relationship. See literature addressing Lollardism, in particular: Jones, 1973; Aston, 1984; Aston, 1993; Kamerick, 2002; Lutton, 2006.

⁴ On the destruction of images see Eire, 1986; Aston, 1988; Dupeux et. al., 2001; Graves, 2008. Recently, Reformation iconoclasm was considered alongside iconoclasm of other kinds in the exhibition *Art Under Attack: Histories of British Iconoclasm* (Tate Britain, London, 2013): see Barber and Boldrick, 2013. For a study of the effects of the Reformation in the cathedral context in particular, see Lehmborg, 1988.

sources at both institutions. However, they also complement the chronological scope of previous studies of images both in English and continental contexts, allowing relevant comparisons to be made.⁵ Furthermore, c.1540 is an appropriate point on which to end our discussion due to the profound religious upheavals and ecclesiastical changes in the ensuing decade.

Before addressing the reasoning for the focus on three-dimensional sculpture, and discussing the term ‘devotional image’ itself, some explanation of the choice of the cathedral church context is necessary. Scholarship on the devotional image in the context of late medieval England has, for the most part, thus far concentrated on those within parish churches.⁶ In contrast, the contexts of the English cathedral and great abbey have received only isolated attention, often limited to discussing devotional images in relation to the interior topographies of a single institution.⁷ Detailed examination of the devotional image in the late medieval English cathedral - distinct in ecclesiastical terms as being the seat of a bishop and the mother church of a diocese - therefore allows us to consider a number of things. Firstly, in light of previous scholarship, it allows us to delineate points of distinction, but also points of similarity in relation to images in the cathedral context relative to those in the parochial context and those in the context of the great abbey. The latter context is particularly important as the great abbey shared in many, but not all, of the cathedral church’s characteristics architecturally, but also in regard to its resources and the breadth of its ecclesiastical networks.

There were also significant differences between the contexts of cathedral, great abbey, and parish church. Cathedral churches and great abbeys were bigger in physical scale than parish churches, allowing for a large number of altars within the interiors and more elaborate liturgies. This gives us scope to consider the distribution of images within cathedral church interiors. Cathedral institutions carried out more varied administrative and sacred functions than parishes; like great abbeys they also had wide geographical and ecclesiastical links, and higher financial revenues and more accumulated wealth than parish churches. To what

⁵ For instance, Marks, 2004; Cragoe, 2005; Luxford, 2005 (in relation to the English context), and Montgomery, 1996; Joubert, 2008; Jung, 2013 (in relation to the continental context).

⁶ Most notably, Marks, 2004, but see also Gill, 2000 (on wall paintings) and Kamerick, 2002.

⁷ For example, Orme, 1986: 22-24 (on Exeter cathedral); Shinnars, 1987-89 (on Norwich cathedral priory), and Luxford, 2011a: 242-43 (on St Augustine’s abbey, Bristol). But see also Recht, 2008: 195-262 for a discussion of ‘The Carved Image’ within the continental cathedral context.

extent can we therefore suggest points of distinction not only in terms of use, but also in terms of images' iconographies and materiality?

Saints' shrines formed an important element of the sacred topographies of cathedrals and great abbeys, and were usually not present within the parochial context. Pilgrims therefore form a significant audience for us to consider in relation to images within the cathedral context. Importantly, cathedral hierarchies comprised bishops as well as the institution's secular or monastic community, a point of significant contrast in relation to great abbeys which were not also cathedral priories. This allows us to consider images in relation to these distinct ecclesiastical audiences as well as pilgrims and laity of different social strata and both sexes. For example, what distinct or shared connotations might a certain image in a particular location have had for these various audiences, and why? Exploration of the cathedral context also allows us to assess bishops and members of the communities as patrons of images too. Was there anything distinctive about the patronage of bishops, for instance, compared to what we find in relation to the patronage of images by abbots in the great abbeys of late medieval England? What can be said of the patronage of members of the nobility in the cathedral church?

Further explanation is also necessary as to the choice of the cathedral churches of Durham and York for comparative examination here. On a practical note, both have particularly rich surviving documentary sources from which to draw, ranging in variety from account rolls to a substantial narrative, and a few notable extant images, making them outstanding candidates for study. However, they are especially apt for comparative analysis due to the significant points of contrast and complementarity. This allows us to see in greater relief the iconographies, locations, uses, and meanings of images; to assess which were common to both institutions and unique to each, and to consider why. Most notable of these points of contrast is the secular status of the community at York Minster versus the monastic status of the community at Durham. In comparison to York's secular Dean and Chapter, the presence of the Benedictine community at Durham meant that an ecclesiastical body with an identity and mode of religious life distinct from that of the secular bishop played a significant role in the commission and upkeep of images, and formed an important audience for them as well.

Durham and York's shared geographical status as cathedrals in the north of England, and, in relation to ecclesiastical geography, cathedrals in the northern province, is a point of complementarity. Focus on them here acts as a counterbalance to previous scholarship on images in the English cathedral context, which have concentrated on institutions further south.⁸ This focus also allows us to suggest points of distinction between those institutions in more southern regions of England. Furthermore, it allows us to consider which saints from the north of England were represented at York and Durham, and assess their functions and meanings at each institution.

Within this geographical complementarity, however, is a further point of contrast between the two institutions. As a metropolitan cathedral, York Minster was the seat of an archbishop, and was the mother-church of the northern province to which Durham belonged, Durham's bishop therefore being subordinate to the archbishop of York. We can therefore also assess if we see this mother-church status promoted in the images at York, and to what extent we see patterns in relation to images between the two institutions. Did one take precedent from the other, and if so, did this follow the current of the ecclesiastical hierarchy or did it work the other way round?

Throughout this examination it should be borne in mind that images were one element in a wider multi-sensory environment of the cathedral church which encouraged devotion.⁹ The extent to which such elements, particularly *ars sacra* and architecture, can be said to be 'integrated' within the cathedral context has been a topic of some debate amongst art-historians since the mid-1990s, and more recent work has also highlighted the tendency towards 'holism' in the study of the art and architecture of the cathedral church.¹⁰ We cannot present the 'whole

⁸ See Orme, 1986: 22-24; Shinnars, 1987-89.

⁹ See Woolgar, 2006; Graves, 2007; Jung, 2010; Wells, 2011, and Milner, 2011. These works build on scholarship which appeared in the last fifteen years exploring medieval theories of vision, notions of visuality, and the 'visionary' as part of the 'visual turn' in the humanities. See Jay, 1996 (for an overview); Hamburger, 1997 and 1998, Carruthers, 1998, the essays in Nelson and Bryson, 2000 (especially Franks, 2000); Latour and Weibel, 2002; Bierhoff, 2002; Newman, 2005; Lentz, 2006, Giles, 2007; Davis, 2008. Earlier works related to these issues include Ringbom, 1969; Miles, 1985, and Freedburg, 1989. However, for a critique of relating changes in architecture to medieval theories of optics, see Binski's comments on Davis, 2008 in Binski, 2009b: 229 (a review) and see also Binski's comments on the relationship between the introduction of the retable altarpiece and seeing the host in Binski, 1995a: 150; 1995b; and 1999: 4-5.

¹⁰ Most notably Crossley, 2009 and the essays addressing 'Artistic Integration' in Raguin, Brush and Draper, 1995, especially Sauerländer, 1995a and Caviness, 1995. On the history of 'holism' in the study of the cathedral, see Crossley, 2009: 159-64; Brush, 1995 (on the historiography of

picture' of images and their roles within the interiors of either Durham cathedral priory or York Minster here due to the incomplete nature of the evidence at our disposal. However, by using both the documentary and physical evidence we have, within our analysis we can investigate the relationships that could be constructed by audiences between images, and between images and other sacred objects, within each interior.

This thesis therefore presents an innovative approach to the art-historical study of the late medieval English cathedral, viewing the cathedral churches of Durham and York in a new light. It also comprises a new contribution to the study of the medieval image, demonstrating its importance within the physical and imaginative spaces of these important cathedral churches and the people who worshipped in them.

i. *The ('Devotional') Image: Scope, Terms, and Definitions*

The focus throughout this thesis are those objects described in sources as images, indicated by the use of nouns 'ymago'/'*imago*' and '*pictura*': in ecclesiastical contexts these were usually in the media of sculpture or wall paintings, as previous scholarship has shown.¹¹ The cross has often been a distinct object of discussion in scholarly discourse.¹² Here, the crosses in the inventories from York, significantly in one inventory listed separately to '*Ymagine*s' and '*Reliquie*' and numbering nineteen, have not been included individually due to this distinction, and to their large number, though reference will be made to their probable (and in some cases specified) functions as altar and processional crosses in the discussion. Similarly, the thirteen crosses described in the Durham *Liber de Reliquiis* will not be included individually, apart from one which has a particular relationship with a monumental rood in the interior.¹³ Monumental roods have been included in this study due to their significance both within these institutions

Gothic sculpture in particular). Particularly notable works in this history are Mâle, 1898, 1922 and 1949; Sedlmayr, 1950; von Simson, 1956; Panofsky, 1957. A more recent study of the cathedral giving a European-wide historical, architectural, and functional overview is Erlande-Brandenburg, 1989.

¹¹ Marks, 2004: esp. 13, 15, and 18-19.

¹² For example, O'Reilly, 1987; Duffy, 1990; Raw, 1990; Binski, 2004: 201-05 and 209-30; Karkov, Keefer and Jolly, 2006; Jolly, Karkov, and Keefer, 2007; Keefer, Jolly and Karkov, 2010; Munns, 2010.

¹³ The forms and functions of the processional cross have merited its own monograph: see Hourihane, 2005.

(spatially and devotionally), and their importance in the wider context of scholarly discourse on images in ecclesiastical interiors.¹⁴ To exclude them would be akin to staging a production of *Hamlet* without the lead actor.

A small but significant body of evidence for wall paintings has also been included. This is firstly due to their devotional use in both the parish, cathedral, and abbey contexts, all of which have been explored to varying degrees in previous scholarship.¹⁵ Secondly, it allows us to consider relationships between images in different media. Comprehensive discussion of the images in the media of stained glass and those on textiles and *tabulae* at Durham and York is not possible within the bounds of this thesis due to the sheer amount of evidence we have. Not only are there an astonishing number of surviving images in stained glass at York, but we also have a detailed account from c.1603 of the iconography of the stained glass at Durham; we also have a large number of textiles and *tabulae* listed in the York chantry inventories.¹⁶ However, images in stained glass and on textiles or *tabulae* could be *foci* for devotional acts, and were usually significant components of ecclesiastical environments, as our evidence suggests.¹⁷ This thesis will therefore consider examples of images in these media, especially that of stained glass, comparatively with the three-dimensional images and wall paintings which will be our focus. In doing so, it allows us to draw attention to the relationships and associations that could be constructed by audiences between images in different media, and also the image complexes created by their presence in particular spaces within the interiors. Similarly, exterior sculpture, for which there is plentiful evidence, especially at York,¹⁸ will not be a focus here, but will be referred to in order to elucidate potential relationships and associations with the interior images.

¹⁴ For example, Brieger, 1942, Raw, 1990: 47-54; more recently, Lutz, 2004, Beer, 2005, Fisher, 2006, Buran, 2011, Marks, 2011 and 2012.

¹⁵ Primarily Gill, 2000, Marks, 2004, and Rosewell, 2008. But see for example Binski, 1992 and 2010; Park and Welford, 1993, and Reeve, 2008 for discussions within the contexts of cathedrals and great abbeys.

¹⁶ See *Rites*: 109-22, for the description of the glass. On the role of textiles within the ecclesiastical context, see most recently Heard, 2011. Extant stained glass in cathedral churches has received significant attention. On Durham, see Haselock and O'Connor, 1980. On York see Harrison, 1922, O'Connor and Haselock, 1977, French and O'Connor, 1987, French, 1995, and 1999, and Norton, 2005. On Salisbury, Marks, 1996 and Brown, 1999: 79-110, and on Wells, Ayers, 2004. For an overview of stained glass in the period, see Marks, 1993.

¹⁷ Marks, 2004: 18.

¹⁸ Oosterwijk and Norton, 1990; Brown, 2003: 118-22.

This approach is therefore both a complement to, and to an extent a departure from, previous definitions and discussions of the image, more specifically the ‘devotional image’, a term which has a complex history in continental scholarship. The German ‘*Andachtsbild*’ was used in the nineteenth century to describe images used in relation to private devotional practices.¹⁹ In 1921 it was used by Georg Dehio specifically to distinguish a kind of fourteenth-century sculpture consisting of a single scene, such as the *Schmerzensmann* and *Vesperbild* (Man of Sorrows and *Pietà*), from other kinds of sculpture in the ecclesiastical interior, particularly the altarpiece, but also architectural and tomb sculpture.²⁰ Wilhelm Pinder in particular linked the emergence of these iconographies to the emotional and spiritual climate of fourteenth-century Germany and the mysticism of figures such as Henry Suso.²¹ The term was widened to include paintings by Erwin Panofsky, who delineated their distinctive function from that of the cult image and also ‘historical’ scenes.²² The *Andachtsbild*, in Panofsky’s opinion, enabled the viewer to immerse him or herself contemplatively in the image they were beholding, allowing ‘the subject and object almost to merge on a spiritual level’.²³ This more generous definition ‘widened the scope [of study] both chronologically and geographically’,²⁴ but also drew too precise a line between forms and their respective functions in the eyes of others. As Berliner pointed out, a narrative or a figure from a narrative could easily become an ‘incentive or object of a devotional attitude and prayer’.²⁵

Sixten Ringbom’s reassessment of the nomenclature for images in 1965 concluded that the English term ‘devotional image’ should be understood as one of function, encompassing various media such as sculpture and painting, and both single and narrative scenes, the images’ purpose being to encourage ‘private edification, prayer, and meditation’ in the domestic or ‘private’ sphere of a chapel.²⁶ In contrast *Andachtsbild* ‘should be defined by formal and iconographical criteria alone’.²⁷

¹⁹ For an overview of the uses, see Schade, 1996: 35-46.

²⁰ Dehio, 1921-34: II, 117.

²¹ Pinder, 1922: 3.

²² Panofsky, 1927: 264.

²³ *Ibid.*

²⁴ Ringbom, 1983: 54.

²⁵ Berliner, 1956: 104, fn.13.

²⁶ Ringbom, 1983: 54-5.

²⁷ *Ibid.*: 57.

Yet Hans Belting, in his 1990 monograph *Imago Pietatis, The Image and Its Public*, pointed out that Ringbom's use of *Andachtsbild* as a term which 'designates form without function' is nonsensical, it being 'merely the German term for 'devotional image'' which 'does not provide a second term at all, and in addition, does not define what it ought to define, the pictorial form'.²⁸ Belting drew attention to the 'complex, and moreover, unstable' relationship between form and function as justification for the use of the term 'devotional image' rather than *Andachtsbild*.²⁹ Importantly, he also suggested that using the term 'devotional image' still presents problems because of its inherent artificiality. Despite the late medieval preoccupation with images' ability to 'stimulate a feeling of pious devotion', rather than their oft-quoted abilities to instruct the illiterate and 'serve as a reminder of the constant presence of the mysteries of the faith', in line with Gregory the Great's dictum, Belting noted that 'no third term was introduced, in addition to *imago* and *historia*, to designate an image specialized for effecting [pious devotion]'.³⁰

Nevertheless, he used the category in his 1994 monograph on the medieval image, *Likeness and Presence*, in which the late medieval period was characterized as 'the era of the private image', where a 'confusing spectrum of religious images' enjoyed wide availability and challenged 'the authority of the old cult image'.³¹ Here, the cult image was again set up in opposition to the devotional image, and the latter also in contrast to the altarpiece, the 'stage of the public image'.³² The uniting characteristic of the devotional image in its many forms was reiterated as being that it was used to aid private, individual prayer outside the bounds of the liturgy.³³ More recent German scholarship has continued to wrestle with the term *Andachtsbild*, and highlighted its relatively recent origins, the first record of its use being in the work of Goethe, a point that

²⁸ Belting, 1990: 50.

²⁹ *Ibid.*

³⁰ *Ibid.*: 55-6. For discussion of Gregory's dictum, see Duggan, 1989 and Chazelle, 1990. It should be noted that whilst these terms perhaps had a different inflection, this is difficult, if not impossible to detect in the written sources on which we must rely, especially in the English context.

³¹ Belting, 1994: 409-10.

³² *Ibid.*: 409-11; 414.

³³ *Ibid.*: 417.

reiterates Belting's remark that no new term was coined in the Middle Ages for images which aided pious devotion.³⁴

Two works of English scholarship have also revisited the problems surrounding the classification of medieval images. Beth Williamson's consideration of altarpieces, liturgy, and devotion has pointed out the potential for altarpieces' iconographies to be 'used and understood both liturgically and devotionally' as 'making reference to the sacrament of the Mass but also stimulating devotion to the depicted saints'.³⁵ She suggests that the distinctions drawn by earlier scholars between public liturgical activity and altarpieces on the one hand, and private devotional activity and 'devotional images' on the other, 'are rather too sharp'.³⁶ Altarpieces in ecclesiastical settings could be used for private, devotional purposes within or without the structure of the liturgy, and devotional images 'designed to be used in private, outside the setting of a church or chapel' could 'encourage, or allow consideration of, certain liturgical themes and concepts as part of the devotional process'.³⁷ She urges scholars to think more in terms of the different types of possible responses to images, including 'liturgically structured' responses, rather than the 'fixed categories' of devotional images, altarpieces, or liturgical images.³⁸ This, as she points out, would break the reflexive oppositions between liturgy and devotion, and liturgical images and devotional images.³⁹

In addition, Williamson suggests that in light of the increasing research 'into the specifics of context and function', we need to be aware of the 'possible problems created by too close an attachment to the idea that objects are fully explained by their context', arguing for more discussion of how 'all kinds of images engage their beholders', with evidence of their context aiding this endeavour.⁴⁰ This common-sense argument brings analysis of the image into the orbit of a more 'holistic' or 'integrated' approach, and cuts through the lexical

³⁴ Schade, 1996 (see 21-36 for discussion regarding Goethe); Kammel, 2000; Schmidt, 2000; Noll, 2004 (particularly 299).

³⁵ Williamson, 2004: 380.

³⁶ *Ibid.* 381.

³⁷ *Ibid.*: 381.

³⁸ *Ibid.*: 381.

³⁹ *Ibid.*: 405-06.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*: 405.

and methodological knots (especially that of the definition of *Andachtsbild*) created by the strict categorization of images by earlier scholars.

Richard Marks' *Image and Devotion in Late Medieval England* has applied a similar kind of holistic approach to images within the context of the parish church.⁴¹ It is this study from which the present thesis takes a large part of its methodological cue, but which also provides some of the most fertile ground for points of comparison when considering the *locus* of the English cathedral, evidence from the latter being employed by Marks only in specific instances and usually for the purpose of contextualization (an exception is his consideration of Our Lady of the Undercroft at Christ Church, Canterbury).⁴² The devotional image is still used as a functional category, but Marks's definition is much looser, and simpler, than those of previous scholars: like Williamson he identifies response as being the key factor. The devotional image is 'defined neither by medium nor form, but by function...[it] derives its meaning...from the process of its cultural use by the devotee'.⁴³ Devotional images are therefore 'incomprehensible without considering the communities and individuals which used them'.⁴⁴ This approach to defining the devotional function is informed by physical and documentary evidence which demonstrates interaction with images, such as votive offerings and monetary bequests, and the individual, collective, and liturgical prayer around which they were 'the pivot'.⁴⁵ It is these activities, in Marks's opinion, 'which distinguishes...[the devotional image] from the vast majority of English imagery in screen-paintings, murals, and stained glass', for which there is scant evidence concerning devotional practices; yet the potential of this imagery to be used devotionally is acknowledged, and such artefacts are invoked for comparative purposes, especially when discussing iconographical issues.⁴⁶

Like earlier scholars, Marks limits his study to those forms which were most popular in his chosen geographical and situational context.⁴⁷ Here, as

⁴¹ For an earlier assessment of the problems and questions in relation to this context see Binski, 1999.

⁴² For instance, Marks, 2004: 146; on Our Lady of the Undercroft, see 190-93.

⁴³ *Ibid.*: 1, 13.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*: 1.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*: 157.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*: 1, 13-15, 134. Two examples of bequests to images in stained glass are cited, but 'such references are not common': 19.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*: 18.

elsewhere in northern Europe, the devotional image ‘was often on a monumental scale’ and ‘usually took the form of carved statues or reliefs, although painting on walls and piers was also common’.⁴⁸ Yet within this the ‘cult or miracle working image’ is singled out for consideration in its own chapter, therefore its distinctive quality is preserved to an extent.⁴⁹

Importantly, and in contrast to Marks, Williamson’s comments are made in the wider context of a discussion of extant painted altarpieces. Yet her arguments, as well as Marks’ focus, give us precedents for exploring the potential flexibility of functions of, relationships between, and responses to images, primarily those in three-dimensions, within the interiors of the cathedral churches at Durham and York. In doing so, this study intersects with a diverse body of previous scholarship which allows for consideration of the images in relation to the nuances of space, occasion (particularly the liturgy), audiences, and other sacred objects which lay within both churches. An outline of this scholarship is therefore necessary.

ii. *Previous Scholarship: Themes, Issues, and Methodologies*

The ‘spatial turn’ in the humanities has led to an increase in literature concerning the construction, delineation, and use of sacred space in and around the medieval church; related to this is a continuing interest in the idea of liminality put forth in the work of anthropologists such as Eliade, van Gennep, and Victor and Edith Turner.⁵⁰ Both Peter Draper and Nicholas Orme have recently considered the practicalities of, and reasoning behind, access and enclosure within both secular and monastic cathedrals, and the relationship between gender and access to sacred space within the cathedral context has been discussed in the works of Jane Tibbits Schuenburg, Dawn Marie Hayes, and Roberta Gilchrist.⁵¹ The *foci* for the discussions of Hayes and Gilchrist, respectively the secular institution of Chartres cathedral and the monastic cathedral priory of Norwich, are particularly apposite

⁴⁸ Marks, 2004: 16.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*: 186-227.

⁵⁰ For an overview of the phenomenon, see Warf and Arias, 2008; and the introduction to, as well as the essays within, Hamilton and Spicer, 2006, for a discussion of medieval and early modern sacred space (1-23). On liminality, see particularly Eliade, 1959; van Gennep, 1960: 15-25; Turner and Turner, 1978; more recently the essays on liminal space in visual culture edited by Gertsman and Stevenson, 2012. See also Pocock, 1996, for a geographer’s utilization of the spatial turn in a ‘place evocation’ of Durham’s Galilee Chapel.

⁵¹ Draper, 2003; Orme, 2007; Tibbits Schuenburg, 2005; Hayes, 2003, and Gilchrist, 2005.

comparative examples for our consideration of the delineation of, and access to, sacred space at Durham and York in relation to the locations of images.

The relationship between images and sacred space has also been addressed specifically. The potential for ‘cognitive maps’ to be constructed in the parish church, discussed by Pamela Graves, has been applied by Paul Crossley in his explorations of the devotional ‘pathways’ which can be constructed using the exterior and interior images at Chartres as markers.⁵² Mary Carruthers’ work on memory, and the idea of *ductus* in relation to art, is one to which Crossley is also heavily indebted, but its influence more widely on recent art and architectural scholarship is one which should not be underestimated.⁵³ Fabienne Joubert and Jérôme Baschet have also considered the functional and iconographical relationships between exterior and interior images, the latter in the context of a wider discussion of the place of images in the space of the church.⁵⁴ Similarly, Claudine Lautier has examined the relationship between the images in stained glass and the relics within the sacred space of Chartres cathedral, especially the *chevet*.⁵⁵ These discussions give us starting points for the consideration of the potential relationships between images in various media at both institutions, and, in the case of Lautier’s, between images and relics.

This latter relationship is one that potentially has particular significance within the cathedral context. Hans Belting memorably asserted that images and relics were ‘never two distinct realities’ in the medieval imagination,⁵⁶ and consideration of the relationship between images and relics by Caroline Bynum and Jean-Claude Schmitt has particularly focused on the materiality of figural reliquaries.⁵⁷ Specifically, these objects blurred the lines between the two categories not only because of their reliquary function, but also because of their encasement of the earthly remains of saints in precious metals and jewels, the stuff of the heavenly Jerusalem.⁵⁸

⁵² Graves, 1989: 309; Crossley, 2009: 166-72, and more fully in Crossley, 2010.

⁵³ Carruthers, 1990, 1998, and particularly in relation to Crossley’s work, Carruthers, 2010.

⁵⁴ Joubert, 2008; Baschet, 2011.

⁵⁵ Lautier, 2009.

⁵⁶ Belting, 1994: 301.

⁵⁷ Bynum, 1992b: 261-97, 1995: 200-225; 318-29, 2011: 70-82; Schmitt, 2002: 273-96.

⁵⁸ On this see especially Schmitt, 2002: 285-87, and Bagnoli’s contribution in *Treasures of Heaven*: 137-148.

However, in recent scholarship and museum display there has been a tendency to explore relics and figural reliquaries in isolation from images without a reliquary function. Most prominent in this regard is the British Museum's exhibition of relics and reliquaries, *Treasures of Heaven* (2011).⁵⁹ Yet the medieval cathedral was a context in which images and figural reliquaries resided together. This contrasts particularly to the parish church, where relics and reliquaries were scarce, and this study therefore provides an opportunity to assess to what extent, and how, these objects were regarded as distinct at Durham and York, but also how they may have invited associations across, and created devotional complexes within, particular spaces with images that did not have a reliquary function.

The interaction between architecture and liturgy, and particularly the question of whether, and how, one influenced the other, has been explored several times in relation to English cathedrals, including specifically the phenomenon of the Lady Chapel, by Peter Draper; Kees van der Ploeg explored the question in detail through analysis of Siena's cathedral in 1993.⁶⁰ Importantly for our purposes, van der Ploeg also specifically addressed the role of church art in the equation, particularly altarpieces. His conclusion that architecture, liturgy, and church art were only 'loosely related...in a broad sense', but that specific circumstances, problems, and solutions, brought them together is one that can be tested within the contexts of both Durham and York.⁶¹

The problematic issue of the workings of ecclesiastical art, architecture and liturgy, and its connection to consideration of sacred space, has taken on new significance in light of the 'liturgical turn' in art-historical studies, of which Williamson's article may be seen as an example.⁶² Whilst 'liturgically-structured' responses to fixed images may be a fruitful avenue of exploration, as Williamson has noted, the relationship between these fixed objects, especially in the vicinity

⁵⁹ *Treasures of Heaven*; see in particular the essay by Hahn on figural reliquaries: 163-72. See also Boehm, 1990, Montgomery, 1996, and the 1997 volume of *Gesta*, comprising essays on body-part reliquaries by Boehm, Montgomery, Shortell, Hahn, and Head, and also the catalogue for the 2001 exhibition *The Way to Heaven: Relic Veneration in the Middle Ages* (Nieuwe Kerk, Amsterdam, and Museum Catharijneconvent, Utrecht): Van Os, 2001.

⁶⁰ Draper, 1987, 1990 (for Lady Chapels), 2006, esp. 206-15; Van Der Ploeg, 1993.

⁶¹ van der Ploeg, 1993: 165-67.

⁶² Williamson, 2004. See in particular the introduction to, and the essays within, Kroesen and Schmidt, 2009 (with introduction at pages 1-10), especially Binski, 2009a, and the essays within Opačić and Timmermann, 2011. For an earlier collection, see the essays within Blindheim, 1995, especially Binski, 1995b.

of the altar, and portable images is one that also merits investigation, and will be addressed here. Also notable in addressing the problematics of architecture, liturgy, sacred space, and images, are Jacqueline Jung's publications on the role of the choir screen in German and French churches, c.1200-c.1400. Her argument for the unifying role of the screen, and the images associated with it, despite its ostensible architectural function as a barrier between spaces and people (notably the clergy and the laity), not only gives us a comparative context for the study of the *Triumphkruez*, a major feature in the image-topographies of the interiors of both Durham and York, but also suggests the importance of considering images flexibly in relation to associated architectural features, and in relation to their potential audiences.⁶³

Often related to audience(s) is the issue of patronage. Patrons, those who 'commissioned, financed, and/or gifted' images, could be among their intended audience(s), but patronage usually held within it, amongst other motivations, a desire for others to behold and use images, and within this to associate the image with the patron, especially after death, as Julian Luxford has noted.⁶⁴ The patronage of art and architecture in Benedictine monasteries in the south-west of England has been explored by Luxford in detail,⁶⁵ and focused on the nature and extent of both internal and external patronage (i.e. patronage by monks themselves, and those outside the cloister), systematic analysis of the patronage of persons of different status within these groups (and importantly, their motivations), as well as consideration of the forces competing for the patronage of those external to the cloister. These approaches lend themselves to consideration of both the nature and patterns of patronage at Durham, a northern Benedictine cathedral priory, but also at York, where they can be tested within the context of a secular institution. This is particularly important because although the canons of the secular cathedrals have been the focus of detailed study by David Lepine (1995), their relationship to images, and patronage of them, has figured only briefly within this, even within his very recent discussion of the specific topic of the artistic patronage of the higher secular clergy.⁶⁶

⁶³ Jung, 2000; 2006; 2013.

⁶⁴ Luxford, 2008: 82; see also esp. 95-97.

⁶⁵ Luxford, 2005, and (largely functioning as case studies) 2003, 2011a, and 2012.

⁶⁶ Lepine, 1995: esp. 140-141; 2012, esp. 279-80.

Discussion of scholarship concerning patronage within monastic and secular institutions leads us towards further consideration of the two institutions which form the focus of this thesis and the characteristics which make them particularly suitable for comparative study.

iii. *A Framework of Difference: Durham Cathedral Priory and York Minster*

The late medieval institutions at Durham and York and their cathedral churches are both objects of extensive bodies of scholarship.⁶⁷ The late medieval community at Durham was monastic, specifically Benedictine, one of the richest in the country, and the product of the reforms of William of St Calais, Bishop of Durham (1080-96).⁶⁸ St Calais, a Benedictine himself, brought monks from Jarrow and Monkwearmouth to Durham in 1083, expelling the secular community which had originated as that which fled Lindisfarne with the body of St Cuthbert in 875, and who had moved to Durham from Chester-le-Street in 995 under the leadership of Aldhun, the last bishop of Lindisfarne and first of Durham.⁶⁹ Under St Calais, the roles of bishop and abbot were united, with the prior responsible for the day-to-day leadership of the monastic community. Uniquely in medieval England, the bishop of Durham also exerted considerable secular power as *comes palatinus*, at the core of which were the territories within the ‘bishopric’, the land between the rivers Tyne and Tees (and distinct from the spiritual diocese, which

⁶⁷ In connection to Durham, of particular importance are Dobson, 1973; the collections of essays in Bonner, Rollason and Stancliffe, 1989, and Rollason, Havey and Prestwich, 1994; Liddy, 2008 (specifically on the bishopric). In relation to the art and architecture, Willis, 1727; Carter, 1801; Billings, 1843, the collection of essays in Coldstream and Draper, 1980, and Klukas, 1995, which briefly discusses the changing features of the interior from the nineteenth back to the twelfth century. In connection to York, Drake, 1736; Browne, 1847; Aylmer and Cant, 1977, including in particular the chapters by Hill, and Dobson. In relation to the architecture, Willis, 1727; Willis, 1848; Bassham and Gee, 1980; Gee, 1984; Norton, 2001, 2007; Brown, 2003. Dobson, 1996, includes a number of collected essays addressing aspects of the history of both institutions, and his comparative approach supports the methodology applied here. The architectural history of York Minster from c.627-1500 is to be the subject of a major new publication by Prof. Christopher Norton and Stuart Harrison, research for which is ongoing at the time of writing. A booklet based on the research findings so far, ‘*York Minster Revealed. An Illustrated Architectural History c.627-1500*’, is forthcoming later in 2014, but has not been available for consultation for this thesis. I am grateful to the authors for allowing me access to the new phased reconstruction plans of the Minster which will be used in the booklet, which I have used in a modified form in Volume II of this thesis.

⁶⁸ On the Benedictine order in its wider medieval European context, see most recently Clark, 2011.

⁶⁹ Rollason, Harvey and Prestwich, 1994: xxvii. On the background to the reforms, see also (J) Barrow, 1994, and Burton, 1994; on the community at Chester-le-Street see Cambridge, 1989 and Bonner, 1989, and on the cult at Lindisfarne, see Thacker, 1989.

encompassed land between the rivers Tees and Tweed).⁷⁰ Geographically, the cathedral priory's location in what was, by the time of the Reformation, a 'medium-sized' city⁷¹ in Northumberland, meant it was also on the front-line in the Anglo-Scottish wars from the end of the thirteenth century onwards.⁷² The region had been subject to periodic Scottish attacks as early as the reign of Malcolm III, who 'personally led at least four attacks'; yet it was also this king who was present when the foundation stone for the cathedral building was laid in 1093.⁷³ His *volte-face* in relation to his regard for St Cuthbert and the community appears to have been the starting point of the Cathedral Priory's close, if sometimes difficult, association with Scottish royalty until the Anglo-Scottish wars.⁷⁴

After the initial building programme of the late eleventh and early twelfth century, the only significant architectural additions to the cathedral priory's church were the Galilee Chapel, at its west end, under Bishop Hugh le Puiset (1153-95) and the Chapel of the Nine Altars, at its east end, in the mid-thirteenth century.⁷⁵ Of intrinsic importance to the bishop and community were the relics of St Cuthbert (c.635-687). The origins of the bishopric lay in lands granted to St Cuthbert, and the community identified itself as the custodians of St Cuthbert's cult.⁷⁶ The presence of the head of the Northumbrian royal saint Oswald (603/04-642) in Cuthbert's coffin, confirmed at the 1104 translation of Cuthbert's relics to the eastern apse, and the alleged *furta sacra* of the relics of the Venerable Bede (673/4-735) from Jarrow during le Puiset's bishopric, meant that by the period under consideration here, two other saints were important components in the interior's sacred topography, as well as Cuthbert's shrine in the east end.⁷⁷ Both were linked to Cuthbert's cult, and Bede to Oswald as well, Oswald having granted Lindisfarne to Cuthbert's predecessor as bishop, Aidan (635-51),⁷⁸ and

⁷⁰ Liddy, 2008: 17.

⁷¹ Harvey, 2006: 1.

⁷² Liddy, 2008: 13.

⁷³ (G) Barrow, 1994: 313. On Malcolm's role in 1093, see Wall, 1994.

⁷⁴ (G) Barrow, 1994: 313 and 319-20.

⁷⁵ On the building, and particularly its architectural resonances with Old St Peter's, as well as its context within the *corpus* of English and continental Romanesque cathedral buildings, see Fernie, 1980 and 1994, and Thurlbury, 1994. On the Galilee Chapel, see Halsey, 1980, and on the Chapel of the Nine Altars, see Draper, 1980.

⁷⁶ Liddy, 2008: 176-77; Piper, 1989.

⁷⁷ *Rites*: 46; *Libellus*, iii.7; Halsey, 1980: 71.

⁷⁸ *Libellus*: i.1.

Bede having promoted the cults of both Cuthbert and Oswald through his writing.⁷⁹

In contrast, York Minster was a secular institution which traced its history back to the seventh century and to the Roman mission, and the first church dedicated to St Peter at York was that in which King Edwin (c.586-633) was baptized by one of Gregory the Great's Roman missionaries, Bishop Paulinus (d.644).⁸⁰ The see of York had attained Metropolitan status in 735, and therefore was the mother church of Durham throughout our period.⁸¹ By 1300 it had also exerted its autonomy in relation to the dispute over primacy with the province of Canterbury,⁸² and was an integral part of what was economically and politically the country's second city.⁸³ Unlike Durham, where the monastic vow of *stabilitas* ensured that the cathedral priory was continually the site of the *opus dei* of the monks, at York Minster many of the canons who comprised the chapter, numbering thirty-six prebends, were often absent, and much of the quotidian *opus dei* fell to the vicars choral.⁸⁴ Furthermore, the liturgical rites differed at each institution: Durham appears to have followed its own rite, for which there is only scant evidence, while the Minster was the primary *locus* for the Use of York.⁸⁵

Although the site of the Minster appears always to have lain in the city itself, and in the vicinity of the present building, from the eighth century onwards a succession of churches was built. Paulinus' church was replaced by an Anglo-Saxon cathedral, which documentary evidence suggests may have been destroyed in 741, and the eleventh-century Minster was subject to the ravages of the Harrying of the North in 1069, with Danish invaders damaging what was still standing in 1075.⁸⁶ The cathedral built by Archbishop Thomas of Bayeux (1070-1100), was modified by Archbishop Roger Pont l'Évêque (1154-81), who

⁷⁹ Colgrave, 1985: 141-308 (*Life of St Cuthbert*); *HE*: particularly III.5-6 and 9-13.

⁸⁰ *HE*: ii.14. On the history of York's secular status within the wider context of secular English cathedrals in the late medieval period, see Edwards, 1967, esp. 12-21.

⁸¹ Hill and Brooke, 1977: 5.

⁸² *Ibid.*: 31-35.

⁸³ Tillot, 1961: 54-113. On the period 1068-1300, see also Rees Jones, 2013.

⁸⁴ Dobson, 1977: 86-98. Two of these prebends were appropriated to the Augustinian priors of Nostell and Hexham. *Idem*: 53. On the small number of residentiary canons at York during the fifteenth century, see Dobson, 1996: 195-225. The number of monks at Durham during the fifteenth century has been calculated as, on average, seventy at any given time. See Dobson, 1973: 52-55, and Dobson, 1996: 54-55.

⁸⁵ Pfaff, 2009: 180-83 (Durham); 445-63 (York).

⁸⁶ Rollason et. al., 1998: 144; Johnson et. al., 1990: Ch. 2, 18, for Hugh the Chanter's comments on the eleventh-century destruction.

replaced Thomas' choir and also significantly modified the west façade (see Plan 6, showing the latest conjecture on the layout of Roger's cathedral).⁸⁷ The extant transepts were replacements of those of Thomas of Bayeux's church, and were built under Archbishop Walter de Grey (1215-55); the chapter house and its vestibule were added in the late thirteenth century.⁸⁸ Unlike the architectural chronology at Durham, for much of our period rebuilding continued, beginning with the nave, which was undertaken c.1291-1360, and then the entire eastern arm, which started c.1360 but not complete until the second decade of the fifteenth century.⁸⁹ A related contrast in this context is that unlike Durham, where very little medieval stained glass survives, York Minster retains one of the richest *in situ* collections in Europe.

Like Durham, the late medieval Minster housed the relics of a saint, the archbishop William of York (d.1154; canonised 1226).⁹⁰ William was the object of pilgrimage throughout our period, as suggested by panels in the great fifteenth-century St William window (n7; see Plan 13).⁹¹ Though both prelates, William's cult was different in character and never matched the renown of that of Cuthbert, therefore providing a further point of contrast between the two institutions. By the early fifteenth-century, as at Durham, the relics of more than one saintly figure were present at York. After the beheading of Archbishop Richard Scrope in 1405 for his part in the rebellion against Henry IV, he was buried in the Scrope family's chapel of St Stephen at the north-east side of the eastern arm, and regarded unofficially as a martyr.⁹² Although he was never canonized due to the political sensitivities surrounding his cult, Scrope's tomb was the focus of pilgrimage throughout the fifteenth century.⁹³

⁸⁷ On Thomas's cathedral, see Norton, 2001b.

⁸⁸ Brown, 2003: 10-45; 46-85. For discussion of the significance of one of the Chapter House's extensive programmes of stained glass, see Morgan, 2009.

⁸⁹ Brown, 2003: 137-67; 168-215; see also Norton, 2007: 138-45.

⁹⁰ On William's life and the circumstances surrounding the canonization is Norton, 2006; see Wilson, 1977 on the later shrines.

⁹¹ French, 1999. See also Boertjes, 2007, on the pilgrim *ampullae* and the healing oil from the shrine.

⁹² See the essays within Goldberg, 2007, especially Pirovansky, 2007 and Norton, 2007: 166-70.

⁹³ Norton, 2007: 171-79; 198-213.

iv. *Structure and Content of This Study*

The thesis is divided into two parts. The first part comprises four chapters, of which the first two relate to Durham cathedral priory and the second two to York Minster. Chapters One and Three discuss the character, values, and limitations of the sources used for each cathedral, and the methodologies employed in approaching them for this study. This is particularly important as many of the primary sources have been published in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, and the published editions used extensively in subsequent scholarship, but as yet there has been no systematic analysis of their editorial methodologies and the scope of what has and has not been included.

Chapters Two and Four use the sources discussed in their preceding chapters to build up the topography of images in the interiors of the two institutions. These two longer and primarily discursive chapters are of intrinsic importance to the study. Some of the evidence for some of the images at both institutions has been cited in previous literature, but often briefly, and in many instances tangentially in relation to architectural features.⁹⁴ A small number of extant images has occasionally been the subject of detailed discussion, most notably the wall paintings in the Galilee Chapel at Durham,⁹⁵ but so far there has been no attempt to gather the evidence from all available sources to set out the topography of images at either Durham or York. As well as orientating the reader within the interiors, these two chapters therefore allow us, where appropriate, to place images within their spatial contexts and in some cases suggest new locations from those which have been previously assigned. It also allows us to posit possible iconographies and materials for some images, relating the textual descriptions to pertinent extant images where appropriate, and the wider European art-historical context, therefore enabling visual and stylistic contextualization. It also allows us to highlight the richness of the sources from both institutions, and

⁹⁴ For instance, in Browne, 1847: I, 236 and 269; Brown, 2003: 112, 235, 239. Some but by no means all are included in the useful *Index to York Art*, classified iconographically alongside images in other media, principally stained glass, from other institutions, including the parish churches of York (Davidson, 1985). Articles by Gee (1984) and Sheils (1999) discuss the locations of altars and chantries within the Minster. Gee's analysis is particularly problematic due to his lack of chronological stratification. Sheils concentrates on the early sixteenth-century evidence within a wider discussion of the clergy and chantries. Neither discusses images in relation to the altars and chantries.

⁹⁵ Johnson and McIntyre, 1958-65; Johnson, 1958-65; Park, 1990; 1993, and 2014.

therefore to draw attention to those images and issues related to them which will be explored in detail in Part Two.

The topographical structure and section headings of these two chapters in Part One have been suggested by the descriptors used in the primary sources for each interior, particularly the narrative *Rites of Durham*, whose east-to-west structure also gives us a methodology for the sequence of discussion: this is employed in both chapters. However, the different section headings within each chapter are a response to the fact that their interior layouts were not architecturally or liturgically the same. Within these sections are some notable absences, the Nine Altars at the east end of Durham Cathedral Priory being the most prominent. This is due to the lack of evidence for images in these areas, and underlines the point that our evidence, though rich, is not always comprehensive.

Part Two, comprising chapters Five to Seven, is primarily analytical, and considers the functions of a number of the images set out in Part One, both in relation to those who used them and to each other. They are set out in the form of a series of case studies chosen due to the richness of evidence for them found in the sources, and their potential for fruitful analysis in relation to extant scholarship. Within this format are discussions in each chapter of objects which problematize the focus on fixed images found within the case studies, and respond to the categorization of images within wider scholarship: in particular, moveable images and image-reliquaries are considered.

Part Two is divided by broad iconographical categories. Chapter Five considers images of Christ, Chapter Six images of the Virgin Mary, and Chapter Seven images of the saints. Although many images were composed of more than one figure (for instance, Christ and the Virgin), and there is scope to have configured the analysis in several other ways (thematically, for example), there is justification for this division in light of the ways in which the images are described in our sources, much as we have noted in relation to the locational division in Part One. Moreover, this categorisation preserves the theological delineation between the figures that would have been familiar to their medieval audiences. It also complements secondary literature from a number of disciplines

which focuses on these figures and/or aspects of their cults individually.⁹⁶

Throughout Part Two, the discussion of the images' functions and relationships is variously informed by, tested against, and contextualized by the approaches and issues which have been discussed within previous literature relating to images in continental cathedral contexts and to the English parochial context. Comparative evidence is also employed from other English cathedrals, and great abbeys for which surviving evidence is particularly strong, such as the Benedictine abbey of St Albans and the Augustinian foundation of St Augustine's, Bristol. This allows us to delineate further similarities and points of distinction between institutions.

Stratified plans, each covering a fifty year period, of the topographies of images, chapels, and shrines referred to in the text can be found in Volume II. Also included in Volume II are plans of the locations of stained glass windows at both institutions, and other plans of the interiors relevant to the text. A table of the offerings recorded at Durham Cathedral Priory is also included as an Appendix, as is a list of figures on the choir screen at Durham: both are at the end of this volume (see pp. 265 and 266-67).

The structure of this thesis enables a comparative examination of the images within two of the most important ecclesiastical interiors in late medieval England. Within this, it also seeks to connect the images, their uses, and their meanings to wider geographical and institutional contexts through the use of a range of documentary and physical evidence. In doing so, it aims to contribute significantly to our understanding of the image in late medieval England, and to our understanding of the interiors of English cathedrals. This introduction has set out the scope of this study, outlined the approaches, issues, and themes of relevant previous literature, and summarized salient points of comparison between the institutions of Durham Cathedral Priory and York Minster. Finally, it has set out the structure of the thesis. We shall turn now to our first chapter.

⁹⁶ For instance, on Christ, see: Raw, 1990; Ross, 1997; Morello and Woolf, 2000; Reynolds, 2000; and Lipton, 2005. On Mary see Clayton, 1990; Morgan, 1991, 1993, 1994, 1999, 2003; Pelikan, 1996; Oakes, 2008; Rubin, 2009; and Warner, 2013. On the saints, see Brown, 1982, and Vauchez, 1987 and 1999; Nilson, 1999.

CHAPTER ONE

SOURCES AND METHODOLOGY: DURHAM CATHEDRAL PRIORY

1.i. *Outline*

Durham possesses the largest archive of muniments to survive at any English cathedral. There are, for example, ‘several hundred’ obidentary rolls dating from before the Reformation.¹ This richness precludes a detailed examination of all potentially relevant documents in their original format for this study. Fortunately, many of the most salient documents for the history of the cathedral priory and its fabric, and for its images, have been published by the Surtees Society in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, albeit in some cases in fragmentary form, and modern scholarship on Durham still makes copious, if cautious, use of these volumes.² Most relevant for the purposes of this study are the *Extracts from the Account Rolls* (in three volumes), and the narrative source entitled *The Rites of Durham*, both of which were edited by J.T. Fowler and published between 1898 and 1903. The overall methodology employed has therefore been a detailed examination of the pertinent Surtees Society volumes and antiquarian sources, and judicious recourse to relevant original documents, especially in order to assess the extent of the printed versions’ completeness and accuracy. The specific methodology used in relation to each individual source is detailed below, as well as discussion of its character, values, and limitations.

1.ii. *The Sacrists’ Account Rolls*

The sacrists’ account rolls are unfortunately ‘one of the most defective series’ in terms of their continuity of all the extant series of obidentary rolls, some of which are represented by accounts ‘for nearly all years for two centuries or more’.³ They date from between 1318 and 1535-36, totaling 117 separate

¹ Snape, 1980: 26. On the development of the accounting system, see Cambridge, 1992: 19-20

² See, for instance, Dobson, 1973; Snape, 1980; Wilson, 1980; Cambridge, 1992; Dobson, 1996; Nilson, 1998.

³ Snape, 1980: 26.

documents, with the majority dating from the period 1342-1488.⁴ All decades within this period are represented, with many years' rolls running sequentially, but only the 1350s in their entirety.⁵ Of the total number of documents, there are eighty-six separate accounts and inventories: the latter will be discussed in the following section. Twenty-nine of the eighty-six documents are also extant in a second copy, known as the 'B' copy. The account for 1351-52 is extant in two first version counterparts and also a second version, reflecting the medieval practice of making three copies of each account: one for the prior, one for the sub-prior, and one to be kept in the custody of the sacrist.⁶ The copies differ in content in only a few places, and those termed 'A' copies have been consulted for the purposes of this study, unless there is manuscript damage or the handwriting has proven unreadable, in which cases what has been termed the 'B' copies have been consulted.⁷ The format of the accounts proper varies slightly throughout the period, but usually follows a general pattern listing receipts, expenses (often divided into general expenses or 'expenses *pro ecclesia*' and 'necessary' or 'minute' expenses), pensions and stipends, repairs, and donations and *exennia* ('gifts').

Fowler's *Account Rolls* act, to a certain extent, as a useful guide through the rolls for the purposes of this study. It lists all the surviving rolls, usually notes when more than one copy exists, and provides extracts of varying lengths from all but three.⁸ The character of the extracts indicates Fowler's methodology. He begins by giving full transcriptions of the earliest rolls, but extracts from many

⁴ The eleven offices of obidientaries were that of the Sacrist, Feretrar, Almoner, Bursar, Cellarer, Chamberlin, Communar, Granator, Hostiller, Infirmarer, and Terrar.

⁵ Whilst most of the accounts begin in May/June and run to May/June of the following year, the start and end dates are not always in continuous sequence, and some rolls cover six or twelve months beginning in November, or twelve months beginning in February. For example, 6th November 1349 - 10th May 1350, 11th November 1401 - 11th November 1402, and 2nd February 1406 - 2nd February 1407.

⁶ I am grateful to Alan Piper for pointing this out.

⁷ The differences are that in several instances the 'A' copy includes lists of arrears, of waste and decay, of debts, or a summary balance (1376-77, 1377-78, 1378-79, 1382-83, 1408-09, 1420-2); in one instance the 'B' copy does not give a balance (1379-80). Those classified as 'A' copies, perhaps due to their being in some instances slightly more comprehensive, are usually those from which Fowler took his extracts. Here, footnotes will clearly state when the 'B' copy has been used.

⁸ Namely, that of 1341-42, which is badly damaged and for which there is no copy, that of 1343-44, for which he notes 'With Status; nothing special', and that of 1405-06, for which he notes 'Presents nothing remarkable'. DDCA Sacrist's Rolls, 1341-42; *Account Rolls* II: 379, 400. It should be noted that Fowler's dating of two of the rolls has been modified in the cataloguing process: that which he describes as 'c.1350' is now thought to be from 1358-59, and that from '1384-5' has been shown to cover only the period 23rd May 1384 - 11th September 1384.

later rolls dispense with many of the routine receipts, stipends, and pensions and do not necessarily list routine expenses which appear regularly in the rolls.⁹ Rather, the extracts concentrate on entries that give information about building work, repairs, and labour on the cathedral fabric and the receipt, buying, and maintenance of fittings and furnishings. Entries which become routine are noted the first time they occur but rarely on subsequent occasions, unless some new or unusual information is included within the entry. The receipt from the collection box at Bede's tomb, for example, is a regular entry in the accounts from 1377-78 onwards, but Fowler notes its first appearance and only again in the 1483-84 extract, perhaps because of the large amount of money received: 34 s. 8d, in comparison to 7 s. 9d. in 1474-75.¹⁰ Significantly, no collection receipts are given by Fowler for the 1485-86 account, yet the original roll does include several.¹¹ Furthermore, for 1486-87 only the receipt of King Henry's is given by Fowler, but again the roll itself includes more, and although Fowler gives the amounts in the 1535-36 roll, he does not give the full entry for each, which in some cases includes the location of the box.¹²

Thanks to their concentration on entries in the rolls regarding the fabric of the cathedral, Fowler's extracts do include numerous references to images, yet the lack of a systematic approach in his methodology and lacunae such as that mentioned above in relation to the collection box receipts means that they cannot be relied on for sole use within this study, and recourse to the originals has therefore been employed alongside use of Fowler's text.¹³ As administrative documents, the account rolls from Durham and other institutions include valuable details about the locations and appearances of images, their upkeep, and even their purchase. Particularly pertinent to this study are the receipts from collection

⁹ The extract for 1379-80 gives the totals for each section of the account, but this is unusual. The extract for 1383-84 actually elides receipts and expenses. *Account Rolls* II: 388; 390.

¹⁰ *Account Rolls* II: 387 (1377-78 account roll); 414 (1483-84 account roll). DDCA Sacrist's Roll 1474-75 (front). Fowler's extract of the 1353-54 account includes '*In vino et piris pro festo Sci. Aydani*', which Fowler notes as being 'a regular entry'; it only occurs again in the extract for 1377-78, which states '*In vino, ficis {sic}, racemis, amigdalidis, et piris in die Sci. Aidani...*'. *Account Rolls* II: 382; 387.

¹¹ *Account Rolls* II: 416. DDCA Sacrists' Rolls, 1485-86 (front).

¹² *Account Rolls* II: 416; 417. DDCA Sacrists' Rolls, 1486-87 (front); 1535-36 (front).

¹³ All references to images which Fowler gives have been checked against the original entries in the rolls to ensure that they have been accurately and completely transcribed. All inventories have been checked through for references to images, and the most relevant sections of the accounts themselves, the lists of receipts and expenses, have been checked through each account to ensure that further references to images there have been captured.

boxes in the Durham account rolls, which are usually listed using the name of the altar or image with which they were associated, and which are set out in Appendix 1 (see p.265). This breakdown of amounts from individual boxes does not necessarily occur in the accounts from other institutions, including York Minster.¹⁴ In some cases in the Durham rolls, the more general location of that altar or image is given too, helping us to build up the sacred topography of the building. Furthermore, the amounts given are also helpful in suggesting the images' relative popularity.

However, the Durham rolls also have several limitations, both general and particular. Account rolls at every institution were compiled by a succession of office-holders: different individuals could have different ways of describing images and, where listed, collection boxes. In relation to collection boxes, we do not know the motivations behind donations that were made. We must remember that donations could be towards the upkeep of the altar with which the image and collection box may have been associated, or acted as a general donation to the institution, placed in the most convenient collection box possible. For instance, it is notable that at Durham no collection box is associated with donations for the fabric, whereas one is at York Minster. Furthermore, the amounts are totals only, and do not tell us the breakdown of who offered what.

There are more specific limitations to consider in relation to the Durham rolls. Although they have a wide chronological span in total, the last ninety years (from 1446 to 1535-36) are only represented by eleven account rolls, the last two rolls being separated by forty-eight years (between 1488 and 1535), meaning that they are a very incomplete set of sources. It can therefore be difficult to ascertain when collection boxes were introduced, and the long gaps between the rolls mean that references to some short-lived collection boxes may not survive at all. Also, despite the fact that the rolls cover years when important modifications to the cathedral fabric were made, some of which could impact on the location of images or suggest the need to purchase new ones, the accounts do not necessarily contain evidence for images linked to these projects.¹⁵ When images are listed in the rolls, it is often in only basic terms, mirroring the 'exasperatingly vague'

¹⁴ See, for instance, the editions of transcriptions of the fabric accounts from Ely and Exeter: Chapman, 1907 and Erskine, 1981-83.

¹⁵ Snape, 1980: 28.

nature of the accounts' entries in general.¹⁶ This was probably because the writer would assume that the reader was one of the community and therefore acquainted with the images. Furthermore, and also symptomatic of a more general limitation of account rolls, many of the entries associated with images are concerned with their upkeep and/or repair: often only one detail of an image is noted, and it is therefore difficult, if not impossible, to ascertain more about an image, such as its specific iconography.

1.iii. *Inventories from the Sacrists' Rolls, and the Feretrar's 'Liber de Reliquiis'*

Inventories are also found in the sacrists' account rolls: usually entitled '*Status*', they provide details of items in the custody of the sacrist, sometimes explicitly stated as residing in the sacristy itself.¹⁷ The inventories number twenty-two in total, the majority of which date from the period 1338-59 and are written on the same roll as the corresponding year's account, often on the dorse; later inventories date from 1404, 1439-40, and 1445-46.¹⁸ The inventories are usually short and appear to have been compiled as part of the annual accounting process, listing items such as altar cloths, chalices, and missals, but also in some cases tools, pieces of glass, and other items related to the upkeep of the priory.

It is perhaps the case that the practice of compiling annual inventories continued after 1359, and that those from 1439-40 and 1445-46 are representative of a swathe of inventories written on separate rolls which are now lost. The 1404 inventory is, however, far more comprehensive and appears to have a different purpose. It is stated as being drawn up by the outgoing sacrist, Thomas de Lyth, to be delivered to the incoming office holder, Robert of Massham, presumably to provide a full account of the items in his custody as he begins his role.¹⁹ Fowler follows a similar methodology with the extant inventories as he does with the entries in the sacrists' account rolls proper. The 1338 inventory compiled on a

¹⁶ Snape, 1980: 26.

¹⁷ For example, the 1338 inventory begins '*In primis in Camera Sacriste sunt xiiij baudekynes*'. *Account Rolls II*: 375.

¹⁸ The following years' accounts include a status on the dorse of the same document: 1338-40, 1341, 1342-43-1343-44, 1344-45, 1345-46, 1346-47, 1347-48, 1348-49, 1349-50, 1350-51, 1351-52, 1352-53, 1353-54, 1355-56, 1356-57, 1358-59 ['c.1350' in *Account Rolls II*], 1439-40, 1445-46. In addition, the 1318 status survives without any corresponding account; a status from 7th October 1338 is separate from the 1338-40 account and status, and the 1404 status is also separate from the corresponding year's account.

¹⁹ *Account Rolls II*: 394-99.

separate roll to the account for 1338-40 is transcribed fully by him, with entries from subsequent inventories in the mid-fourteenth century only briefly noted, if at all, including another inventory from 1338 on the 1338-40 account roll.²⁰ An exception is that dating from 1355-56 (perhaps transcribed fully because of the relatively high number of monks it mentions as having books in their custody).²¹ Fowler also transcribes fully the longer and more comprehensive inventory from 1404, probably because of the information it provides about building materials, tools, and the craftsmen working on the fabric.²² The next inventory, from the 1439-40 roll, is also transcribed fully, perhaps because it mentions other items for the fabric such as Spanish iron (*'ferro Hispan.'*).²³ However, the last surviving inventory, for 1445-46, is not mentioned by Fowler at all.²⁴ This lack of comprehensiveness on Fowler's part means that for the purposes of this study all of the inventories in the sacrists' rolls have been consulted: they have revealed no references to images.

The *Liber de Reliquiis*, drawn up in 1383 by Dom Richard de Segbruck in his role as feretrar of the shrine of St Cuthbert, has a very different character to the other inventories. Although the manuscript is damaged, the preamble appears to state that it is a record of what relics were kept in the feretory, their condition, and their positions: the end of this record describes them as being '*in armariolo qui subest proxime pavimento*'.²⁵ Printed amongst the extracts from the feretrars' account rolls in volume II of Fowler's *Extracts*, for the purposes of this study the original manuscript has been consulted and Fowler's transcription has been verified as comprehensive and accurate.²⁶ The *Liber* consists of fifty-three paragraphs, numbered by marginal arabic numerals, with roman numerals appearing throughout the paragraphs, usually interlined and in red ink in the original manuscript, which are used to number many of the objects: all these features are preserved by Fowler as far as publication would allow. The arabic

²⁰ *Account Rolls* II: 375-76. The 1342-43 inventory is mentioned as being 'much as before', 379; the extract for the 1350-51 inventory only comprises '*It iij missalia et ij manutergia. It. de vitro glauco, albo, et rubeo, j pond. et di. It. j naytole. It. de cabils* (etc., as in 1351-52)', 381. The inventory found on DDCA, Sacrists' Rolls, 1346-47 (dorse) is not mentioned at all by Fowler (but see *Account Rolls* II: 380 for extracts from the roll).

²¹ *Account Rolls* II: 383.

²² *Ibid.*: 394-99.

²³ *Ibid.*: 409.

²⁴ *Ibid.*: 411.

²⁵ *Ibid.*: 425; 435.

²⁶ DCL, MS B.II.35, fols. 192r-198v.

numerals are used in an alphabetical index which follows the record, to provide a guide for which paragraph should be consulted within the text to find the object. Each object and each saint is listed separately in the index, alongside their arabic numeral ('*costa beate Margarete*' thus appears under both 'C' and 'M', for example, with '6' noted afterwards to indicate it can be found in the sixth paragraph). The late Alan Piper has suggested that this well-organized and eminently useable document was kept at the shrine itself.²⁷

The lines differentiating lists, catalogues, and inventories are and were problematic.²⁸ It is perhaps because of the combination of comprehensive list and elaborate indexing that the *Liber* was given its catch-all name, though its concentration on a particular kind of object (those considered relics), residing in a particular place (at St Cuthbert's shrine), means it can be considered as an inventory. The values and limitations of this kind of document, as well as those of the inventories from the sacrists' rolls and the *Liber*, are several. Inventories are of particular value for the study of images due to their potential to reveal details concerning iconographies and materials, sometimes in considerable detail. In certain cases, this fills in some of the gaps in relation to images for which little or no details other than location are revealed in sources such as wills or sacrists'/fabric rolls. Often they give us details of otherwise unrecorded images. In addition, inventories' formats and methods of classification are also of considerable importance, giving us an insight into what could be considered an 'image', how they related to other objects within the institution's interior, and indicating who was looking after them. These details allow us to consider how and when they were used.

However, they are also problematic. As with account rolls, images may be listed in inventories compiled for a wider purpose, and therefore peripheral in the mind of the compiler, impacting upon the level of detail with which they are described. When inventories for the same purpose are compiled over a number of years by several individuals, we cannot be sure that their criteria for selection or modes of description were uniform. Depending upon the purpose of the inventory and the criteria used, only a limited number of images might be included from the

²⁷ Pers. comm., February 2011.

²⁸ As witnessed by the stimulating discussions during the recent conference 'Architectures of Knowledge: Objects and Inventories in the Pre-modern World', Courtauld Institute, 15th May 2014.

full complement of an institution. Moreover, this selection might be dictated by administrative concerns such as financial value and not necessarily indicative of a similarity in size, materials, locations, or uses of the images listed, unless they are explicitly stated by details in the text or implied by the inventory's declared purpose.

The *Liber* is particularly valuable as it places a large number of objects in a specific and important area of the interior of Durham Cathedral Priory, and gives us a secure date for them being *in situ*. Furthermore, the naming and classification of images within the scope of a 'Book of Relics' opens up the potential for discussion of the relationship between images and relics, to be explored in Part Two. However, it does not give us comprehensive details of iconographies, nor does it specify provenance and/or donors in the majority of cases. Moreover, it is compiled by one obidentary, de Segbruck, and is therefore potentially reflective of his particular idiosyncrasies in terms of description and classification: an element of bias and desire to claim these objects for the feretory, considering his role, might also have been at play.

1.iv. *The Rites of Durham*

The Rites of Durham is a unique post-Dissolution narrative. Comprising 'a discription or briefe declaration of all the ancient monuments Rites and customes, belonging or beinge within the Monasticall Church of durham before the suppression', it describes the interior of the cathedral from east to west, noting the locations and appearances of altars, images, shrines, furnishings, and some of the liturgical and monastic customs that occurred there.²⁹ It then describes other buildings in the monastic complex and the customs associated with them, as well as the names and the offices of some of the monks on the eve of the Dissolution in 1539. The *Rites* has been used as a touchstone for scholarship on the cathedral building and St Cuthbert's shrine, but its references to images, of which there are many, have received no in-depth analysis.³⁰ The earliest surviving complete manuscript dates from c.1630 (the 'Cosin' manuscript) and its text states the description was first written in 1593.³¹ A separate and incomplete manuscript of

²⁹ *Rites*: 1.

³⁰ For instance, Wilson, 1980; Nilson, 1998. Park, 1993, much of which is repeated in Park, 2014.

³¹ DUL, MS Cosin, B.II.11, fols. 49r-86v.

the text, which dates to 1593 or a few years after it, is also extant: as John McKinnell has noted, ‘it is possibly a fair copy of the author’s autograph...in the hand of the antiquary William Claxton (d.1597)’.³² In this manuscript, known as the Hogg Roll after its nineteenth-century owners, the descriptions of the east end of the cathedral, the high altar, the choir and the cross alley of the lantern, which form the beginning of the Cosin manuscript, are missing.³³

Richard Gameson has described the *Rites* as ‘a romantic yet well informed recollection of the lost monastic foundation’, and McKinnell has suggested that ‘it may have been partly compiled from the oral accounts of elderly people who remembered the priory before the suppression’, including George Clyff, vicar of Billingham (d.1595/6), who was the last surviving monk of Durham and William Claxton’s neighbour.³⁴ These comments hint at both the value and limitations of the text as a source for this study. The *Rites* is a text replete with references to images, redolent of familiarity with the building. Yet these references also need to be treated with a degree of circumspection, remembering that they were written down over fifty years after the Suppression and over thirty years after the Marian restoration, perhaps originating in the memories of either one or only a few first-hand observers, and filtered through at least one other party (Claxton).³⁵ His purposes in recording the information are not clear, though they may be related to the recusant cause. It thus provides a somewhat faded snapshot of images in the cathedral on the cusp of the Reformation, but it is not a source which helps us to gauge when the images mentioned were installed, under whose patronage, or how their appearances and locations may have changed over time.

The systematic narrative locates images and altars within the cathedral priory, and in some cases these locations can be confirmed by extant physical evidence. Importantly, some of the images mentioned in the last extant sacrist’s roll (1535-36), and therefore likely present at the Dissolution and potentially memorable to those individuals who provided Claxton with his information, are

³² DCL, MS C.III.23. McKinnell’s comments appear in his entry on this manuscript in Gameson, 2010.

³³ Margaret Harvey and Linda Rollason are currently working on a new edition of the *Rites*. They are particularly concerned with tracing the medieval sources used for the historical information within the text, and the *Rites*’ post-Reformation context and subsequent circulation. As part of this, they are in the process of studying a hitherto unknown manuscript which may be earlier than the Hogg Roll (Pers. comm. , Margaret Harvey, August 2014).

³⁴ Gameson, 2010: 21; 162.

³⁵ *Ibid.*

not present in the *Rites*. The *Rites* should therefore not be interpreted as necessarily providing a comprehensive list of all the images in the interior, but only those which were particularly remembered. This does, however, give us potential to explore the possibilities of why the images mentioned might have been so memorable. In dealing with a source written long after the Dissolution, and from the information of potentially more than one person, we also need to be alert to the possibility that images and altars might be interpreted and named in different ways to that which are found in the sacrists' rolls or other sources written by members of the community.

The *Rites* gives information about the iconographies and materials of the images it mentions, although the level of detail varies. Iconographies are usually noted, although in some instances the text employs only stock names and meagre descriptions. Elsewhere, the text details the materials from which the images were made and the colours with which they were painted, giving us a far more vivid impression than we would find in administrative documents. The narrative also describes the emotional impact of some of the images, suggesting a devotional function, although these phrases are somewhat prosaic and repetitive.

Versions of the *Rites* were published in 1842 and 1903, edited by James Raine and J.T. Fowler respectively.³⁶ Both editions use the c.1630 manuscript as the basis for the text until the beginning of the c.1593 manuscript, whence they revert to the latter, on the basis that it is the earliest text available.³⁷ Fowler's edition keeps the original spellings and contractions from the manuscripts, in contrast to Raine, whose transcription is looser. Furthermore, where the two earliest texts differ, and where later manuscripts provide (questionable) alternative or extra readings, Fowler includes them in square brackets to a greater extent than Raine, clearly stating from which manuscript the reading originates.³⁸

Many previous scholars have relied on Fowler's edition of the *Rites*, yet few have commented on its quality: only M.G. Snape has noted that it was 'ably edited'.³⁹ In light of this paucity of detail, and the character of the account roll extracts also edited by Fowler, the methodology employed here has been to check

³⁶ Raine, 1844.

³⁷ *Ibid.*: vii-viii; 20; *Rites*: x.

³⁸ For references to later copies of the *Rites*, see McKinnell's entry in Gameson, 2010: 162. The principal later manuscripts used by Fowler are DCL, MS Hunter 45, c.1655; and DCL, MS Hunter 44, c.1660, and MS Lawson, c.1656.

³⁹ Snape, 1980: 20.

his transcription, principally against the two manuscripts which form the main text of the *Rites* in order to check its accuracy and completeness, paying particular attention to passages which mention images, and where later manuscripts provide alternative, additional, or problematical readings, to consult them as well. This has demonstrated that Fowler's edition is accurate and can be used confidently. In the one instance where he has deviated from the Cosin manuscript by referring several images as being 'right over' the high altar, he has stated in a footnote that the manuscript in fact reads 'right on': a salient editorial point on which for us to turn to the topography of the cathedral priory.⁴⁰

⁴⁰ *Rites*: 7.

CHAPTER TWO

THE TOPOGRAPHY OF IMAGES IN DURHAM CATHEDRAL PRIORY

2.i. *The High Altar*

The position and arrangement of the high altar at Durham before the late fourteenth century has not been the object of extensive study. However, discussion of the position of St Cuthbert's tomb, in the central apse of the triple-apsed east end of the Romanesque cathedral, has demonstrated that it retained the same position from the twelfth century into the later medieval period, and up to the present day.¹ From the late fourteenth century, it was dominated by the Neville Screen behind it. Made from Caen stone transported from London in the 1370s, and erected probably before 1380, it was jointly financed by John, third Baron Neville of Raby (d.1388), and the priory (Fig.3).²

According to the *Rites*, the altar had 'many pretious and costly ornaments appertaininge to it both for principall day as also for euery...dayes', and the screen was 'uerye curiously wrought both of the inside and outside with faire images of Alabaster being most finely gilded', suggesting that the niches, open-backed tabernacles, and semi-enclosed tabernacles all contained statuary comparable to that on the feretory side of the screen, to be discussed below.³ The *Rites* continues, '...in the midst whereof right on the said high altar', were three images of 'uery fine Alabaster...all richly gilded', identified as 'our lady standinge in the midst, and the picture of St Cuthbert on the one side and the picture of St Oswald on the other'.⁴ Fowler, and more recently Wilson, have both interpreted the position of the images as being 'right over' the high altar, and that the images filled the central three niches of the Neville Screen which span the width of the high altar (Fig.4).⁵ These images and their positions will be considered in detail in Part Two.

¹ Crook, 1994: 236-38.

² Neville is said to have paid either £500 or 500 marks, with the institution contributing 200 marks. Wilson, 1980: 90.

³ *Rites*: 7.

⁴ *Ibid.* See DUL, MS B.II.11, fol. 51r. for 'right on'.

⁵ Wilson, 1980: 90.

2.ii *St Cuthbert's Feretory*

St Cuthbert's relics were moved to the area behind the high altar of William of St Calais' cathedral in 1104. This east end was replaced by the Chapel of the Nine Altars in the thirteenth century, and Crook proposes that the platform was converted into its present rectangular shape at that time.⁶ The east side of the Neville Screen forms the feretory's west side, and, in a similar fashion to the screen's west side, it incorporates numerous niches in its wall, which according to the *Rites* held 'fine little Images': in some cases dowel holes are clearly discernible in the screen at the back of these niches (Figs.5 and 6).⁷

Before discussing the contents of the *Liber de Reliquiis*, the arrangement of the inventory and the *armarium* itself merit discussion. The first three paragraphs each begin by describing the locations of the items which follow according to the '*gradus*', which can be interpreted as indicating 'position', with a suggestion of grade, or more prosaically 'step', but here might be rendered more appropriately as 'shelf':⁸ '*in primus [sic] et suppremo gradu australi*', '*in gradu sub primo*', and '*in gradu tercio et suppremo*'.⁹ A large number of the relics are listed in subsequent paragraphs, and it is only in the fortieth paragraph that another location is mentioned: '*in suppremo gradu australis partis versus occidentem*'; no further locations are given in the remaining paragraphs of the inventory.¹⁰ The size, scale, and arrangement of the *armarium* is therefore not clear from the locational descriptors used, rendering any reconstruction difficult. They suggest three shelves, although the use of '*suppremo*' to describe both the first and third shelves is confusing. It may be that the south and north sides had different arrangements. It is noticeable that although the 'south part' is mentioned, there is no corresponding mention of the 'north part' anywhere in the inventory.

The *Rites* describes 'almeryes of fine wenscote' being located 'both of the north side and the south [of the feretory]', and Crook has drawn attention to the 'arc-shaped wear caused by a door visible at the south end of the [shrine] platform', which he associates with one of these 'almeryes' and the 'square

⁶ Crook, 1994: 236-242; 244-45.

⁷ *Rites*: 5.

⁸ Lewis & Short: '*gradus*'.

⁹ *Account Rolls*, II: 426.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*: 431.

sockets on the north and south ends of the platform, some with lead matrices still in position', which he contends were supports for a metal grille, 'perhaps part of an arrangement for displaying additional relics preceding that described in the *Rites*', rather than fixings for the cupboards themselves (Fig.7).¹¹ He does not mention the evidence of the 1383 *Liber*, but there is a possibility that its *armarium* is one of the *Rites*' 'almeryes'. Another possibility is that the *amarium* was used for some time in between the installation of the 'almeryes' and the metal grille. The late-fifteenth-century relic cupboard at Selby Abbey, destroyed by fire in 1906, may give some indication of the imposing nature of the setting of the collection of relics at Durham (Fig.8): the same can be said for the extant relic cupboard from the high altar at the cathedral of saints Stephen and Sixtus at Halberstadt, Germany (c.1520, Fig.9).¹²

The inventory itself contains details of a large number of crosses, including '*una crux nigra que vocatur Blak rode of Scotland*', and '*una crux que vocatur Sancte Margarete regine Scocie*': the problematics associated with the identification of the former by this name will be explored in Part Two. Also listed are Gospel books, textiles, and containers including phials, bags or purses, and chests, which contain a variety of bones and other objects. All crosses are listed under 'C' in the index, whilst three '*ymagines*' are under 'Y'. The name of the first image is missing because of damage to the manuscript, but the arabic numeral 40 allows us to cross reference it with the image of the Virgin described as '*alba in tabernaculo*' in the main text.¹³ The second image is described as '*Ymago beati Oswaldi cum costa*', which can be cross-referenced with the unnamed image in the first paragraph described as 'silver and gilded with the rib of the same [person] included in the chest of the image'.¹⁴ The third is listed in the index as '*ymago beati Cuthberti et...*': as Fowler notes, there is no reference number and some damage to the manuscript, meaning the next few words are obscured. However, the words '*Walcheri episcopi*' follow this lacuna, and the image can be cross referenced with an entry inserted at the end of the first paragraph in a second hand, which describes it as silver ('*argentea*'), '*ex dono*

¹¹ Crook, 1994: 245-46.

¹² St John Hope, 1907. I am indebted to Dr Eric Cambridge for this reference.

¹³ *Account Rolls* II: 439; 431.

¹⁴ '*ymago {S. Oswaldi} argentea et deaurata cum costa ejusdem inclusa in pectore ymaginis*'. Fowler inserts Oswald's name and refers to the index in order to justify this. *Ibid.*: 439; 426.

Willelmi episcopi'.¹⁵ Fowler appears to be correct in suggesting the donor to be Bishop William Walcher (d.1080).¹⁶

It is notable that more objects are described specifically as '*ymagines*' in the text of the inventory itself than under this category in the index. The first item of the first paragraph (and therefore, like the images of Oswald and the image of Cuthbert, located '*in primo et supremo gradu australi*') is an image of the Virgin, described as 'silver and gilded' ('*argentea et deaurata*'),¹⁷ and the sixteenth paragraph lists another image of the Virgin, this time made of ivory ('*eburnia*').¹⁸ Neither appears in the index under '*ymagines*'. Several other figural objects are listed in the inventory, but again do not appear in the '*ymagines*' listing of the index. These are the silver-decorated arm 'with bones of St Lucy' ('*unum brachium argentatum cum osse Sce. Lucie*');¹⁹ the head ('*caput*') of St Aidan (d.651), 'decorated in gilded copper and precious stones' ('*ornatum in cupro deaurato et lapidibus preciosis*')²⁰ and the head ('*caput*') and bones ('*ossa*') of one of the Eleven Thousand Virgins of Cologne.²¹ The heads ('*capud*' and '*caput*') of St Ceowulf and St Boisil also appear in the inventory, described as residing, seemingly together, in a feretory decorated 'with gold and silver and...images', the description being incomplete due to damage to the manuscript.²²

This categorisation of the objects does not point to a fixed interpretation on the part of Richard de Segebruck of images as figural objects or even figural objects made from precious materials; nor does reliquary function or lack thereof appear to be a defining characteristic. Rather, it appears that in terms of the index, the objects were in some cases defined by their shape or by the identity of the saint, or more than one of these categories.²³ However, in dealing with a working document it may also be the case that de Segebruck simply decided not to list all the objects which could come under the listing of '*ymagines*' for the simple

¹⁵ *Account Rolls* II.: 439; 426.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*: 439.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*: 426.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*: 429.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*: 426.

²⁰ *Ibid.*: 433.

²¹ *Ibid.*: 433.

²² '*Item capud Sci. Ceowulphi regis et postea monachi, et caput Sci. Boysili .iiij. presbiteri in uno pheretro ornato cum argento et auro et...ymaginibus*'. *Ibid.*: 433.

²³ *Ibid.*

reason that the listing was at the end of the index and all the objects were already listed under one or more categories. The wider issues of the provenance, functions, and significance of the images of the Virgin, St Cuthbert, and St Oswald, as well as the *capita*, and these objects' relationship with the shrine of St Cuthbert itself, will be explored in detail in Part Two.²⁴

2.iii. *The Choir Ambulatory*

Two roods hung in the choir ambulatory according to the *Rites*. One was in the north choir ambulatory, located within a chapel. This had formerly been an anchorite's cell and was reached by stairs 'adioyninge to the north dore of St Cuthberts feretorie'.²⁵ Although there is a set of steps leading up to the feretory on its north side in the present cathedral, Wilson has noted that these and the lateral walls of the screen are later than the Screen itself, and Ben Nilson has pointed out that no steps are shown in that location on Browne Willis' plan of the cathedral from 1728.²⁶ This point supports Wilson's hypothesis that access to St Cuthbert's shrine was usually through the doors of the Neville Screen from the choir; notably, the stairs are also not shown on Carter's 1801 plan.²⁷ The screen's north door could be that which is being described here in relation to the chapel. The rood is described as 'marueillous faire...with the most exquisite pictures of Marye and John'.²⁸ Although no further details are given regarding its iconography or provenance, the *Rites* does state that a monk said mass there daily, and that it was where priors were wont 'to frequent both for the excellency of the place as also to heare masse standing so conueniently unto the high altar'.²⁹

More detail is given concerning the rood in the south choir ambulatory, located 'opposite to the foresaid porch [the anchorite's chapel]' and identified as the 'black Roode of Scotland' in Cosin MS B.II.11, the earliest complete

²⁴ The early fourteenth-century mutilated statue of St Cuthbert holding St Oswald's head which now stands in the feretory is likely to have been from the central tower, and moved to the feretory in the nineteenth century. See Billings, 1843: 14; Pevsner and Williamson, 1983: 200, and *Durham Cathedral Inventory*, 2006: VII, Section 10(8), inventory number 10.8.2. I am grateful to Suzanne Pepper at Durham Cathedral Library for details from the inventory, and Dr Eric Cambridge for drawing attention to the possibility of a late fourteenth-century date and different provenance for the head of St Oswald.

²⁵ *Rites*: 17.

²⁶ Willis, 1727: 222-23; Nilson, 1998: 99.

²⁷ Wilson, 1980: 95; Carter, 1801: Plate II.

²⁸ *Rites*: 17.

²⁹ *Ibid.*

manuscript of the *Rites*.³⁰ Here, it is described as being ‘brought out of holy Rood house, by King Dauid Bruce and was wonne at the battaile of Durham’, a reference to the battle of Neville’s Cross in 1346, which took place only a few miles west of the Cathedral Priory on Bearpark Moor.³¹ The figure of Christ is not mentioned, but further details of its iconography are given in MS Cosin B.II.11:

with the picture of oure ladye on the one side, and St Johns on the other side uerye richly wrought in siluer all 3 hauinge crownes of gold with deuice or wrest to take them of or on beinge adroned with fine wainscote.³²

The description of the Battle of Neville’s Cross which forms the first surviving membranes of the Hogg Roll suggests that not one, but two roods were associated with the battle. It states that in the aftermath of the battle, the prior, monks, and the leading English noblemen of the battle, including Ralph, 2nd Lord Neville of Raby (d.1367), John, his son and later 3rd Baron Neville of Raby, and Henry Percy, 9th Baron Percy (d.1352), all went back to the cathedral priory ‘ther ioyninge in hartie praier & thanks...for ye conquest & victorie atchived that daie’.³³ The mysterious provenance of ‘A holy cross which was taken out of holie rudehouse’ is recounted immediately after the report of the after-battle thanksgiving in the cathedral priory. The cross had appeared to David II from between the antlers of a hart when he was hunting outside Edinburgh, and was subsequently housed at the abbey of Holyrood, built in honour of the object.³⁴ The king, the Hogg Roll states, ‘cummyng towards ye said battell, dyd bring yt upon him as a most myraculous & fortunate relique...’³⁵. The text then reports that David was ‘punished by god almighty’ by being captured and wounded,

also lost ye saide crosse which was taiken vpon him, & many other most wourthie & excellent Jewells & monuments which weare brought from scotland as his owne banner & other noblemens auncientes...which all weare offred vp at ye shryne of St Cuthbert for bewtifiyinge & adorninge therof, together with ye blacke Rude of scotland (so tearmed) with Mary and John, maid of silver, being as yt were smoked

³⁰ *Rites*: 18.

³¹ *Ibid.*: 19; 25. On the battle, see the essays in Rollason & Prestwich, 1998, especially Lomas, 1998, for a discussion on the geography of the landscape in relation to the written sources: the exact site of the battle on Bearpark Moor remains unclear.

³² *Rites*: 18. The word ‘wrought’ was added in a second hand.

³³ *Ibid.*: 24.

³⁴ *Ibid.*: 24.

³⁵ *Rites*: 25.

all ouver, which was placed & sett vp most exactlie in ye pillar next St Cuthbert's shrine in ye south alley...³⁶

This report suggests that both the small rood taken from Holyrood abbey and the rood which was set up in the south choir ambulatory were taken at the battle and possibly even set up in the east end of the cathedral priory immediately after the victory, as part of the community and noblemens' thanksgiving. The small rood can be suggested as being the same object as 'the Black Rood of Scotland' mentioned in the 1383 *Liber de Reliquiis*. We shall discuss the problematic nature of the *Rites*' assertion that the 'relique' cross was taken from David, and reassess the significance of both crosses in relation to the battle, in Part Two.

As well as repeating the name and provenance of the south choir ambulatory rood, the mid-seventeenth century MS Lawson version of the *Rites* includes a more detailed description of its appearance not found in the earlier manuscripts. It states that the three figures were 'all smoked black over, being large pictures of a Yard and five quarters long'.³⁷ This unconventional mode of recording the figures' height suggests that we should perhaps be cautious regarding the description's veracity. Their crowns are described as 'of pure bett gold of goldsmiths work', and a description of the manner in which they were fastened and displayed follows:

on the backside of the said rood and pictures, there was a piece of work that they were fastened unto being all adorned with fine Wainscot work and curious painting well befitting such costly pictures from the middle pillar... up to the height of the Vault, the which wainscott was all redd Varnished over very finely, and all sett full of starres of Lead, every starre finely guiltd over with gold, and also the said roode and pictures had every of them an Iron stickt fast in the back part of the said Images that had a hole in the said Irons, that went through the Wainscott to put in a pinn of Iron to make them fast to the Wainscott.³⁸

Unlike the earlier manuscripts' descriptions, this does not specify a location for the Black Rood. The Hogg Roll's specification of 'in ye pillar next St Cuthbert's shrine' suggests it may have been located at the first pier from the east on the south side of the shrine, yet the Cosin manuscript suggests that its location should

³⁶ *Rites*: 25.

³⁷ *Ibid.*: 19.

³⁸ *Ibid.*

be understood as related to the second pier from the east on the south side of the choir, and so opposite the site of the former anchorite's chapel. Close inspection of the two piers reveals no damage to their faces related with the placing of a monumental rood and its accompanying figures. However, a series of three holes is discernible on the upper part of the second pier from the east with corresponding holes on the opposite pier to the north: this raises the possibility that that the rood may have been mounted on a beam (Fig.10).

The Sacrists' Rolls reveal little more about the Black Rood of Scotland in the south choir ambulatory or the rood in the north choir ambulatory. A fragment of a roll from 1358-59 notes 55 s. 11 d. as being spent on or around 'the cross hanging near to the choir' (*'circa cruce [sic] ponendam juxtam chorum'*), though details of the work done are not stated and the wording is ambiguous.³⁹ The Black Rood may well be that described as 'in the south part of the choir' (*'ex australi parte chori'*) in the 1486-87 roll, in which it is stated as being cleaned at a cost of 20 d.⁴⁰ This is only one of two references to the upkeep or repair of crosses in the rolls. The other is an entry in the 1411-12 account for two amounts of 4 s. and then 10 s. 4 d. 'for the repair/restoration of the cross' (*'pro...emendacione crucis'*), giving no further information as to which cross this was.⁴¹

2.iv. The Choir Screen

The choir screen ran between the north-east and south-east pillars of the crossing (Plans 1-5). Echoing the description of the images in the Neville Screen, according to the Cosin B.II.11 manuscript of the *Rites*, 'gilted' images 'uery beautifull to behould' were '[placed] either side the west dore...in the lanthorne...in their seuerall rooms one aboute another'.⁴² The figures are identified in the *Rites* as thirty-four kings and queens of England and Scotland from Canute to Richard III who 'weere deuout and godly founders and benefactors of this famous Church and sacred monument of St Cuthbert'.⁴³ There is no indication of the order in which they were depicted, or their size. However, the royal status of the figures and their prodigious number suggests a programme

³⁹ DDCA, Sacrists' Rolls, 1358-59 (mem. 1, front).

⁴⁰ DDCA Sacrists' Rolls, 1486-87 (front).

⁴¹ DDCA, Sacrists' Rolls, 1411-12 (front).

⁴² *Rites*: 20.

⁴³ *Rites*: 20-21.

similar in tone yet more ambitious in scope than those at Christ Church, Canterbury and at York Minster, both built in the middle of the fifteenth century and therefore nearly contemporary with the Durham work.⁴⁴ As Fowler has noted, MS Hunter 45's version of the *Rites* (c.1655) gives only twenty-eight names of kings and queens.⁴⁵ He suggests that two of the thirty-four names in the Cosin manuscript can be interpreted as mistaken repeats, but nonetheless, all thirty-four names can be accounted for in the historical record.⁴⁶

Another Cosin manuscript (B.II.2), dating from 1660 and comprising a number of texts on the history of the cathedral and monastic community, includes a list of thirty-two kings and bishops, rather than queens, and short biographical details said to have been depicted on the screen under them.⁴⁷ Further to his theory regarding the mistakenly repeating names, Fowler has speculated that the images of kings and queens mentioned in Ms. B.II.11's text of the *Rites* 'were at some point substituted for the same number of kings and bishops'.⁴⁸ This appears to be a viable theory especially considering that the latest reigning king mentioned in Cosin B.II.2 is Henry I (d.1135) and the latest bishop of Durham is Hugh le Puiset (d.1195).

In addition to this evidence from the *Rites*, a list of works and repairs made under the priorship of John Wessington (1416-46) mentions a sum paid for the '*novum opus vocatum le Rerdoose, ad ostium chori*'.⁴⁹ This has been interpreted to mean that Wessington commissioned a new choir screen.⁵⁰ Fowler supposed that the screen contained the niches, the 'seurall roomes', in which the images of kings and queens stood, in a similar fashion to the niches incorporated into the screens at Christ Church, Canterbury, and York Minster.⁵¹ However, Eric Cambridge, who has also interpreted the 'Rerdoose' as the screen itself, has noted that the amount stated for the cost of the work (£69 4 s.) seems ill-fitting to cover

⁴⁴ Brown, 2003: 233.

⁴⁵ *Rites*: 212.

⁴⁶ The repeated and undistinguished names are Alexander of Scotland, which occurs three times, Matilda of England, which occurs twice, and which could denote the Empress Matilda, Matilda, consort of William I, or Matilda, consort of Henry I; Malcolm of Scotland occurs three times, and entries for Helinor of England and Elinora of England could refer to Eleanor of Aquitaine, consort of Henry II, and Eleanor of Provence, consort of Henry III.

⁴⁷ DUL, MS Cosin B.II.2, pp.15-25, transcribed as an appendix in *Rites*: 137-44.

⁴⁸ *Rites*: 212.

⁴⁹ *Scriptores Tres*: cclxxiii.

⁵⁰ Snape, 1980: 31 and 36, n.73; Klukas, 1995: 73 and 80, n.20.

⁵¹ *Rites*: 212.

the cost of a new screen.⁵² He has therefore proposed that the figure may be erroneous, or an amount for completing a structure begun earlier.⁵³ Might the ‘Redoose’ refer simply to an altar reredos rather than a choir screen? The same word could be used to denote either,⁵⁴ and as Julian Luxford has noted, seven late fifteenth-century painted wooden panels of bishops surviving at Hexham Abbey may once have formed either ‘the high altar retable or a monumental screen’ (Fig. 11).⁵⁵ The lack of any evidence for an altar at the choir screen at Durham suggests that in this case, the ‘Rerdoose’ was more likely to refer to a monumental screen. However, we should also perhaps not discount the possibility that the ‘new work’ was in fact the installation of one set of figures for another.

The arrangement of the text of MS B.II.2 is worth outlining as it suggests a potential scheme for the choir screen imagery before the installation of kings and queens, and it includes images of a number of saints, including Cuthbert and Oswald. It begins by listing, with short biographies, eight kings ‘*ex parte Australi*’; following this are eight kings said to be ‘*ex parte Boreali*’; similarly eight bishops are listed, with their biographies, located ‘*ex parte Australi*’, and finally eight bishops are listed, with biographies, said to be located ‘*ex parte Boreali*’ (see Appendix 2, pp.266-67).⁵⁶ It is likely that the biographies were not inscribed below the images, as Fowler notes, though the names of the kings and bishops may have been included in the scheme.⁵⁷

The positions translate into two tiers of sixteen images on either side of the choir door, although each individual figure is not given a position, nor is it clear whether the figures in each group are being listed from north to south or south to north, or which group was on top of the other. A loose chronological order can be discerned in each group of kings, though this order is not always consecutive, the first group of which are, as the preamble states, ‘kings of all of England’, the second, six ‘kings of Northumbria...and two kings of Scotland’.⁵⁸ The groups of bishops, representing the sees of Lindisfarne and then Durham, also run chronologically though not consecutively, with figures from each group

⁵² Cambridge, 1992: 98.

⁵³ *Ibid.*

⁵⁴ *MED*: reredos(e).

⁵⁵ Luxford, 2011b: 428-430. A further panel, as he notes, is no longer extant.

⁵⁶ See Appendix 2 for complete list.

⁵⁷ *Rites*: 293.

⁵⁸ ‘*Octo Reges Totius Angliae...Sex Reges Northumbriae...et Duo Reges Scotiae*’. *Rites*: 137-38.

filling in some of the chronological gaps of the other. The first group of bishops begins with Cuthbert, and three of his immediate successors are listed after him (Eadberht, 688-698; Eadfrith, 698-721, and Aethelwold, 721-740); there is then a chronological jump to Bishop William Walcher, followed by his two immediate successors, William of St Calais and Ralph Flambard (1099-1128), and finally the later Hugh le Puiset. The other group of bishops begins with St Aidan (635-51), and two of his successors, Finan (651-61) and Eata (678-85), followed by figures who held the see of Lindisfarne well after Cuthbert: Ecgrid (830-845), Eardulf (854-875) and Cuthbert (900-915); these are followed by the first two bishops of Durham, Aldhun (990-1018) and Edmund (1021-41).

The first figures in each of the four groups are, respectively, King Alfred, St Oswald, St Cuthbert, and St Aidan, and especially in light of the loose chronological order described above, we can propose that these figures were nearest to the choir door in the centre of the screen, with kings Henry I and David I, and bishops Hugh le Puiset and Edmund at the far end of each tier respectively (see Fig.12 for a diagram of this proposed arrangement). The potential significance of these positions will be addressed in Part Two.

2.v. *The Transepts*

Four corbels have been incorporated into the west side of the four eastern piers of the south transept (Figs.13 and 14). Each is different in size and moulding. Those attached to the first and second piers from the north are substantially larger than the others, the latter in particular. The most southerly is notable for being compact and neater in its execution, and its similarity to that attached to the south-west side of the south-east crossing pier. They have not been subject to any detailed study or dating.⁵⁹ John Carter labels them on his 1801 plan of the interior, noting in the legend that they are 'brackets for statues', but does not provide further details.⁶⁰ Billings does not comment on the differences between the sizes and mouldings, but regards them all as medieval, and states that they held statues of the saints whose altars were on the eastern side of the transept⁶¹. These were, from north to south, 'the alter of our Ladye, alias

⁵⁹ The mouldings do not match or are closely similar to any in Morris, 1978 and 1979.

⁶⁰ Carter, 1801: Plate II (labelled 'P3'); legend on 7.

⁶¹ Billings, 1843: 47.

Howghels Alter', 'the Ladie of Boultons alter', and the altar of St Faith and St Thomas, according to the *Rites*.⁶² However, Billings does not provide a source for his statement,⁶³ and surviving documentary evidence does not refer explicitly to the corbels themselves or specify any images as being located on them.

Cambridge has suggested that on the basis of their mouldings the two smaller corbels attached to the two southernmost piers may date from the mid-fourteenth century, perhaps being part of the alterations carried out under John Fossor's priorship (1341-74), whilst those to the north of the most northerly and the middle chapels (Fig.13, right; Fig.14, left) may be of a late-fourteenth-century date.⁶⁴

The only evidence in the fabric to indicate fittings related to the corbels, and therefore possibly images on them, are the holes in the west face of the second pier from the north (Fig 14, left), which, due to their considerable height from the ground, may indicate a candle prick or rack. Documentary evidence which may be linked to such a candle prick is found in the sacrist's rolls. From 1382-83 onwards each surviving roll refers to a sum of 13 s. 4 d. being received from the bursar 'for the light of the Blessed Mary'.⁶⁵ The wording of this entry, replicated exactly in later rolls, gives us no information about the image's location, size, or iconography. However, the regular payments from the bursar, to whom all the other office-holders rendered their accounts, suggest an institutionally important image, as no other images are singled out in this way.⁶⁶ It is only in the final surviving roll, from 1535-36, that the wording of the entry changes to '13 s. 4 d. for the light of Blessed Mary of Bolton [sic]'.⁶⁷ This suggests that the image referred to in these entries is the same as the image stated in the *Rites* as being situated at the middle altar in the south transept, 'so-called the Lady of boultone', a name mirroring the dedication of the altar, which we have noted above (Plans 2-5, no.5).⁶⁸

⁶² *Rites*: 30-31. As Fowler notes, 'Howghels' altar was probably so-called because of an appropriation of some of the estate of the prior and convent of Houghal for the altar's maintenance. Similarly, 'the Ladie of Boultons' altar was probably maintained out of the estate of the prior and convent of Bolton in the parish of Edlingham. *Rites*: 219.

⁶³ Billings, 1843: 47.

⁶⁴ Cambridge, 1992: 52-58. Cambridge, Pers. comm., June 2014.

⁶⁵ 'xiiij s. iiij d. rec de bursario pro luminaris beate marie', DDCA, Sacrist's Rolls, 1382-83 (mem. 1, front). See also Turner, 2006: 17.

⁶⁶ *Account Rolls III*: xxiii.

⁶⁷ 'xiiij s. iiij d pro lumine beate marie de Bolton [sic]' DDCA, Sacrist's Rolls, 1535-36 (front). See also Turner, 2006: 17.

⁶⁸ *Rites*: 30.

From the detailed description in the *Rites*, this image can be identified as a *Vierge ouvrante*, an iconography relatively popular on the continent, but otherwise unrecorded in medieval England, as Melissa Katz's study has recently confirmed (Fig.15).⁶⁹ Opening from the Virgin's breast downwards, it revealed an image of

oure saviour, fynlie gilted houldinge vppe his handes, and holding betwixt his handes a fair & large crucifix of christ all of gold, the whiche Crucifix was to be taiken fourthe euery good fridaie, and euery man {Moncke, H. 45} did crepe vnto it that was in yt churche as that Daye. And ther after yt was houg vpe againe within the said image and euery principall Daie the said image was opened that euery man might se pictured within her, the father, the sonne, and the holy ghost, moste curioslye and fynely gilted.⁷⁰

The sides of the opened Virgin were coloured with green varnish 'and flowres of goulde which was a goodly sight for all the behoulders therof', and the image itself stood on a stone 'drawn with a faire crosse vpon a scutchon cauled the Neivells cross the which should signifye that the neivells hath borne the charges of ytt'.⁷¹

Marks' brief discussion of this image has stated that the 'stone' is still *in situ*, with the Neville arms visible, but he does not specify its location and inspection of the chapel and transept do not reveal any extant escutcheon (Fig.16).⁷² It is possible that he is referring to the large corbel incorporated into the pillar to the north of the entrance to the altar (Fig.17), below which are the holes possibly made when attaching a candle prick or rack to the pier. There is also considerable damage to the pier above the corbel, suggestive of an image being fastened to it. This location would be in line with Marks' suggestion that the Durham *Vierge* was akin to the extant example from Nürnberg, standing at 126cm high (c.1395; Fig.18) and whose flat-back supports the idea of the corbel being a suitable place for the Durham version.⁷³ Extant *Vierges ouvrantes* range in height from the likes of the Metropolitan Museum example at 36.8cm high (Fig.15), to that from the cemetery chapel of the parish church of Marly bei

⁶⁹ Katz, 2009: 219-221 (no. 47).

⁷⁰ *Rites*: 30.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*: 30.

⁷² Marks, 2004: 198. Inspection of the area behind the dossal of the altar did not reveal a 'stone' either. An escutcheon is not mentioned by Carter or Billings.

⁷³ Marks, 2004: 198; Radler, 1990: cat. no. 33.

Fribourg, Switzerland (c.1360) which stands at 138cm high,⁷⁴ and so location would also perhaps depend on the size of the image, a factor which is not mentioned in the *Rites*. However, the possibility that it was a smaller example of the type and stood on a freestanding ‘stone’ pedestal at the altar itself should perhaps not be discounted. The significance of the image of Our Lady of Boulton, its location and provenance, and this ritual use of the crucifix from within it during the Good Friday service will be explored in Part Two.

Three corbels have also been incorporated into the eastern piers of the north transept but, unlike those in the south transept, these are of uniform size and moulding, and matching the most southerly of the corbels in the south transept (Fig.19).⁷⁵ Cambridge has suggested these are also likely to be of a mid-fourteenth-century date and associated with Fossor’s alterations, which in this transept included reglazing of the ‘great window’ of the north wall, and several of the windows on the east side.⁷⁶ Billings states that these corbels also held images of saints to whom the north transept altars were dedicated, and Carter also records them on his plan, but again there is no extant documentary evidence to support Billings’ assertion.⁷⁷ None of the piers display damage similar to that above and below the corbel associated with Our Lady of Boulton’s altar, although all three have been cut into, probably in order to affix screens separating the altars from each other and from the west side of the transept.

The altars in this transept were, from south to north, dedicated respectively to St Benedict, St Gregory, and Sts Nicholas and Giles according to the *Rites*; in a treatise by Prior Wessington the altar of St Benedict is, however, stated as also being dedicated to St Jerome.⁷⁸ Images were certainly associated with two of these altars, although in neither case are they stated as positioned on the corbels. The chronicle ascribed to William de Chambre (fl.c.1365) records that Fossor donated, amongst other items, images of the Trinity and the blessed Virgin ‘in alabaster, with their tabernacles and ornaments, priced at £22’ to the altar of Sts Nicholas and Giles ‘in the north part’, where his chantry chapel was

⁷⁴ Radler, 1990: cat. no. 27.

⁷⁵ As above, the mouldings do not match or have close similarity to any in Morris, 1978 and 1979.

⁷⁶ Cambridge, 1992: 56, and Pers. comm., June 2014.

⁷⁷ Billings, 1843: 47; Carter, 1801: Plate II; legend on 7.

⁷⁸ *Rites*: 22-23, 29.

intended to be.⁷⁹ This suggests that the images were for the altar itself, and the large sum of money also indicates that they and their appurtenances were of some significance in quality and perhaps size as well. The Flawford figures of the Virgin, St Peter, and an unidentified bishop are of a comparable date and are each close to a metre in height, and the figures of saints Peter and Paul at Santa Croce in Gerusalemme, Rome, also of c.1380 and probably of English origin, are 128cm high, giving some idea of the sizes of contemporary examples (Figs.20 and 21).⁸⁰ Cheetham has suggested that Fossor's donations, in tune with these and other early alabasters, were figures rather than reliefs, and the extant Trinity image in the Burrell Collection provides a possible parallel for Fossor's Trinity (Fig.22).⁸¹ The significance of his donations will be considered in Part Two.

Evidence in the form of Prior Wessington's treatise '*De Origine Monachatus cum aliis de Statu Monachali*'⁸² reveals details of more images in the north transept. This treatise includes a list of 'pictures and inscriptions' of monks at the altar of Sts Bededict and Jerome. 148 figures in total are listed, from popes and kings to local figures such as Cuthbert and Bede, all of whom were members of the Benedictine order. The c.1603 description of the stained glass suggests that the images survived the sixteenth century. It describes 'ye oder of St Bennett sett forth in there pictures in wainscott, with a partition, the priors within & ye monkes with out'.⁸³ Fowler, who posited that these were probably the same figures as those described by Wessington, suggested that the figures were therefore 'upon the screen work' of the altar, though their configuration is not clear from the wording.⁸⁴

2.vi. *The Nave*

According to the *Rites*, gates at the east end of the north aisle of the nave and wainscot panels between the easternmost pillar of the south aisle of the nave and

⁷⁹ '*Hic construxit in aquiloni parte ecclesie...ordinavit dicto altari...imagines sanctae Trinitatis et beatae Virginis, de alabastro, cum tabernaculis cum aliis ornamentis, pretium 22 l.*', *Scriptores Tres*: 131.

⁸⁰ The Flawford figures are respectively 81cm, 83cm, and 96cm high. Cheetham, 2004: 22, 24, 26. For discussion of the Santa Croce figures, see Cheetham, 1984: 41.

⁸¹ Cheetham, 1984: 41.

⁸² DUL, MS Cosin B.III.30, fols. 1-25v. The list of names is published with part of the preamble of the treatise in *Rites*: 124-136.

⁸³ *Rites*: 23; 113.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*: 124; 292.

the south-west crossing pier formed parts of the divide between the nave and crossing (Plans 1-5).⁸⁵ The *Rites* describes in detail the design of the main section of the rood screen, set up ‘betwixt two of ye hiest pillors supportinge & holding vp ye west syde of ye Lanterne’:

in ye hight of ye said wall from piller to piller ye whole storie & passion of our Lord [was] wrowghte in stone most curiously & most fynely gilte, and also aboue ye said storie & passion was all ye whole storie & pictures of ye xij apostles verie artificiallye sett furth & verie fynelie gilte conteninge frome ye one piller to thother, wrowghte verie curiouslie & artificially in ye said stone...⁸⁶

Above this was a border ‘fynly gilt with branches and flowres’.⁸⁷ There are two sets of holes, similar in height from the ground and in appearance, on the south face of the north-western crossing pier and the north face of the south-western crossing pier, which Russo has suggested provided ‘anchoring-points for the top of the rood screen’ (Fig. 23).⁸⁸ However, the only extant physical evidence that may be linked to this major architectural feature is two sandstone relief panels.⁸⁹ They have been dated on stylistic grounds to c.1155-60, and Clapham first identified them as fitting with the scheme described in the *Rites*.⁹⁰ One panel depicts *Christ Appearing to the Two Marys* in the upper register, and the *Noli Me Tangere* in the lower register, the other depicts *The Transfiguration* over the upper and lower register (Fig. 24).⁹¹ As Russo has noted, the surviving panels, and the *Rites*’ description of the rood screen’s iconographical scheme, are therefore in part suggestive of extant relief narratives of the Passion such as that found on the west choir screen at Naumburg Cathedral, Germany (c.1250-55, Fig.25), and the surviving panels, formerly on the choir screen, from Bourges Cathedral, France (mid-thirteenth century, Fig.26),⁹² but also relief schemes with a more extensive chronology of Christ’s life, such as that around the choir

⁸⁵ *Rites*: 37; 40.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*: 33.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*

⁸⁸ Russo, 1994: 260.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*: 251-53. The panels are described in *English Romanesque Art*, 1984: 188-89, cat. nos. 154a and 154b.

⁹⁰ Clapham, 1934: 149.

⁹¹ Russo, 1994: 252-53.

⁹² *Ibid.*, 266-68. For recent discussion of these schemes, see Jung, 2013, particularly 156-67 and 173-79 (Naumburg), and 124-29 (Bourges).

enclosure of Notre-Dame, Paris (mid-fourteenth century, Fig.27).⁹³ Furthermore, as Russo has also pointed out, such a scheme was not singular to Durham within the twelfth-century English cathedral context.⁹⁴ The two extant relief panels at Chichester show *Jesus arriving at Bethany* and the *Raising of Lazarus* and are likely to have formed part of a scheme which ran around the interior of the screens partitioning the choir from the nave and transepts.⁹⁵ This suggests that not all schemes were on the west face of a choir screen, though it should be noted in relation to this that there is no physical evidence suggesting the Durham reliefs were elsewhere.

The *Rites* also notes that above the screen was ‘the most goodly and famous Rood yt was in all this land’.⁹⁶ No further details about the rood itself are given, but a number of accompanying images are noted, as well as its effect on the viewer:

ye picture of Marie on thone syde, & ye picture of John on thother, with two splendent & glisteringe archangels one on thone syde of Mary, & ye other of ye other syde of Johne, so what for ye fairness of ye wall ye staitlynes of ye pictures & ye lyuelyhoode of ye paynting it was thought to be one of ye goodliest monuments in that church.⁹⁷

As we shall discuss in Part Two, its location places it within the tradition of the *crux triumphalis*, or *Triumphkreuz*, the image of Christ on the cross which stood between the nave and chancel or choir of every late medieval church.⁹⁸ The Durham description is reminiscent of extant continental rood groups such as that in the cathedral of saints Stephen and Sixtus, Halberstadt, Germany (c.1220, Fig.28).⁹⁹ When might the Durham *Triumphkreuz* have been installed? *Triumphkreuze* were commissioned for St Augustine’s, Canterbury, Christ

⁹³ Russo, 1994: 267-68 (though note that here he does not make clear that the scheme runs around the choir enclosure, rather than on the non-extant screen itself). For a more detailed and recent discussion of the scheme, see Jung, 2013:107-16.

⁹⁴ Russo, 1994: 267.

⁹⁵ Zarnecki, 1954: 109-112, which sets out the reasoning for this position. See also the schematic drawing of the screens on 112 (Fig. 1).

⁹⁶ *Rites*: 33-34.

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*

⁹⁸ The term *Triumphkreuz* has been most recently borrowed in English scholarship by Marks. See Marks, 2012a: 185, and Chapter Five of this thesis.

⁹⁹ Meller et. al., 2008: cat. no. 95.

Church, Canterbury, and Beverley Minster in the late eleventh century.¹⁰⁰ It is therefore not unreasonable to suggest that Durham's was commissioned and installed during this period and retained up until the Dissolution. The extant *Triumphkreuz* at Halberstadt, for instance, was retained in the late medieval period despite significant changes to the surrounding architectural features.¹⁰¹ Alternatively, considering the often close relationship between screen and rood, which we shall explore in Part Two, it is also possible that the *Triumphkreuz* described in the *Rites* was a product of the mid-twelfth century, and installed at the same time as the surviving relief panels. It was perhaps even a replacement for an earlier rood in this position.

One of the most arresting aspects of the *Rites'* description of the rood group is the presence of two 'archangels' flanking the figures of Mary and John. Brieger has explained the theological connotations of angels in this position.¹⁰² Within this, he has noted that the flanking angels described in relation to the *Triumphkreuz* at Christ Church, Canterbury, 'appear to have been an isolated example until the 13th [sic] century', until Henry III's request for flanking angels to be installed with the *Triumphkreuz* at Westminster Abbey in 1250/51.¹⁰³ An eleventh or twelfth-century date for the Durham *Triumphkreuz* suggests that this feature was perhaps not necessarily as isolated as Brieger imagined.¹⁰⁴ Alternatively, the archangels may have been later additions of the mid to late thirteenth century, installed in response to their inclusion in rood groups such as that requested by Henry for Westminster.

The *Rites* also describes the Jesus altar, located immediately west of the rood screen in the centre of the main aisle of the nave, and enclosed within its own 'porch' of wainscotting.¹⁰⁵ The altar's retablo depicted the Passion, and the description of it suggests a sumptuous triptych:

¹⁰⁰ For St Augustine's, Canterbury, *L-B I*, 175 (653); for Christ Church, Canterbury, *L-B I*: 179 (665); for Beverley Minster, *L-B I*: 86 (326).

¹⁰¹ Jung, 2013: 48.

¹⁰² Brieger, 1942: 90-93.

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*: 93.

¹⁰⁴ Here it should be noted that Brieger does mention the Durham description in a footnote, but does not believe it to be dateable. He does not, however, appear to take into consideration the existence or dates of the surviving panels, and the possible relationship between rood and screen. *Ibid.*, n.43.

¹⁰⁵ *Rites*: 32.

standing on ye alter against ye wall aforesaid a most curiouse & fine table with ij leues to open & clos againe all of ye hole Passion of our Lord Jesus christ most richlye & curiously sett furth in most lyvelie coulors all likeye burni'ge gold, as he was tormented & as he honge on ye cross which was a most lamentable sighte to beholde.¹⁰⁶

The lack detail in this description, and the lack of any further evidence mentioning it outwith the *Rites*, makes it difficult to assign a date for the retable's installation or a medium on which were found the 'lyvelie coulors'. The 'lamentable' sight it constituted for the author, and its portrayal of Christ 'as he was tormented', suggests this was perhaps a product of the fourteenth or fifteenth century, when depictions of the crucifixion increasingly focused on the physical suffering of Christ.¹⁰⁷ One possibility is that its medium was gilded and polychromed alabaster, panels of which were being carved as sets and made into altarpieces, often triptychs, by the end of the fourteenth century (Fig.29, a-e).¹⁰⁸ However, the use of painted and gilded panels and/or carved wood, the latter often used sumptuously and on a large scale on the continent in the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries (Fig.30), should not be discounted.¹⁰⁹

Visual and physical access to this retable was limited: it was 'alwaies lockt vp ... And on ye principall daies when any of ye monckes said mess at that alter, then ye table was opened which did stand on ye alter'; in addition, the door into the enclosed space surrounding the altar was opened 'also that euery man might come in & se ye said table'.¹¹⁰ This concentration of Passion-related sculpture and imagery on, above, and before the screen in the form of the rood, rood screen, and Jesus altar retable, will be explored in Part Two.

The sources from Durham suggest only a small number of altars were located in the nave. The Neville family chantry chapel occupied the second and third bays from the east in the south aisle of the nave from c.1417 onwards.¹¹¹ It is described in the *Rites* as possessing an altar with 'a faire Allablaster table' on

¹⁰⁶ *Rites*: 32.

¹⁰⁷ For this in relation to devotional literature as well as art, see Ross, 1997.

¹⁰⁸ Cheetham, 2003: 3, and see Cheetham, 1984, cat. nos. 149-214; Cheetham, 2003: 170-76; Flavingy and Jablonski-Chauveau, 1998, and Prigent, 1998 for further extant examples.

¹⁰⁹ For example, Kroesen, 2009a: 25-134 on the development of painted and sculpted retables in the Iberian context, and Jacobs, 1998, on Netherlandish carved examples.

¹¹⁰ *Rites*: 32.

¹¹¹ *Ibid.*: 244.

it.¹¹² The chapel's dedication, which might give us some clue as to the iconography of the table, remains unknown.¹¹³ The *Rites* does describe two altars located further west in the nave, whose dedications and images it states explicitly. One was dedicated to Our Lady of Pity, enclosed in wainscoting, and sited between the first and second pillars from the west of the north arcade (Plans 3-5, V): here was 'ye picture of our Lady carying our saviour on her knee as he was taiken from ye crosse verey lamentable to behoulde'.¹¹⁴ An altar between the first and second pillars from the west of the south nave arcade (Plans 3-5, W), therefore corresponding to the location of the Our Lady of Pity altar, is described in the *Rites* as possessing an image of Christ:

a Roode, representing ye passion {of our Sauour, H. 45}
having his handes bounde, with a crowne of thorne on his head,
being commonly called ye bound roode, inclosed on etch syde
with wainscott as was ye foresaid alter of our Lady of Pietie.¹¹⁵

Fowler notes that here the 'Rood' seems to refer to the image of Christ himself rather than the cross, although 'there may have been a cross behind the figure'.¹¹⁶ The description is suggestive of both the iconographies of the *Herrgottsruh* (the Repose of the Lord), and that known as *Christus im Elend* (Christ in Distress), whose origins in sculpture can be traced to fifteenth-century Germany.¹¹⁷ Whilst the *Herrgottsruh* usually depicts Christ robed, and therefore before his journey to Calvary, in the *Christus im Elend* iconography he is usually either naked or wearing a loin-cloth, sitting on a stone or low wall, with the inference that it is later in the chronology of the Passion.¹¹⁸ A standard feature of both iconographies is that he is wearing the Crown of Thorns, and in some extant examples both his hands are bound. The Mostyn Christ of c.1500, now in Bangor Cathedral, is an example of the bound-hands variation on the *Christus im Elend*, and its

¹¹² *Rites*: 40.

¹¹³ I am grateful to Izzy Armstrong-Frost for discussion of this point.

¹¹⁴ *Rites*: 38. On this iconography, see Marks, 2002, and 2004: 123-40. In relation specifically to the French context, see Forsyth, 1995.

¹¹⁵ *Rites*: 41.

¹¹⁶ *Ibid.*: 226.

¹¹⁷ Schiller, 1971: II, 73-4; 85-6. On the *Christus im Elend*, particularly its derivation from the iconography of Job in Distress, see Von der Osten, 1953.

¹¹⁸ Schiller, 1971: II, 73.

identification as a ‘Bound Rood’ is perhaps a result of the description of the image in the *Rites* (Fig.31).¹¹⁹

This crossover of the iconographies of the *Herrgottsruh* and *Christus im Elend* has been noted by Schiller.¹²⁰ He has also suggested the potential confusion between them and figures of the *Ecce Homo*, which by the late fifteenth-century included a variation in which Christ was depicted alone and standing (in contrast to the *Herrgottsruh*’s seated figure), often with his hands bound.¹²¹ The absence of any detail regarding Christ’s attire in the *Rites*’ description makes the identification of the particular iconography difficult. However, two-dimensional variations on the *Christus im Elend* iconography usually depict Christ seated on the cross itself, or with it in the background (Fig.32),¹²² and this is perhaps what is suggested by the *Rites*’ description.¹²³ The rood may even have been in another medium to that of the figure of Christ.

The *Rites* mentions another altar with a christological dedication as being located in the north-west corner of the nave, near the north entrance to the Galilee (Plans 1-5, X):

under the Belfraie called ye gallely steple was Sancte saviours alter ye north end of ye said alter stone being wrought & inclosed into ye piller of ye waul from ye first founacion of the church (for messe to be said at) as appered at ye defacinge therof, and Remayneth there to be knowne til this day by a corner of the sayd (altar) stone not to be pulled further but by breaking of ye wall.¹²⁴

Potential evidence for the altar is discernible in the fabric (Fig.33). The receipts for offerings in the five rolls dating from between 1483-84 and 1535-36 all include amounts given to St Saviour (‘*Sanctae Salvatoris*’). Four of the rolls identify this box as being ‘at the door of the Galilee’ (‘*ad hostium galilee*’),

¹¹⁹ The remarkable Mostyn Christ appears to have received little recent scholarly attention: made of oak and nearly life-size, it was in the custody of the Mostyn family of Mostyn Hall, Flintshire before being given to the Dean and Chapter of Bangor Cathedral. Edwards, et. al. (Royal Commission), 1960: 8.

¹²⁰ Schiller, 1971: II, 74.

¹²¹ *Ibid.*

¹²² Extant fifteenth-century French examples of the iconography are discussed in Mâle, 1949: 94-98. It is noticeable that the *LCI* does not use the term *Christus im Elend*, but an example of the variation showing Christ with his head in his hand rather than his hands being bound features within its discussion of the *Rast Christi*. The *LCI* identifies two variations within the iconography of the *Rast Christi*: Christ sitting on the cross and Christ sitting alone on the cross: the presence of the cross appears to be the defining factor. *LCI* III: cols. 496-98. See also Karrenbock, 2001: cat. no. 18.

¹²³ Fowler suggests as much without relating the image to known iconographies. *Rites*: 226.

¹²⁴ *Ibid.*: 38.

suggesting that it was associated with this altar.¹²⁵ Its absence from the list of collection box offerings in 1474-75, and from the lists in earlier rolls, therefore gives us a possible *terminus post quem* for its installation, though the altar and image may well have been far older, as the *Rites* suggests. Harvey suggests that this altar was ‘almost certainly’ the focus of the guild of the Holy Saviour, which is mentioned as owning property in the Almoner’s estate accounts and in the Receiver’s Books during the mid-sixteenth century, and that these offerings may be connected to the guild.¹²⁶

None of the sources gives further information as to the medium or details of the iconography of the image of Saint Saviour which was presumably sited at the altar and the recipient of the offerings. Two images of ‘St Saviour’ are listed in the extant fifteenth-century fabric accounts from Wells cathedral, one of which was located in the vicinity of an image of ‘Holy Cross’.¹²⁷ To what extent (if any), and how, these two images were iconographically distinct cannot be gleaned from the references. However, it is notable that the crucifix at Bermondsey abbey, allegedly of twelfth-century origin, was referred to as ‘St Saviour’ in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.¹²⁸ It may therefore be possible that ‘St Saviour’ was used specifically to describe crucifixes depicting a more upright and dignified Christ, such as the *Volto Santo* (c.1200, Fig.34), rather than the more ‘collapsed or collapsing, semi-naked...suffering or dead’ Christ.¹²⁹ Visual evidence suggesting the retention of a similar robed and upright figure of Christ on the cross at Westminster Abbey appears in the Litlington Missal initial for the feast of the Exaltation of the Cross (1383-84; Fig.35). As Pamela Tudor-Craig has noted, this depiction may be ‘a late medieval interpretation of a much earlier object’, possibly with a reliquary function, especially in light of Westminster’s ownership of part of the Holy Cross and part of Christ’s seamless robe, both of which were donated by Edward the Confessor.¹³⁰

A collection box at ‘St Mary of Bethlehem’ (*Sancte Marie de Bethlem*) is also listed in the last five extant Sacrists’ rolls, in each case straight after that

¹²⁵ DDCA, Sacrists’ Rolls, 1483-84 (front); 1484-85 (front); 1486-87 (front); 1487-88 (front). The entry in the roll for 1535-36 (front) does not give the location.

¹²⁶ Harvey, 2006: 166.

¹²⁷ Colchester, 1983: 9, 16, 21, 28, 35.

¹²⁸ Vallance, 1947: 5.

¹²⁹ Binski, 2004: 218-19. On the *Volto Santo* see Ferrari, 2000, esp. 254-55.

¹³⁰ Tudor-Craig, 1998: 112.

for St Saviour; its location is given in all instances as '*ibidem*', suggesting that it too was associated with the altar of St Saviour described in the *Rites*.¹³¹ The absence of this box in the list in the 1474-75 roll and in earlier lists of offerings again gives us a potential *terminus post quem* for its installation,¹³² but its description indicates an iconography of Our Lady in Gesyn, or Childbed (Fig.36), which, as Marks has noted, was relatively common in England by the mid-fourteenth century.¹³³ The image may therefore have been in this location long before a collection box was associated with it, but the possibility remains that it was a fifteenth-century addition to the image complement of the institution. The significance of both its iconography and location will be addressed in Part Two.

2.vii *The Galilee Chapel*

Originally conceived as a five-aisled chapel with arcades of four bays, and dating from c.1165-75, the Galilee Chapel was built against the west wall of the nave, and connected with the nave solely via the imposing doorway in the centre of the west wall of the nave (Fig.37) until doorways in its north and south aisles were pierced during Cardinal Langley's alterations to the chapel in the first quarter of the fifteenth century (Figs.38 and 39).¹³⁴ There was also an entrance from the exterior into the Galilee Chapel on its north side: the exterior face of this is a nineteenth-century restoration, though Harrison has noted that it reproduces the doorway's original details accurately (Fig.40), and the interior setting, in a projecting frame, is extant, though now obscured by a modern addition to allow disabled access.¹³⁵

The surviving wall paintings of the chapel were subject to conservation and restoration work by Eve Baker in 1960-61, the conclusions of which were summarised and published by Johnson and McIntyre soon afterwards; additionally, Johnson provided a unique interpretation of the paintings and the altar dedications of the Galilee in light of the work.¹³⁶ Re-examination of the paintings was undertaken as part of the National Survey of Medieval Wall

¹³¹ Turner, 2006: 18-19.

¹³² DDCA Sacrists' Rolls, 1483-84 (front), 1484-85 (front), 1486-87 (front), 1487-88 (front), 1535-36 (front).

¹³³ Marks, 2004: 146-47.

¹³⁴ Harrison, 1994: 213, 216, 218.

¹³⁵ *Ibid.*: 217.

¹³⁶ Johnson & McIntyre, 1958-65; Johnson, 1958-65.

Painting (c.1990), and new summaries and interpretations were offered soon after by David Park. The most notable surviving paintings are the two figures on the jambs of the north central aisle altar recess, of a bishop to the south and a king to the north, the latter holding a scroll and sceptre (Figs.41 and 42), and the painted foliage which decorates the soffit of the arch, with two sets of painted drapery in the recess itself, above which is a foliate border (Fig.43).¹³⁷ Johnson, as part of a wider argument for the dedication of this altar to Holy Cross, identified the figures as Bishop Hugh le Puiset and either Richard I or Guililemus de Borres, Constable of the Latin Kingdom c.1123, whom she posited as donor of a relic of the True Cross which she argued was present at the altar.¹³⁸ Park has dated the figures to the last quarter of the twelfth century, revising that of Baker, who gave them an early twelfth-century date and even suggested that the figures could have been painted on the outside of the West wall before the Galilee was built.¹³⁹ Additionally, he has identified the figures as almost certainly being representations of St Cuthbert and St Oswald.¹⁴⁰ Tristram, though not ascribing identities to the figures, noted as early as 1950 the similarity between the figure of the bishop and the depiction of St Cuthbert in what is now BL MS Yates Thompson 26, which also dates from the late twelfth century (Fig.44).¹⁴¹ Park has also convincingly refuted Johnson's argument for the altar dedication to Holy Cross, partly through these identifications and by reiterating the textual authenticity of the *Rites*.¹⁴² In the *Rites*, the north central aisle altar is said to be 'called ye lady of pieties alter', with 'her pictur carrynge our saviour on hir knee

¹³⁷ Park, 1990: 21. For an earlier discussion, see Tristram, 1944-50: 59-60.

¹³⁸ Johnson, 1958-65.

¹³⁹ Park, 1990: 21.

¹⁴⁰ *Ibid.*: 21-22.

¹⁴¹ Tristram and Constable, 1944-50: 60. For more on the manuscript and its context see Marnier, 2000.

¹⁴² The altar of Our Lady of Pity in the Galilee, Johnson contended, 'may be merely a ghost, conjured up by a textual dislocation in the *Rites*' of the altar and image of the same name in the nave. She concludes this from a textual difference in a number of manuscript versions of the *Rites*, the earliest of which is MS Cosin B.II.11, therefore only the second earliest extant version, which state that opposite Our Lady of Pity's altar in the Galilee was the altar of 'St Roode', rather than the St Bede dedication in Fowler's edition; this 'St Roode', she argues, should be read as in fact referring to the altar of the Bound Rood in the nave, the counterpart to Our Lady of Pity in the nave. However, The Hogg Roll, the earliest extant manuscript containing this section of the *Rites*, and one which importantly Johnson seemingly did not consult, clearly reads that there was an altar on the south side of the Galilee dedicated to 'Saynt Beede', not 'St Roode', thus severely undermining her argument. See DUL, MS C.III.23. Johnson, 1958-65: 372-75; Park, 1990: 22.

as he was taiken from ye cross a very dolorouse aspecte', indicating that, like the altar of the same name in the nave, it possessed an image of Our Lady of Pity.¹⁴³

Baker concluded that the middle of the north central aisle altar recess had never been painted, leaving a central blank panel between the drapery.¹⁴⁴ In addition, 'two vertical incisions or scratches were noticed at the terminations of the drapery at the centre space', though these are no longer visible.¹⁴⁵ Park has remarked that a central space between the draperies would be highly unusual in the context of Romanesque painting, and that an earlier painting may well have been removed during 'later medieval alterations'.¹⁴⁶ Johnson and McIntyre reported that a niche 2ft 2in wide and 1ft 6in deep was revealed when plaster between the drapery was removed, which contained traces of a 'stenciled leaf pattern' also said to '[have] been made to cover both figures and draperies', and of a 'probably post-Reformation' date, which Park has revised more generally to the 'late medieval', based on Tristram's drawing.¹⁴⁷ Johnson and McIntyre do not state exactly where in the central space the niche was located, but it is noted that 'the base of the niche had been somewhat higher than the retable'.¹⁴⁸ The niche is no longer visible.

Directly above the north aisle altar recess are the remains of a wall painting, unidentified during the 1960-61 conservation, but described by Johnson and McIntyre as showing a central, seated figure, the top half of which is cut off by the roof (Fig.45).¹⁴⁹ The same wall painting is described by Park as 'a very large subject within a circular frame...including the lower part of a figure seated on a throne with a diapered cushion. This figure is off-centre, and must have been balanced by another to the left, where only small fragments remain'.¹⁵⁰ Park also notes that a figure of a bishop stands at the lower right of the painting, with his hand raised in blessing towards the scene in the circular frame.¹⁵¹ He has identified the scene as that of a Coronation of the Virgin, and the bishop as St

¹⁴³ *Rites*: 44.

¹⁴⁴ Johnson & McIntyre, 1958-65: 279.

¹⁴⁵ *Ibid.* negatives of the restoration do not show the recess or niche. DCL, B/W Negatives Box 1, no. 266, i-viii.

¹⁴⁶ *Ibid.*; Johnson, 1958-65: 371; Park, 1990: 21-22; 28, fn. 13.

¹⁴⁷ Johnson & McIntyre, 1958-65: 279; Park, 1990: 28, fn. 18. Tristram, 1944, Pl. 87a.

¹⁴⁸ Johnson & McIntyre, 1958-65: 279-80.

¹⁴⁹ Johnson, 1958-65: 372.

¹⁵⁰ Park, 1990: 23; 28, fn. 21.

¹⁵¹ *Ibid.*: 23.

Cuthbert, dating both to c.1300.¹⁵² Harrison has noted that the circular frame of the wall painting suggests that the roof was originally of barrel form, and dates the cutting through of the upper section of the roof during Cardinal Langley's alteration work in the early fifteenth century: we can therefore suggest that this was the time when the upper part of the wall painting was obscured.¹⁵³

The *Rites* notes that another Marian altar, founded as Bishop Langley's chantry chapel, stood in the centre of the chapel, described as 'our Lady's alter'.¹⁵⁴ Although the *Rites* states that wainscotting 'both abue ye head, at ye back & at either end of the said alter' was 'devised and furnished with most heavenly pictures so lyuely in cullers & gilting', no further detail is given regarding their subject matter.¹⁵⁵ The the presence and significance of these multiple Marian images and altars in the Galilee Chapel will be explored in Part Two.

The *Rites*' description of the altar of Our Lady of Pity also notes that there were images of the Passion on the walls above it and above the Venerable Bede's altar:

about the alter on ye wall thone parte of our saviours passion in great pictures, the other parte being about Saynt Beede alter on ye south syde.¹⁵⁶

This may be a reference to the surviving and extremely vivid image of Christ's crucifixion in the midst of the martyrdoms of apostles which span the southern arcade of the north altar. These images have also been dated by Park to c.1300 (Figs.46 and 47): as he notes, the three most westerly figures have been lost, but of those extant, from west to east they show a figure being flayed, probably St Bartholomew; the crucifixion of St Andrew; the beheading of St Paul; the crucifixion of St Peter.¹⁵⁷ East of the Crucifixion are figures of St John the Evangelist being boiled in oil, St James the Great's beheading, the Incredulity of St Thomas, and two damaged and unidentifiable figures; beyond this three

¹⁵² Park, 1990: 23.

¹⁵³ Harrison, 1994: 224.

¹⁵⁴ *Rites*: 43.

¹⁵⁵ *Ibid.*: 43; Halsey, 1980: 62. The remains of the wainscotting is illustrated in Billings, 1843: pl. xxxvi.

¹⁵⁶ *Rites*: 44.

¹⁵⁷ Park, 1990: 23-24.

Benedictine monks kneel in prayer in the easternmost spandrel.¹⁵⁸ Park has also noted that the facing north arcade wall holds the vestiges of green pigment on a patch of plaster, and suggests that in light of the Marian iconography in and above the recess, the miracles of the Virgin may have been painted here.¹⁵⁹

Park has also brought attention to the remains of painting above the south altar recess, in the centre of the wall, which in his estimation ‘seems to be of the lower part of a huge cross standing on a curved base presumably signifying Golgotha’ (Fig.48).¹⁶⁰ This, he contends, suggests the south central aisle altar as being the location for the altar of Holy Cross, which is mentioned in relation to receipts from collection boxes in the sacrists’ rolls, while the altar of St Bede mentioned in the *Rites* in connection with pictures of the Passion was also in the south aisle, somewhere in the vicinity of the altar of Holy Cross and Bede’s Purbeck marble tomb, installed at his translation c.1370, which is still extant in the south central aisle (Fig.49).¹⁶¹ An alternative, however, is that the altar of Holy Cross was colloquially known as that of St Bede because of the tomb’s proximity, an appellation reflected in the wording of the *Rites*.

The evidence related to the Holy Cross has never been set out in full.¹⁶² Receipts of monetary donations ‘at the church door’ are noted in each roll from 1338-40 onwards, joined by those noted as coming from the collection box ‘in the Galilee’ from 1349-50.¹⁶³ In 1376-77 the offerings at the church door are stated as being collected at the two feasts of St Cuthbert and their octaves; in this year and thereafter the receipts for the church door and the Galilee collection box are conflated into one total amount, still described using the two locations of its collection, until 1409 when the amounts are again separated out.¹⁶⁴ From 1377-78 the collection box is described as being located ‘at Holy Cross in the Galilee’, and

¹⁵⁸ Park, 1990: 24.

¹⁵⁹ *Ibid.*: 25.

¹⁶⁰ *Ibid.* Christopher Norton has noted his agreement in this identification. Pers. comm, 2013.

¹⁶¹ *Ibid.*: 26.

¹⁶² Much is summarised by Johnson, 1958-65: 380-81, but it is not comprehensive.

¹⁶³ ‘*Et de vj s. rec de oblacionibus per vices ad hostium Ecclesie*’; ‘*Et de xxvij s. v d. ... rec de oblacionibus ad ostium ecclesie*’, DDCA, Sacrists’ Rolls, 1338-40 (front); 1349-50 (front).

¹⁶⁴ ‘*Et de viij li. xv s. iij d. rec de pixide in Gallilia Dunelm & oblacionibus ad ostium ecclesie ad duo festa sancti cuthberti & in die lune in ebdomada predicti*’; ‘*xj s. ij d. rec de pixide sancte crucis...ij s. iij d. rec de reliquis ad hostium ecclesie die sancti cuthberti*’. DDCA, Sacrists’ Rolls, 1376-77 (rot. 1, front); 1409 (front).

this wording is kept throughout later rolls.¹⁶⁵ These staple entries of the rolls are joined by amounts from the collection box at St Bede's tomb from 1377-78 onwards, and on rare occasions one total from all three locations is given, as in 1385-86.¹⁶⁶ The sacrists' roll for 1356-57 notes that there was an altar of the same dedication in the Galilee, but no location is given,¹⁶⁷ and the roll for 1381-82 includes a payment of 15 s. 'for painting Holy Cross in the Galilee', but again, no location is given.¹⁶⁸

The precise location of the Holy Cross collection box within the Galilee is not stated in the rolls. The inner north aisle altar recess includes the remains of what has been interpreted variously as a 'display cabinet' for relics, notably by Billings, and a collection box, by Johnson (Fig.50).¹⁶⁹ However, Park argues that the 'collection box' is not an original feature, and that damage to the painted figures on the jambs suggests a ledge was inserted in the recess at the same height as the box.¹⁷⁰ It may be that despite the presence of this interesting feature, we should refrain from associating it with any of the collection box receipts.

2.viii. Images in Unknown or Uncertain Locations

The chronicler Symeon of Durham (c.1090-c.1128) recounts in his *Libellus* (c.1104-09) that Judith and her husband, Tostig, Earl of Northumbria (d.1066), commissioned and donated a gold and silver-clad crucifix, with images of St Mary and John the Evangelist, as reparation for Judith's attempts to test the bounds of Cuthbert's dislike of women by sending her servant girl into the cemetery at Durham: the girl was repelled by a 'violent force' and subsequently died.¹⁷¹ The crucifix was despoiled of its precious metals c.1069-70, when the community at Durham decided to take the body of St Cuthbert to Lindisfarne due to the threat from William I's Harrying of the North. Symeon states that it was the only ornament they had left behind, due to the difficulty it posed for carrying, and

¹⁶⁵ 'Et de x li. x s. x d. oblationibus rec de pixide sancte crucis in Gallilia dunelm et oblationibus ad ostium ecclesie', DDCA, Sacrists' Rolls, 1377-78 (mem. 1, front).

¹⁶⁶ 'Et de xvij s. rec de pixide Sancti Bede in Gallilia Dunelm' DDCA Sacrists' Rolls, 1377-78 (mem. 1, front); DDCA Sacrists' Rolls, 1385-86 (mem. 1, front).

¹⁶⁷ 'Item in operibus ecclesie in Campanili et in Gallilea ad altare Sancte Crucis ut patet per particulas viij li. xij s. oblatio', DDCA, Sacrists' Rolls, 1356-57 (front).

¹⁶⁸ 'in pictura sancte crucis in Gallilia, xv s.', DDCA, Sacrists' Rolls, 1381-82 (mem. 1, front).

¹⁶⁹ Billings, 1843: 33-34; Johnson, 1958-65: 380.

¹⁷⁰ Park, 1990: 28, fn. 18. See also Carter, 1801, frontispiece.

¹⁷¹ *Libellus*: iii.11.

that they had hoped that its presence would mean ‘the enemy would show greater reverence towards the place’.¹⁷² Importantly, Symeon comments that the king later sent precious metals and stones to re-ornament the image, and that Bishop Walcher used them in part ‘to adorn it as it is to be seen today’ (*‘sicut hodie cernitur’*), indicating that it was present in the building in the early twelfth-century.¹⁷³ There is no indication of its location in the precursor to the current building, before the Conquest, but we should not discount the possibility that it was the same crucifix as one that we know of from later sources in the extant cathedral. The rood mentioned in the *Rites* as above the roodscreen and the image of St Saviour in the nave are two contenders.

The 1383-84 roll mentions a combined total of offerings of 4 s. 1 d. given to the altar of Holy Cross ‘*vestiti*’ and the collection box associated with St Louis, presumably King Louis IX of France (d.1270; canonized 1297).¹⁷⁴ The image of St Louis may have been installed much earlier than the 1380s. One possibility is that it was under the aegis of the French nobleman Louis de Beaumont (d.1333), who was consecrated Bishop of Durham in 1318. His affinity to Louis was underlined by Robert Graystones, who noted that at the ceremony he swore ‘*Par Seynt Lowis*’ in frustration at his lack of Latin.¹⁷⁵ The extant statue of Louis from the Sainte-Chapelle, c.1300, gives some indication of the possible appearance of the Durham image (Fig.51).¹⁷⁶

A similar entry to that of 1383-84 occurs in the roll for 1384, which also lists 2 s. 6 d. from the collection box of Holy Cross ‘*vestiti*’.¹⁷⁷ Holy Cross *vestiti* is therefore a separate and additional entry to the usual listing of offerings at the collection box of Holy Cross in the Galilee and at the church door. These separate entries in the rolls and the difference in wording suggest the existence of two different altars and images with the appellation of Holy Cross: one in the Galilee and one elsewhere, the latter possibly close to an image of St Louis. This is supported by Harvey’s theory that the altar of Holy Cross which was the subject

¹⁷² *Libellus*: iii.15 (English translation by Rollason).

¹⁷³ *Ibid.* (English translation by Rollason).

¹⁷⁴ ‘*xi li. xvij s. iij d. sancte crucis & ostium...iij s. j d. rec de oblationibus ad altare sancte crucis vestiti & pixide sancti lodowici*’, DDCA, Sacrists’ Rolls, 1383-84 (front). On the early years of Louis’ cult and canonization, see Gaposchkin, 2010: 48-92.

¹⁷⁵ *Scriptores Tres*: 118; on Beaumont’s career see Fraser, 2004.

¹⁷⁶ Durand, Laffitte & Giovannoni, 2001: cat. no. 44.

¹⁷⁷ ‘*lxxviiij s. iij d. sancte crucis in galillia & ad ostium...ij s. vj d. de pixide sancte crucis vestiti*’, DDCA, Sacrists’ Rolls, 1384 (front).

of early fourteenth-century indulgences was separate from that in the Galilee chapel.¹⁷⁸ The locations of Holy Cross ‘*vestiti*’ and of the St Louis image are not given, nor do they appear in any of the rolls before or after these dates, suggesting that perhaps one (or more) collection box was only temporarily situated in their vicinity.

Should we associate Holy Cross *vestiti* with the Bound Rood? Latham’s word list translates ‘*vestiti*’ in this way, his date of 1384 suggesting that he based this on knowledge of the sacrists’ rolls and the *Rites*’ entry on the latter.¹⁷⁹ However, ‘*vestiti*’ literally means ‘clothed’, the opposite of most images of Christ in the *Christus im Elend* iconography.¹⁸⁰ Indeed, it more easily brings to mind an image such as the *Volto Santo*, where Christ is clothed in a robe. In light of the argument made above in relation to the possible iconography of St Saviour in the north-west corner of the nave, we can propose that the two images mentioned in the accounts may have been the same object, and indeed it may be the same object as that described by Symeon. An unusual entry in the 1411-12 roll lists a payment of 3 s. for making a shoe or shoes (‘*sotularis*’) for Holy Cross.¹⁸¹ This accessory can perhaps be explained as indicating the need to protect the image from the touches of the faithful. Moreover, it would not be out of place with the precious metals with which Judith and Tostig’s crucifix was adorned. As with the other entries in the rolls, no location is given. Whilst this perhaps indicates that only one image was known by this name, it may be that it was tacitly understood which, out of two images known as ‘Holy Cross’, was to be shod.

The rolls from 1486-87 and 1487-88 include entries of 4 s. 2 d. from the collection box of ‘King Henry’, presumably Henry VI, who became the focus of an unofficial cult after his death in 1471.¹⁸² The amount is seemingly carried over from one year to the next. The absence of this collection box from the 1483-84 and 1484-85 rolls suggests that it was installed in 1486-87, yet its absence in the roll from 1535-36 indicates that some time in the intervening years it may have

¹⁷⁸ Harvey, 2006: 167. These indulgences are set out in *Rites*: 155-56, nos. XLII and XLIII. Neither mentions the Galilee Chapel.

¹⁷⁹ Latham, 2008: 510.

¹⁸⁰ Lewis and Short, ‘*vestiti*’.

¹⁸¹ ‘*pro factura sotularis Sancte Crucis, iij s.*’ DDCA, Sacrists’ Rolls, 1411-12 (front).

¹⁸² For an example and background to the cult see *Gothic*, cat. no. 323, and Walker, 1995.

become defunct.¹⁸³ A stained glass window depiction of Henry is noted in the *Rites* as being in the Galilee Chapel (G/w1, Plan 12), and it is therefore possible that the offerings were connected to this image. Such an association of offerings and stained glass representation would be unique in our sources.¹⁸⁴ However, an additional three-dimensional image in the Galilee or west end of the nave is not out of the question.¹⁸⁵ The collection box of St Sitha (d.1272), whose location is again not given but can also be suggested as in one of these two parts of the building, is included in the roll from 1535-36, but does not appear in earlier rolls, suggesting its installation sometime between 1488 and 1535.¹⁸⁶ St Sitha's cult was established in England by the beginning of the fifteenth century, and so this suggests a relatively late installation of a collection box, and perhaps the image itself.¹⁸⁷

¹⁸³ *'iij s. ij d. oblationibus rec de pixide henrici Regis'*; *'iij s. ij d. de pixide henrici Regis'*, DDCA Sacrists' Rolls 1486-87 (front); 1487-88 (front). See also Appendix 1.

¹⁸⁴ Haselock and O'Connor, 1980: 115; Marks, 2012d: 610, fn. 12 and Marks, 2012b: v.

¹⁸⁵ For Henry's cult and images in the parochial context, see Marks, 2012d.

¹⁸⁶ DDCA, Sacrists' Roll, 1535-36 (front). See also Appendix 1.

¹⁸⁷ Marks, 2004: 103-105 and Barron, 2007. See also Turville-Peter, 1991 and Franks, 1992, on aspects of her cult.

CHAPTER THREE

SOURCES AND METHODOLOGY: YORK MINSTER

3.i. *Outline*

Although studies focusing on aspects of the history of medieval Yorkshire or the Minster itself have relied on in-depth investigation of, variously, original wills in the records of the courts of both the Dean and Chapter and the Exchequer, archbishops' registers, inventories (especially of chantries), or the fabric rolls, comprehensive examination of all these documents in their original format would not be possible for the purposes of this study due to their sheer number and complexity.¹ Concentrating on the sources most likely to contain references to images in the Minster – fabric rolls, wills, and inventories - this thesis therefore broadly follows the methodology of previous scholars, who have used a combination of consultation of the original documents, as well as the seventeenth-century antiquarian James Torre's important manuscript plan of the Minster's burial plots, compiled c.1690-91, and volumes of selected wills and inventories published by the Surtees Society in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.² The original documents have been consulted judiciously in order to verify the details given in the printed volumes. This has demonstrated that references to images were more than likely to have been included in the volumes, probably due to the editors' interest in the lost practices of traditional religion, curious and foreign to a Victorian, most likely Anglican, audience.

The *Testamenta Eboracensia*, comprising six volumes of wills from the York archives, were published between 1836 and 1902. The first volume was edited by the canon of Durham Cathedral, James Raine Snr., the next five by his son, the clergyman and chancellor of York Minster James Raine Jnr., who died in 1896; John William Clay took up the reins to complete the sixth volume.³ Raine Jnr. also edited a volume entitled *The Fabric Rolls of York Minster*, published in 1859, which comprises extensive extracts from the fabric rolls, as well as a

¹ Most recently, Shiels, 1998; Swanson, 1999; Crouch, 2000; Jefferies, 2000; Oakes, 2003.

² For example, Brown, 2003; Norton, 2005 and 2007.

³ *TE* I-VI.

number of inventories, notably those of the possessions of the chantries, an inventory of relics dating to c.1300, and an inventory of items in the custody of the sacrist c.1500, as well as other texts in a section entitled ‘Illustrative Documents’, mostly concerning the Minster’s interior and exterior.⁴ Raine’s volume was published to expand on and correct what he styled the ‘meagre, and sometimes inaccurate’ extracts found in John Browne’s *The History of the Metropolitan Church of St Peter, York*, published in 1843.⁵

As well as medieval documents, the antiquarian James Torre’s manuscript provides an invaluable guide to the medieval and post-medieval burial plots on the Minster floor before they were taken up and the paving relaid in the 1730s.⁶ Due to the varied nature of these sources, we need to examine the values and limitations of each, and this study’s methodology in using them, before we turn to the topography of images which they reveal.

3.ii. *Wills*

Wills are of particular value to this study as they record requests for burial in the vicinity of an image and bequests of money and/or objects to an image, suggesting their devotional function. They also demonstrate that an image was *in situ* at a particular date. Their limitations, outlined in previous scholarship, bear reiteration.⁷ Wills record desired actions, which often we cannot be sure were carried out; they were usually written in old age or near the time of death, when testators’ thoughts were turned towards the welfare of their souls, so we cannot assume bequests signaled a lifetime’s devotion; they are legal documents, containing homogenizing formulae, and testators’ bequests could be constrained by custom, rather than signifying a personal choice.⁸ Andrew Brown’s observation, quoted by Marks, that wills are ‘less windows on to the soul than

⁴ Raine, 1859: 120-334.

⁵ *Ibid.*: v-vi. Browne, 1863: 5. On this historiographical debate and its context, see Oakes, 2003: 9-12.

⁶ Brown, 2003: 299.

⁷ Marks 2004: 7-8; Marks, 2011: 215, esp. n. 11: but it should be noted here that whilst the date a will was proved is important in calculating the date of any subsequent donation of or repairs/embellishments to images, the date the will was drawn up is significant in assessing when images were *in situ*.

⁸ Brown, 1995: 21; Marks 2004: 7.

mirrors of social convention' is worth repeating.⁹ However, for this study, this is a double-edged sword. In relation to wills of clergy belonging to the institution of the Minster, any detectable social, or rather *institutional*, convention is of interest; so is any detectable social convention amongst the laity, though to what extent this was guided by the Minster is also a pertinent question.

The *Testamenta Eboracensia* comprise 1288 separate documents in total, including a number of personal inventories as well as wills, which range in date from 1316 to 1551. The testators are both clerical and lay, ranging from aristocrats to merchants and artisans, and bishops to priests of chapels and country rectors; male testators feature more prominently than females, probably due to the fact that men in general were more likely to draw up wills.¹⁰ The geographical range of the volumes is wide, including York itself, towns and villages throughout Yorkshire and what is now County Durham, but also the Midlands and the South of England. This is due to the size of the medieval archdiocese of York, and because probate laws required those with a certain value of goods in both the North and South to have their wills proved in the Prerogative Courts of Canterbury and York.

The limitations of the particular wills in these volumes require explanation. The 1288 documents represent only a part of the corpus of medieval wills from the York registers, and were selected by the editors for inclusion. Their methodology is never fully elucidated, although the main criterion for selection is stated in the introduction to volume IV as being genealogical value.¹¹ However, in several instances throughout the volumes what is published is not the full will, but only the bequest that concerns an image.¹² This suggests that criteria other than genealogical value were important. Wills mentioning images were perhaps included in the selection because of their perceived value as being examples of pre-Reformation religious *mores*.

References to images are also included in the footnotes almost by default due to the notation of the burial places of relations and/or associates of the main testator. These are usually given as excerpts and are variously quoted directly,

⁹ Brown, 1995: 21; Marks, 2004: 7. See also Champion, 2012, for a discussion of the problematics of pilgrimage bequests.

¹⁰ Oakes, 2003: 19.

¹¹ *TE IV*: v-vi.

¹² For example, that of Thomas Karr, to be discussed below.

translated and summarised, or a mixture of the original text and a modern English summary.¹³ This haphazard approach is never explained, but most likely it was simply a case of the constraints of space.

A more subtle, and sometimes insidious, approach to curtailment can also be detected in the main collection of wills, which does have an impact on this study. Dashes and ellipses are used to denote lacunae, and although these are sometimes explained as resulting from damage to the manuscript, in other instances they are left unexplained.¹⁴ Again it is only in the introduction to volume IV that the reasoning behind such practices is (unhelpfully) explained as ‘where curtailment was practicable...all formal and valueless details have been generally discarded.’¹⁵

Careful reading of a sample of the original wills suggests that it is often the preamble that has been redacted; elsewhere the ellipses occur in the middle of the published will, and there are even instances where no indication has been given that text has been cut.¹⁶ Nor are these missing details necessarily so ‘formal and valueless’ to modern scholars, as they comprise a variety of bequests relating to institutions throughout York.¹⁷ Of particular importance for the purposes of this thesis, the cuts include in at least one will the place of burial, a likely part of the will to mention an image, and in another, bequests to the lights of images, but this pertains to the Chapel of St William on Ouse Bridge.¹⁸ Often, it is the detailed instructions for funeral arrangements that are left out, some of which state where the candles used during the services were to be put once their formal use was over, and another likely part of a will with potential to include reference to an image.¹⁹

¹³ For example, *TE* II: 54.

¹⁴ For example, *Ibid.*: 46.

¹⁵ *TE* IV: v.

¹⁶ For instance, the will of Richard Wetwang, *TE* II: 248-49; BIA Prob. Reg. 2, fol. 484r. Missing text in the *TE* version is noted by dashes where part of the preamble and details of the burial arrangements have been cut, however no indication has been given that lines 16-32 of the original have been expunged.

¹⁷ As well as Wetwang, other examples include John Esyngwald, *TE* II: 16; BIA Prob. Reg. 2, fols. 607v-608r.; Thomas Karr, *TE* II: 92; BIA, Prob. Reg. 2, fols. 79v-80r.; Jane Chamberlyn, *TE* IV: 200-201; BIA Prob. Reg. 6, fols. 34v-35r..

¹⁸ The *TE* version of Thomas Karr’s will does not give his place of burial: *TE* II: 92. The will of William Revetour cuts out many details, including bequests to lights of the Virgin and St Barbara in the Chapel of St William on Ouse Bridge. *TE* II: 117-18; BIA Prob. Reg. 2, fol. 138v.

¹⁹ For example, the original version of Thomas Karr’s will includes instructions that one candle is to be burnt on the high altar of his parish church at the time of the Elevation, with others to placed

The final volume in the series has unique limitations: it concentrates particularly on the wills of ‘great landowners’²⁰ and takes in the years of the Henrican and Edwardian religious upheavals. There are few wills of York citizens, and no references to images within the Minster or any of the other ecclesiastical institutions of York. It is difficult to know if this is because Clay had a narrower interest in the land and its owners, and therefore disregarded references to images, or if it is down to the simple lack of interest in, or even lack of, images; a combination of all three reasons could be the case.

These limitations mean the texts of the volumes should be approached with some circumspection, and therefore judicious recourse to those manuscript versions has been employed. Wills containing any reference to York Minster’s images have been checked against their original manuscript version, due to their centrality to this study, as have those with obvious lacunae in the printed versions other than in the preamble, in order to check that no further references to images within the Minster have been left out.

3.iii. *Fabric Rolls*

The fabric account rolls for York Minster survive only in fragmentary form. They consist of a broken series of fifty-nine rolls dating from c.1350 to 1640: for the purposes of this thesis, the latest consulted is that for 1537-38, only two years later than the final surviving Sacrist’s account roll at Durham.²¹ The rolls are in varying states of condition, with a significant number missing their headings, therefore the dates to which the roll pertains. As a result, dating has to be assigned via the contents: Raine’s extracts of the fabric rolls has attempted this, sometimes in cavalier fashion,²² but more recent scholarship, notably that of Stell during the course of his transcription, has in some instances challenged Raine’s dates and provided alternatives, and Rebecca Oakes’ detailed study of just seven of the rolls dating from the period 1469 to 1485 has provided convincing evidence that E3/26

on four of the other altars of his parish church and one given to the Carmelites of York. *TE* II: 92; BIA, Prob. Reg. 2, fol. 79v.

²⁰ *TE* VI: x-xi.

²¹ YMLA E3/1-64: E3/44 is that for 1537-38; the next surviving roll is for 1543-44.

²² He appears to have concocted some of the titles for the rolls to include the date he thought they had been written. Raine’s version of roll E3/6, for example, has the title ‘—COMPTUS — CUSTODIS FABRICAE ANNO M.CCCC.IIIII’, yet he acknowledges in the footnote that ‘the beginning [of the roll] has been lost’ and, speaking of the early rolls as a group, ‘the titles are, in each case, wanting’. Raine, 1859: 24.

pertains to 1472-73 rather than 1471-72, and that E3/27 pertains to 1471-72 rather than 1473, and is therefore out of sequence.²³ The methodology employed here when references to images occur in rolls whose dates have been lost due to damage to the document has been to follow Stell where he has assigned one, and where he has not, to use Raine's but with some caution, attempting to assign a date via the contents if suitable evidence is present in the original roll.

In some cases the first membrane of the roll is clearly missing, not just the heading, meaning some or all of the sections usually set out first, those listing the arrears and then income from the rents and contributions, do not survive.²⁴ As Oakes notes, the rolls follow a formulaic layout consisting of a summary of income and expenditure, followed by more detailed sections listing revenue from various sources, including rents within and outside the city, offerings made in the church, and 'Bequests and Alms'; detailed sections follow listing expenditure on building work, labour, and furnishings: these detailed sections often run onto the dorse.²⁵ Only five rolls date from before 1404, and although at least one roll survives from each decade of the fifteenth century, the only decade where a particularly high number survive is the 1440s (five rolls). The sixteenth century is better represented, with twelve rolls surviving from the period 1500-1538.²⁶

There are several problems with Raine's text of the fabric rolls. It is incomplete, and although its concentration on expenditure is helpful, as these sections are likely to contain references to the buying, repair, and upkeep of images, income, including the listing of offerings in the Minster, and the most likely place to list donations to images, is not necessarily included.²⁷ Like the *Testamenta Eboracensia* the text is riddled with lacunae in the form of ellipses and dashes. Some are lacunae in the original documents due to their poor condition, but others denote text Raine had decided not to include, and he does not distinguish one from the other; in some instances he does not give any indication that text has been missed out all.²⁸ His criteria are never explicitly explained.

²³ For discussion of this, see Oakes, 2003: 34-35.

²⁴ *Ibid.*: 15.

²⁵ *Ibid.*: 14-15; 7.

²⁶ E3/1-5 are pre-1404; 6-32 date from the fifteenth century, and 33-44 from the sixteenth century.

²⁷ For example, Raine, 1859: 24: compare YMLA E3/6.

²⁸ For example, Raine's version of roll E3/8 begins with the heading '*Mortuaria Canoniorum*', but in the roll itself sections concerning rents and offerings precede this. The next section, a list of

Although comprising extensive extracts, the lack of comprehensiveness in Raine's edition of the fabric rolls, the lacunae, and his unreliability in dating render them, like the *Testamenta Eboracensia*, unsuitable for sole use, even if again he seems to have included many references to images.²⁹ Stell's transcript of all the rolls up to that which pertains to the year 1498-1499 has therefore been used in tandem with consultation of the original documents for the purposes of this study.³⁰ For those rolls between 1499 and 1544, Raine's text has been used in tandem with the original documents.

3.iv. Inventories

The 'Illustrative Documents' in Raine's volume on the fabric rolls include extracts from chantry inventories which he dates to c.1360, 1364, 1483, 1520-21, and 1543, and are arranged according to the altars with which each were associated. Within this division Raine lists the chantries and the entries pertaining to them chronologically. Other inventories appear to have been made for individual chantries on an *ad hoc* basis, usually when items were donated, or comprise of lists of items Raine has taken from wills; these are also inserted in chronological order where appropriate.³¹ Yet again, Raine's text includes dashes and ellipses, without indicating if they denote missing text because of the poor condition of the original documents, or because he decided to extract only details of the kind of items he found of interest. Only the 1364 inventory has been transcribed fully in recent times, by Jill Jefferies;³² in comparing the original manuscript, aided by Jefferies' transcription, with Raine's version it does seem that he included the entries mentioning images: for the purposes of this study, the c.1360 and 1520-21 inventories have also been consulted in order to ensure all

charitable bequests, has been redacted to only one entry, that of Thomas Haxey, the treasurer, and no ellipses or dashes occur in the text. Compare YMLA E3/8 and Raine, 1859: 36.

²⁹ For example, *Ibid.*: 84-5.

³⁰ As an unpublished version, the transcript does contain some lacunae and textual quibbles, although Stell has marked these clearly within the text, showing the number of words missing and whether they are in the original document and need to be checked again or they are illegible due to the document's poor condition. Only those which comprise full entries which need to be checked again (i.e. those where the the subject cannot be deciphered by context) and are in sections of the rolls which could conceivably contain reference to images have been checked for the purposes of this study. In the following chapter, where Stell's transcription has been used for direct quotation in relation to an image, the original reference has been given in brackets.

³¹ For example, John de Burton's chantry received gifts from his executors in 1378, and Richard Tunnock's gifts to his chantry at the altar of St Thomas of Canterbury are dated to 1339. Raine, 1859: 300; 303.

³² YMLA Ms M2 (4)g, fols. 36r-43v. Jefferies, 2000: 48-84.

references to images have been captured: unfortunately the inventory from 1483 has not been locatable within the Minster's archives.³³

Raine also published two inventories in his 'Illustrative Documents'. The first is an inventory of 'relics concealed in the Minster', found on the flyleaf of the York Gospels, which Raine dates on a palaeographical basis to the middle of the thirteenth century, although it is more likely to date to the last quarter of the thirteenth century.³⁴ This flyleaf inventory is primarily of value as it reveals details of two important images which contained relics.

The second inventory dates from c.1500 and includes revisions and additions by Robert Langton, the Minster's treasurer from 1509-14.³⁵ In its title it describes itself as

An Inventory of all the jewels, vessels of gold and silver and other ornaments, vestments, and books pertaining to the cathedral church of York, in the custody of the subtreasurer of the same church, with jewels and other [items], as is set out below. Along with the money in the chest of St Peter.³⁶

The inventory is divided into sections, one of which is entitled, in the left-hand margin, 'Ymagines'; other sections of relevance to this study include those entitled 'Cruces' and 'Reliquie'.³⁷ The original manuscript is in an extremely neat hand. The section headings are in red ink and in the margin closest to the outer edge of each page, and the sections are well-spaced, often with considerable amounts of blank parchment left, suggesting its function as a working document.

³³ MS M2 (4)g, fols. 31r-32v; MS M2 4(a) fols. 24r-62r.

³⁴ '*Istae sunt reliquie recondite in ecclesia Beati Petri Ebor'*, Raine, 1859: 150 (YMLA MS Add. 1, fols. 166v – 167r.). For the purposes of this study, Raine's text has been compared to that of the original document, and has been found to be mostly accurate in its transcription, departing from the original by his addition of the 'ae' diphthong and overcapitalization, a feature he employs in other publications. Quotations in the following chapter will be given from the original, with Raine's page numbers given for reference. For discussion of the contents of the list, see Thomas, 1974: 145-46, and Thomas' appended catalogue for the listing of Raine's text at page 350 (Y(a)). I am indebted to Professor Linne Mooney for advice on the date of the hand in the manuscript.

³⁵ YMLA MS M2 (2) d., fols. 2r-18v.

³⁶ '*Inventorium omnium jocalium vasorum auri et argenti ac aliorum ornamentum vestimentum et librorum ad ecclesiam cathedralem eboracensem pertinentium in custodia subthesaurarii ejusdem ecclesiae, in jocalibus et aliis prout inferius patet. Una cum moneta in cista Sancti Petri.*', YMLA Ms M2 (2)d., fol. 1r. The last sentence seems to refer to the sums of money noted in relation to the 'chest of St Peter': see fols. 23v-25v. See also Dugdale, 1817-34: VI, part III, 1202-1210 for an incomplete transcription.

³⁷ YMLA MS M2 (2)d, fols. 5v; 4v-5r; 6r-v (Raine, 1859: 212-35). For the purposes of this study, the original inventory has been consulted, and Raine's text can be verified as being largely correct apart from his addition of the 'ae' diphthong, additional capitalization, and abbreviation of 'beate Marie' to B.M. Quotations in the following chapter will be given from the original manuscript, with Raine's page numbers given for reference.

3.v. *James Torre's Manuscript*

Torre's plan of the burial plots in the Minster is unique and invaluable, and helps us to verify the requests for burial found in the wills. The plots appear on separate plans of the nave, crossing and transepts, and east end of the Minster, and within these the areas are divided into sections, usually corresponding with architectural divisions such as aisles. The plots in each section are numbered sequentially. The inscription on the slab or brass, where extant, is also recorded, as well as heraldic devices and/or particularly intricate designs; the request for burial from the relevant will is also quoted where Torre had found it. A number of wills requesting burial for which Torre could not find the corresponding plot are also included in the manuscript. For the purpose of this thesis, in some cases Torre's plans have also been used to cross-reference the wills in the *Testamenta Eboracensia* volumes which mention images in order to suggest the identity of plots for which Torre had no physical or documentary evidence.

There are inherent problems with the data in Torre's manuscript, as this methodology suggests. A large number of the slabs and/or brasses do not include any text or heraldry which identify who was buried there; thus Torre is only able to give the plot's dimensions and a summary of any letters or decoration that were left, and we can only surmise that some may be the plots of those whose wills cannot be matched to any named plot in the manuscript. Additionally, although Torre's numbering system works well in most cases, in some instances it is muddled, meaning there is some confusion as to which burial plot belongs to whom.

In light of the limitations of the wills, fabric rolls, inventories, and Torre's manuscript, both inherent to the kinds of document they are and the ways they have been written or edited, it remains to use these documents to construct a topography of the images in York Minster.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE TOPOGRAPHY OF IMAGES IN YORK MINSTER

4.i. *The High Altar*

Until the eighteenth century the high altar of York Minster stood in the middle of the fifth bay to the east of the crossing, one bay west of its present location; it was therefore flanked by the eastern transepts, constructed as part of the rebuilding of the choir, c.1394-1407, ‘an echo of a feature’ found in the previous choir built under the auspices of Archbishop Roger Pont l’Évêque during the third quarter of the twelfth-century (Plan 6).¹ A new wooden reredos was built in the second decade of the fifteenth century between the fourth set of piers from the east wall, and its design is known only through a surviving sketch by Torre (Fig.52).²

The earliest documentary evidence referring to images associated with the high altar is in the Statutes of the cathedral dating to c.1300.³ In addition to six candles at the high altar, two candles are stipulated to be burnt ‘*coram imagine Beate Marie*’ at Vespers, Matins, and during mass, and one candle is stipulated to be burnt ‘*ad oculum sancti Petri*’ both day and night.⁴ However, the next references to images associated with this location appear in the will of Henry, 3rd Lord Scrope of Masham, drawn up in the year of his execution, 1415. In it, he includes a bequest to the high altar of images of the Virgin, ‘silver and gilded, of the height of one yard’ (‘*argentea & deaurata, altitudinis unius virge*’), with two images of St Peter and St Paul of the same materials and height, as well as an image of St John the Baptist, also of silver and gilded, which he had received from his father, Stephen, 2nd Lord Scrope of Masham (d.1406), and a large cross, also silver and gilded.⁵ After Henry’s execution, his goods were subject to forfeiture: those held at Pontefract were inventoried by Richard Knyghteley, a

¹ Brown, 2003: 181-2; 4-6.

² *Ibid.*: 208-09; Norton, 2006: 180. The screen was taken down in 1726. Brown, 2003: 299.

³ *Statutes*: 8.

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ ‘...*cum duabus imaginibus Petri & Pauli argenteis & deauratis, ejusdem altitudinis, & imagine beati Johannis Baptistae argentea & deaurata, quam quidem habui de dono patris mei, Et una crux major argentea & deaurata absque pede*’, Rymer, *Foedera*, IX: 272.

teller of the Exchequer of the Receipt, and sent to London.⁶ They do not figure in the list of Scrope's goods which seemingly escaped this inventory and came into the possession of his mother, Margery, before 1419, and which were subsequently seized by the Crown.⁷ As Kingsford has noted, Knyghteley's inventory was entered into the Exchequer only ten years later. It includes an image of the Virgin with 'her son in her right hand and in her left hand a branch of a lily, weighing 3lbs. 4 oz. troy', and an image of St John the Baptist, weighing 6lbs 10oz troy.⁸ No images of saints Peter and Paul are recorded. None of the images described in Scrope's will figures in the list of items in his mother's possession in 1419, but the Exchequer inventory does include a crucifix which can be identified by its description as that bequeathed to the high altar of the Minster in the will.⁹ This suggests that the images of the Virgin and the Baptist may also have been those once destined for the Minster. Considering the lapse in time between the movement of the goods and the writing of the Exchequer inventory, it could be that the details of the images of saints Peter and Paul were simply missed out.

Kingsford speculates that the plate and jewel which usually came into the possession of the king through these means at this time were either melted down to pay for the war against France, or sequestered for his use.¹⁰ If the images in the Exchequer inventory were those intended for the Minster's high altar, they may have been subject to one of these fates, though the possibility remains that some or all of the images were given to the Minster at a later date; we shall return to this shortly.

The earliest evidence for images *in situ* and likely to have been associated with the high altar dates to the second half of the fifteenth century. The fabric roll of c.1469-70 notes an entry for the cost of four painted and gilded candelabras or lamp stands placed before the image of the Virgin in the choir,¹¹ and the roll

⁶ Kingsford, 1920: 71-72.

⁷ *Ibid.*: 81; and see the inventory on 98-99.

⁸ 'Vn ymage de nostre dame tenent son fitz en la mayn dextre et en la mayn senestre vn braunche dun lillie, poisant de troie iiij lb. ix vnc....Vn ymage de Seint Johan Baptiste, esteaunt sur vn bas pee de iij leones, portant vn Nouche en son pys de Agnus dei, poisant vi lb. di.'. *Ibid.*: 95.

⁹ *Ibid.*: 95. For the original bequest see, Rymer, *Foedera*, IX: 272.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*: 84-85.

¹¹ 'pro foure candelabri in choro ecclesie Ebor coram ymagine beati Marie iij s. Et Roberto Spollesby pro pictura dicti candelabri et deauracione eiusdem iij s. iiij d.', Stell: 301 (YMLA E3/24, mem. 2, front). As Stell notes, the head of this roll is now lost; Raine saw it and noted it was for the year 1469-70 (Raine, 1859: 72) Stell regards this date with a hint of suspicion due to the receipt from the Archdeaconry of Nottingham, which includes the date 'de anno domini etc

dating from 1481-82 gives a complete breakdown of the cost of making a ‘new tabernacle of St Peter in the choir and decorating the same with an/the image of St Peter’, the total amounting to £27 11s. 8d., including material and labour.¹² Of this total, £8 4s. 8d. alone was spent on ‘old beaten gold for the tabernacle [and] for the image’, and £4 6s. 9d. was given to Francis Forster and his assistants for their work on painting and gilding both items, and ‘red lead, white lead...and other necessities for the said work’.¹³

Although the first line of the entry in the roll could lead us to think that a new image was bought for the occasion, the text breaking down the costs mentions only painting and gilding an image, suggesting that an existing image of St Peter was redecorated to match the new tabernacle: this choice, and its date within the context of the architectural history of the east end of the Minster, will be explored further in Part Two.¹⁴ A quantity of buckram was also bought for the image and its new tabernacle after they were installed, at a cost of 10s. 2d.: possibly this was to act as the cloth that covered the image during Lent.¹⁵ Two cloths of blue buckram are listed in the inventory of c.1500 within the list of ‘cloths for hanging in the choir’ (*Panni Pendentes Pro Choro*), one for the image of St Peter, specifically stated as being for use in Lent, and one for the

lxvii’. However, the receipts for the Archdeaconries of York, Richmond, East Riding and Cleveland all refer to ‘hoc anno’, which at least allows us to suggest that 1468 was not the year of the account (mem. 1, front).

¹² ‘*Custus Circa Facturam Tabernaculi Sancti Petri in Choro et Depicturam eiusdem una cum ymagine Sancti Petri. Et in auro veteri tunso pro tabernaculo pro ymagine Sancti Petri infra chorum ecclesie Cathedrali predictae viij li. iiij s. viij d. Et in auro de novo cuneo tunso ad idem opus [‘xiiij s. vj d.’ interlined] et pro tunsione dicti auri in iij mille dimidio C et dimidio quartis [‘xxx s. vj d.’ interlined] xliij s. Et Francisco Forster pro cccc auri tunci [‘xxvj s. viij d.’ interlined] C ad vj s. viij d. Et Nicholao Vicaris pro C dimidio auri tunci [‘ix s. vj d.’ interlined] xxxvj s. ij d. Et pro xvj^{cim} uncis et quarterio de les byce xvij s. viij d. Et in vadijs dicti Francisci Forster et sociorum suorum operantium circa picturam deauratione dicti ymagine et tabernaculi et pro yude bole cum redlead whitelead sinapes et alijs necessarijs pro dicto opere ob. iiij li. vj s. ix d. ob. Et in regardo dato dicto Francisco ex mandato Dominorum Decani et capituli xx s. Et Johanni Connyng carver operantis super dicto tabernaculo per xxxiiij septimanas v dies et dimidio in septimana iij s. cj s. viij d. Et Johanni Cowper [‘carpentario’ interlined] operantis circa dictum tabernaculum pro xix septimanas iiij dies et dimidio in septimana iij s. lix s. iij d. Et Henrico Connyng carver operantis circa idem tabernaculum per vij septimanas et iij dies in septimana iij s. xxij s. vj d. Summa xxvij li. xj s. viij d.’ Stell: 389 (YMLA E3/29, mems. 1- 2, front).*

¹³ *Ibid.*

¹⁴ Brown, 2003: 239, also regards the entry as pertaining only to a new tabernacle for the existing image.

¹⁵ ‘*Et pro novemdecim virgis de bukasyne emptis pro ymagine Sancti Petri in choro ecclesie Cathedralis Ebor et tabernaculo eiusdem x s. ij d.*’ Stell: 413 (YMLA E3/30, mem. 1, front).

Virgin.¹⁶ These entries suggest that the images were considered a pair, and are also indicative of the Minster following liturgical norms in place elsewhere which held that images, crosses, relics, and pyxes were to be covered during the penitential season leading up to Easter.¹⁷

A Marian image is specifically linked to the high altar in the will of Robert Este, ‘*in utroque jure baccalarius*’, drawn up in 1493, in which he bequeaths 20 marks to its gilding: it is described as ‘*stantis ad finem magni altaris ... ex parte australi ejusdem altaris*’, suggesting that it could either be on the south side of the altar itself, or freestanding to the south.¹⁸ The image and its lights are mentioned again in 1519 in the Presentment made at the Visitation of the Minster, when its location is again noted: ‘one [of] ye basyns afore the heghauther wt ij candelse afor our Lady, of the southesyde, should be lighte all tymes of serves, which is sum tyme not done’.¹⁹ The wording of this suggests that the image was perhaps on the south side of the high altar itself, although it is not clear from the evidence for either the image of St Peter or the Virgin as to whether they, and in St Peter’s case, the tabernacle, were incorporated into the high altar screen, or whether they were freestanding. This is a point of some significance in light of Christopher Wilson’s argument regarding the increasing tendency towards the incorporation of statuary into reredoses in the fourteenth century, and will be explored further in Part Two.²⁰

The c.1500 inventory’s list of images includes a Virgin and Child associated with the high altar, being described as silver-gilt, carrying her son with a sapphire in his hand, and ‘which the ebdomadarius carries daily to mass at the high altar, weighing 5lbs, 11 ounces’.²¹ In contrast to the evidence from the fabric rolls and the Presentment, which suggests the presence of an image of the Virgin being permanently located at the high altar, this evidence introduces the idea of

¹⁶ ‘*Panni pendentes pro choro...unus pannus de bokeram coloris blodii pro coopertura sancti Petri in quadragesima...unus pannus de bokeram, coloris blodii, pro coopertura ymaginis beate Marie.*’ YMLA M2 (2)d, fol. 9r (Raine, 1859: 227).

¹⁷ For the Use of Sarum’s rubric, see Frere, 1898-1891:I, 138-39.

¹⁸ ‘*Lego xx marcas ad deaurandum imaginem beate Marie virginis, stantis ad finem magni altaris in ecclesie Ebor., ex parte australi ejusdem altaris*’, TE IV: 85 (YMLA, D/C Prob. Reg. 1, fol. 380r.)

¹⁹ Raine, 1859: 267.

²⁰ Wilson, 1980: 94-5.

²¹ ‘*...argentea deaurata portans puerum cum lapide saphiro in manu sua quam ebdomedarius portat cotidie ad missam ad summum altare ponderans v lb. xj uncias*’, YMLA M2 (2)d, fol. 5v. (Raine, 1859: 220).

moveable images, and their use within the liturgy. Moreover, it raises the issue of multiple images of the Virgin in the same location, and the status of the Virgin specifically at York. These issues will be explored in Part Two.

Another section in the inventory, entitled '*Pro summo altari*', lists three towels of diapered cloth ('*manutergia de dyaper*') for the head of St William ('*pro capite Sancti Willelmi*'), suggesting that this was the location of his head-reliquary.²² This is a more precise location than the reference to the *caput* in the Chamberlain's account roll of c.1392, in which it is described as '*in choro*', and where payment of 12d. is listed for the making of a canopy ('*selor*') above it.²³ The c.1500 inventory also includes another section entitled '*Circa Caput Sancti Willelmi*', listing a range of *ex-votos* and a girdle 'garnychyt' with silver-gilt, for putting around the head-reliquary ('*pro ponendo capite Sancti Willelmi*').²⁴ However, the *caput* itself is not listed in the inventory's list of relics.

The c.1500 inventory also includes entries for images of the Virgin, St Paul, St Peter, and John the Baptist listed one after another, but with no specifications of their locations. All are described as holding attributes, and space is left on the manuscript to enter the weight of each, suggesting difficulty in actually weighing them and therefore raising the possibility that this may have been because they were set in tabernacles. The image of the Virgin is described as 'big' ('*magna*'), silver-gilt ('*argentea deaurata*'), with her son in her right hand and a lily in her left; St Paul carries a book in his right hand and a sword in his left; St Peter, also of silver-gilt, carries keys in his right hand and a book in his left; John the Baptist is '*cum agno et cruce*'.²⁵ The Flawford alabasters (Fig.20) serve as an example of the visual impression a 'group' of images could give (these three images were possibly accompanied by others in their original context, possibly an altarpiece).²⁶ The weathered Portland stone reliefs of Sts Peter and Paul from Ivychurch Priory, Wiltshire, c.1160, also give an impression of how the different characters of these two saints could be conveyed within the same

²² YMLA MS M2 2 4(d), fol. 9r. (Raine, 1859: 227).

²³ Raine, 1859: 130.

²⁴ YMLA MS M2 2(d), fol. 8r. (Raine, 1859: 225).

²⁵ '*...ymago magna beate Marie virginis argentea deaurata cum puero in manu dextra et liliis in sinistra, ponderans [blank]... ymago sancti Pauli cum libro in dextra manu et gladio in sinistra ponderans [blank]... ymago beati Petri argentea deaurata, cum clavibus in manu dextra et libro in sinistra ponderans [blank]...*', YMLA MS M2 (2)d, fol. 5v. (Raine, 1859: 220).

²⁶ *Chivalry*, cat. nos. 699-701.

scheme (Fig.53) and Hans von Reutlingen's St Peter (c.1510, Fig.54), is suggestive of the material and iconographical description of St Peter (though here he holds a chain-link, indicative of the relic in the base).²⁷

The description of the Virgin in the c.1500 inventory has striking similarities with that in Henry Scrope's will, and the inclusion of images of saints Peter, Paul, and John the Baptist raises the possibility that Scrope's images may have been donated to the Minster after all. The listing of St Paul and John the Baptist with the Virgin and St Peter in the inventory together with all four's presence in the will, their material similitude there, and iconographical similitude in the inventory, all raise questions about these images' relationships with one another, and in relation to the high altar, which we will explore in Part Two.

The c.1275-1300 list of relics in the York Gospels gives us earlier evidence for an image in the vicinity of the high altar. Relics of saints Luke, Marcellinus, Peter, Cyriacus, Euphemia, Tiburtius, and Nereus (all early saints, or martyrs, and most connected with Rome) were enclosed within 'the body of the crucifix' on a cross standing 'behind the high altar'.²⁸ The cross was commissioned and dedicated by Roger Pont l'Évêque, suggesting that it was probably installed as part of the furnishing of his twelfth-century choir.²⁹ As both Sarah Brown and Christopher Norton have noted, the fabric rolls state that during the remodelling of the choir in the first two decades of the fifteenth century, payment of 15s 6d was made in 1415 for 'a great beam for the cross in the new choir', which Norton suggests was the uppermost portion of the screen behind the high altar, shown in Torre's sketch as being decorated with ornamental cresting (Fig.48).³⁰ Neither Norton nor Brown has explicitly linked the c.1300 inventory and Roger's cross to this fabric roll reference, yet it is a distinct possibility. The presence of a monumental rood in this location, potentially Roger's, throughout

²⁷ *English Romanesque Art*, nos. 157a and b.

²⁸ 'In...cruce quae stat retro majus altare...continentur in corpore imaginis crucifixi relique de sancto Luca Evangelista. De sanctis martiribus marcelliano et Petro. de sancto Ciriaco martire. de sancta Eufemia virgine. de sancto Tiburtio martire. De sancto Nereo martire', YMLA, MS Add. 1. fols. 166v-167r. (Raine, 1859: 150).

²⁹ '...quam idem Rogerus Archiepiscopus fecit parari & postmodum dedicavit', YMLA MS Add.1, fol. 166v. (Raine, 1859: 150).

³⁰ 'In j magna trabe empta de Petro Wryght pro cruce novi chori, 15s. 6d.' This entry is noted by Raine, 1859: 35. The original, in YMLA, E3/7, is now lost due to damage to the document. Brown, 2003: 209; Norton, 2005: 177-78; 180.

our period, and the significance of the relics within it, will be explored in Part Two.

4.ii. *The Lady Chapel and St Stephen's Chapel*

The present Lady Chapel, comprising four bays, was built to the east of Roger Pont l'Evêque's choir in the third quarter of the fourteenth century, being complete by the death of the project's financial champion, Archbishop John de Thoresby, in 1373.³¹ The altar of the Blessed Virgin, formerly located in the crypt, as the 1364 inventory specifies,³² was positioned under the east window, and an altar dedicated to St Stephen was located against the east wall in the north-east corner of the new work: both were in use as the sites of chantries by 1369, if not before, the former in relation to Thoresby and the Percy family, the latter in relation to the Scrope family (Plans 8-11, nos.5 and 6).³³

The Lady Chapel's east wall contains four tiers of niches which give the impression that it was 'treated as if for sculptural display', though as Brown notes, there is no physical or documentary evidence to suggest any were ever present (Fig.55).³⁴ The reredos of the altar of the Blessed Virgin, directly under the east window, is extant, comprising three compartments with triple-headed ogival canopies, although it was subject to renovation in the mid-nineteenth century (Fig.56).³⁵ John Browne's plate drawing of the wall space below the reredos, and therefore directly above the altar, shows the remains of a mural of the *Arma Christi* and figures connected to the Passion, with a space of 'about 2ft 8in.' in the middle for an object such as a tabernacle to be placed in the centre (Fig.57).³⁶ However, the pictures were 'nearly obliterated' during the renovation work, and there is now no known extant evidence for them.³⁷ Daw has suggested a *terminus post quem* for the wall painting as 1369, in line with the chantry

³¹ Brown, 2003: 138-39.

³² '*hec sunt ornamenta altar beate marie in cryptis*', YMLA MS M2 (4)g, fol. 31v.

³³ Raine, 1859: 294-95; 301. Brown, 2003: 139; 164.

³⁴ Brown, 2003: 154.

³⁵ According to Browne, the reredos measures 'about 21 ft. in height and about 13ft in breadth', with renovation of damaged parts having been undertaken in 1845. This included 'making a new cornice, piecing the busts [on the cornice], pendants, pinnacles, &c.'. Browne, 1847: I, 279; 291. Brown, 2003: 154.

³⁶ Browne, 1847: 291. For a discussion of the accuracy of Browne's plate drawing in relation to its depiction of the surrounding architectural features in comparison to Britton's earlier drawing of 1819 (Britton, 1819: plate XXV), see Daw, 2011: 31-32.

³⁷ Browne, 1847: 291. Close examination of this area has not been possible due to the ongoing restoration of the east window.

foundations at the altar, and noted the problematic nature of assigning a *terminus ante quem* due to the longue durée of the popularity of *Arma Christi* iconography and the lack of any indication of style or colour in Browne's drawings.³⁸ Her implied belief that it may date from not long after the altar's foundation, due to the fact that it is unlikely that the space was left unadorned until the completion of the east window's glazing in the early fifteenth-century, is one that should be borne in mind, though the possibility remains that the scheme was a later addition.³⁹

A medieval survival was found when, after damage to the area from the 1829 fire, a niche built into the north side of the east wall of the Lady Chapel was found close to the north side of the altar of the Virgin. Inside it, covered with plaster, was a damaged Tadcaster stone relief sculpture of the Virgin and Child (Fig.58). This has been assigned various dates, from before the Conquest to c.1155, though Christopher Norton has more recently suggested c.1130.⁴⁰ It depicts an enthroned Virgin with the Christ child on her knee. The head of the Virgin is lost, as is most of the figure of Christ, but his remaining right hand is raised in blessing; an inscription running either side of the Virgin's head reads '*S[an]c[t]a Maria*' (Fig.59). As Marks has noted, this is an example of the *Sedes sapientiae* type, of which numerous three-dimensional twelfth and thirteenth century survivals can be found on the Continent: helpful clues to the kind of examples once found in England are Anglo-Norwegian figures such as the Ranes Virgin and Child (Fig.60).⁴¹ The potential significance of the York *Sedes sapientiae* will be explored further in Part Two.

The chantry inventories provide further documentary evidence related to images in the Lady Chapel, specifically associated with the altar of the Blessed Virgin which was the location of a chantry for Henry, 2nd Lord Percy (d. 1351/2), members of his family, and later also Archbishop Thoresby.⁴² A number of sumptuous accessories for a Virgin and Child image are listed in the c.1360 and

³⁸ Daw, 2011: 33. On *Arma Christi* iconography see Schiller, 1971: II, 184-96.

³⁹ Daw, 2011: 33.

⁴⁰ Clapham, 1948: 6-13; *English Romanesque Art*, cat. no. 153, Marks, 2004: 42; Christopher Norton, York Minster in 1212 Lecture, 29th November 2012, and Pers. comm., May 2013.

⁴¹ Marks, 2004: 42-44; Blindheim, 1998: cat. no. 30. For more examples see also Blindheim, 1998: cat. no. 27 (Urnes); *Chivalry*, cat. no. 250 (Enebakk); Blindheim, 2004a: cat. nos. 1(Hove) and 4 (Austråt), and the register of extant examples in Ilene Forsyth's classic study of the *Sedes sapientiae*. Forsyth, 1972: 156-203.

⁴² Raine, 1859: 295; Brown, 2003: 139.

1364 inventories: a silver gilded crown with a stone for the Virgin, a small silver gilded crown ‘for the image of the Son of the same Virgin’, two silk kerchiefs for the Virgin, two silk garments for the same image, and two silver plates for her feet.⁴³ The image itself is not listed in the inventories, but an alabaster Virgin and Child is listed in the c.1420 inventory, described as ‘the Virgin seated with her Son’; a ‘white panel painted with the Coronation’ is also listed, possibly an alabaster panel of the Coronation of the Virgin.⁴⁴ This inventory also lists silver crowns for the Virgin and Christ-child, a silk garment, and two silver plates for the feet of the Virgin, but also notes that a gold ring with a diamond hung on the Virgin’s crown, and that eight necklaces and six rings hung from a muslin garment belonging to her image, one being studded with four little stones and four little pearls, as well as a crystal encased in silver.⁴⁵

Thomas Karr, sheriff of York in 1428, and his son John Carre, sheriff 1440-41, and mayor in 1448 and 1456, whose wills date from 1444 and 1487 respectively, both include bequests to an image at the altar of Our Lady which we can link to this Virgin and Child, and indicate its continued presence into at least the last quarter of the fifteenth century.⁴⁶ Thomas left 100 s. to buy two gold necklaces to be hung around the necks of the Virgin and the Christ-child respectively, and a gold ring worth 13s. 4d. to be hung around the Virgin’s neck.⁴⁷ His son bequeathed a gold ring with a diamond in it to hang around the neck of the Virgin, and a ring with a ruby in it, as well as a necklace, to hang around the

⁴³ ‘*una corona argentea deaurata cum lapidibus pro imagine beate virginis... alia parva corona argentea pro imagine filii ejusdem virginis deaurata ...ij flammeolae de serico pro imagine beate virginis...ij indumenta de serico pro eadem imagine...duae platae argenti pro pedibus beate virginis ...*[1364] *una corona argentea de auro cum lapidibus pro ymagine beate Marie virginis... alia parva corona argentea pro ymagine filii ejusdem virginis deaurata...ij flammeole de serico pro ymagine beate virginis Marie...ij indumenta de serico pro eadem ymagine...duae platae argenteae pro pedibus beate virginis*’, YMLA MS M2 4 (g), fol. 31r.

⁴⁴ ‘*una ymago beate Marie sedentis cum filio suo de alabaustro...una tabula alba picta cum coronation beate Marie*’ Raine, 1859: 295. I have been unable to find the original inventory in the Minster’s archives. For a catalogue of extant alabaster panels of the Coronation, see Cheetham, 2003: 99-106.

⁴⁵ Raine, 1859: 296.

⁴⁶ *TE* II: 92 (BIA, Prob. Reg. 2, fols. 79v-80r.). *TE* IV: 26-30 (BIA, Prob. Reg. 5, fols. 327v-329r.)

⁴⁷ ‘*lego c. s. ad emendum duas catheras aurias, unam, videlicet, ad ponendum circa collum yemaginis beatae Mariae virginis, stantis ad altare ejusdem virginis Mariae, post summum altare ecclesiae cathedralis beati Petri eboracensis; et alteram ad ponendum circa collum Filii yemaginis praedictae, in brachiis ejusdem existentis. Item lego unum annulum aureum, preci xiii s. iiij d. ad ponendum et catherandum circa collum yemaginis beate Marie predictae*’, *TE* II, 92 (BIA, Prob. Reg. 2, fol. 79v.)

neck of the Christ-child.⁴⁸ The evidence from these two wills and the chantry inventories suggest that the Virgin and Child was a particularly important image: this status, and its relationship to the surviving *Sedes sapientiae*, will be explored in detail in Part Two.

At least one other Marian image can be located in the east end of the Minster, from the early fifteenth century through to the second quarter of the sixteenth century. A fabric roll dated to 1416x1421, possibly for the year 1419-20,⁴⁹ includes an entry for the cost of buying a Marian image, the making of its tabernacle, and its painting; its location is given as ‘standing above the parclose before the altar of St Stephen’.⁵⁰ The screen, as Norton has noted, may only have dated from around the same time, rather than been an installation of the mid-fourteenth century, as it was only at this later time that the north ambulatory aisle was vaulted.⁵¹ The image’s location corresponds closely with those given in the wills of John Chapman, notary, and John Fewlar, chaplain of St Stephen’s altar, who, respectively, requested burial before a Marian image ‘before the chapel’ (*‘ante capellam’*) in 1528 and ‘at the altar’ (*‘ad altare’*) in 1530.⁵² Although the latter’s use of *‘ad altare’* could be interpreted as meaning precisely at the altar itself, in light of similar phrasing being used in other wills, we can suggest that here it is being used to refer to the chapel more generally. Conceivably the image could also be that referred to in the wills of John Gisburgh, canon residentiary and Precentor 1457-60, and Robert Este, whose wills of 1479 and 1493 respectively request burial near a Marian image ‘in the north aisle’ (*‘in insula boriali’*) and ‘in the north ambulatory’ (*‘in ambulatori boriali’*) of the Minster, with Este specifying in his request that he wishes it to be near (*‘prope’*) Gisburgh’s burial

⁴⁸ ‘I bewit my gold ryng wt the dyamonde to hyng aboute the nek of the ymage of oure Ladye yt standes abowne [‘abowve’ in MS] oure Lady alter in the mynster where they singe oure Lady messe. Also I bewit an other ryng wt a ruby and one torcos to hyng aboute oure Lorde nek that is in the armis of the same ymage of oure Ladye’, *TE IV*: 27 (BIA, Prob. Reg. 5, fol. 327v.).

⁴⁹ Stell: 82 (YMLA E3/9). The head of this roll, and therefore its date, has been lost. Rolls E3/7 and E3/10 are securely dated, giving us this date bracket into which this can be fitted. The more precise date is used by Norton (Norton, 2007: 178), following Raine, 1859: 42, who does mention that the head of the roll is lost, but does not note how he has dated it to that particular year.

⁵⁰ ‘*Et in j ymagine beate Marie empte cum factura tabernaculi sui et pictura eisdem stantis super le parclos ante alterm [sic] Sancti Stephani, xxiiij s. iiij d’*. Stell: 82 (YMLA E3/9, mem. 3, front).

⁵¹ Norton, 2007: 178.

⁵² Chapman: *TE V*: 240 (YMLA, D/C Prob. Reg. 2, fol. 158v.) Fewlar: *TE V*: 289 (YMLA, D/C Prob. Reg. 2, fol. 156r.)

plot.⁵³ Torre's plan of the burial plots in the east end of the Minster (Fig.61) shows a particular concentration in the most easterly bay of the north aisle, to the west of the parclose screen: of these burials, number 70 is identified by Torre as belonging to John Chapman, and number 72 to John Gisburgh, but Fewlar and Este are not mentioned in relation to any of the other burial plots in the area.⁵⁴ The proximity of Chapman and Gisburgh's plots, on the north side of the ambulatory and close to the screen, suggests a more precise location for the image as above the north side of the screen, though without any corroborating evidence that they were buried directly before the image, this must remain speculative.

4.iii *The Crossing and Transepts*

Before describing the relics enclosed within the cross behind the high altar, the c.1300 inventory of relics begins with a list of those contained within a '*magna crux*' which is described as 'standing above the pulpitum at the entrance to the choir' ('*que stat ultra pulpitum in introitu chori*'), suggesting it can be identified as a *Triumphkreuz*.⁵⁵ Like the cross at the high altar described in the same inventory, this too was commissioned and dedicated by Archbishop Roger, and contained a number of relics of saints, most of whom were martyrs, and several of whom were connected with Rome.⁵⁶ Importantly, they included saints Peter, Paul, and Matthew. Its survival throughout our period is not certain, but it remains a possibility.

Two wills request burial before the '*magnum crucifixum*' and 'blissed roode': respectively, John Esyngwold, 'Moneymakerr', in 1431, and John Chesman, a 'chanler and barbur', in 1509.⁵⁷ Torre's plan of the burials in the transept and crossing (Fig.62) shows a distinct concentration of plots in the crossing, and especially before the extant choir screen and the entrance into the

⁵³ Gisburgh: *TE IV*: 85 (YMLA, D/C Prob. Reg. 1, fol. 350r.). Este: *TE IV*: 84-85 (YMLA, D/C Prob. Reg. 1, fol. 380r.). For Gisburgh's career see Neve and Jones: 41. These burials are noted in Browne, 1847: I, 218-19.

⁵⁴ Torre, fols. 119r-121r.

⁵⁵ YMLA, MS Add. 1. fol. 166v.

⁵⁶ '*...quam Rogerus Archiepiscopus fecit parari & postmodum dedicavit, continentur in corpore imaginis crucifixi reliquie sanctorum apostolorum Petri & Pauli & mathei et sanctorum martirium mauricii sociorumque ejus. Sebastiani et Calixti papae, Cipriani episcopi, Justinae matris Felicis Treverensis episcopi. sancte Rustici Treverensis episcopi & sanctae felicitatis.*' YMLA, MS Add. 1. fols. 166v-167r. (Raine, 1859: 150). For the saints, see Attwater, 1965: 35; 304; 78; 96-97; 272-73; 127-28.

⁵⁷ *TE II*: 16 (BIA Prob. Reg. 2, fol. 607v). *TE IV*: 336 (YMLA, D/C Prob. Reg. 2, fol. 78r.).

choir. Out of 49 plots, most have no features allowing them to be identified securely to an inscription plate or will; neither Esyngwold nor Chesman are identified by Torre.⁵⁸ The significance of Roger's twin commissions, the relics within them, and the importance of the *magna crux*, especially in relation to burials, will be explored in Part Two.

Further evidence related to the *Triumphkreuz* can be found in the fabric rolls. A roll dating to the second half of the fourteenth century mentions a cloth for the 'cross under the bell-tower', valued at 25 s. 6d.⁵⁹ The cross was repaired in 1469-1470 after it was 'broken' in an accident on the feast of the Holy Innocents: the payment was 4s. 8d.⁶⁰ The roll for 1518-19 includes an intriguing reference to payment of 12s. 8d. to 'Robert Reid and others' for making two clappers for bells and 'for large nails for the crucifix'.⁶¹ This roll also includes an entry for buying cord and other items including curtain rings to suspend the quadragesima cloth before the 'new crucifix' ('*novum crucifixum*'); payment for the painting of this cloth is also noted.⁶² This crucifix's location is not given, nor is it clear how 'new' it was when the roll was compiled. As we shall see, this is one of a number of elliptical references to a 'new' crucifix in the Minster.

A fabric roll from c.1475 includes payment to Richard Latomer for his work writing depositions before the image of Henry VI.⁶³ In 1479 Archbishop Booth called for veneration of the image of Henry VI to stop: as Brown has noted, the image is referred to in the past tense, suggesting it had already been

⁵⁸ Torre, fols. 111r-114r.

⁵⁹ '*j velum pro cruce subtus campanile pretij xxv s. vj d.*', Stell: 25 (YMLA E3/3, mem. 3, dorse). There is no internal evidence to date this roll precisely: E3/2 can be dated to between 1354 and 1371, and E3/6 can be dated to 1404 or 1405, so a date of sometime in the last quarter of the fourteenth century is likely. On the bell-tower, see Brown, 2003: 33-4; 140, and 195-96.

⁶⁰ '*solutim pro emendatione magne crucis [iv s. viij d. interlined] fracte pro casum in festo Sanctorum Innocentium*', Stell: 304 (YMLA E3/24, mem. 2, front).

⁶¹ '*Roberto Reeid et aliis facientibus duo les clappirs pro campanis et emendatibus alia et pro clavis magnis pro crucifixo xij s. xij d.*', YMLA E3/37 (mem. 3, front). Also noted in Vallance, 1947: 84.

⁶² '*et pro c fawthoms cordarum pro suspensione pannorum quadragesimalium ante novum crucifixum, iij s. Pro pictione unius panni pendentis coram novo crucifixo in tempore quadragesimali et pro les curtayn ringes et pro les laic ac pro suicione alterius panni xij s.*', YMLA E3/37 (mem. 3, front).

⁶³ '*In retributione data magistro Ricardo Latomer pro laboribus suis impositis circa scripturam depositionum certorum personarum coram ymagine regis Henici sexti...offerencium xl s.*', YMLA E3/27 (mem 3, dorse). Stell's transcript has '*scapturum*' instead of '*scripturum*' and '*septi*' instead of '*sexti*': the original roll confirms Stell is correct in the first instance but incorrect in the second (Stell: 366). Raine stated that the head of the roll was missing, and dates it to 1472-73, although Browne dates it to 1475-76. The head is missing, and the first six inches of the surviving roll are extremely damaged.

removed.⁶⁴ Both she and Marks have interpreted this to be the image which was installed on the west face of the choir screen as part of the sculptural programme of kings in the late 1430s or early 1440s, pointing out that the original image was removed and subsequently replaced (see Fig.63 for the current image, installed in the early nineteenth-century).⁶⁵ Further in support of this theory, Marks has cited the evidence for the proximity of the chantry founded in 1475/6 by Dean Andrews, Henry's former private secretary, to this choir screen location.⁶⁶ The chantry is stated as being '*in solario* ['loft'] *coram ymagne S.Salvatoris ex parte australi ecclesie*', which has been interpreted as referring to the rood loft; Henry VI's soul is stated as one of those for whom services were to be offered.⁶⁷ This theory supersedes that which Marks previously held, in which he suggested that the image referred to by Booth was likely to have been 'an independent devotional image'.⁶⁸ He links this 'independent' image, 'or its replacement' (presumably in light of Booth's proscription), with evidence from the c.1500 inventory, which records a cloth which was 'to hang behind the altar lately of Henry VI' in the section listing cloths for hanging in the choir⁶⁹ and the fabric roll for 1515-16, which includes a payment of 20s. to John Paynter for the painting of an image of King Henry, which he notes may have been associated with the altar in the choir, 'dedicated to King Henry'.⁷⁰

An alternative theory is that the choir screen image was removed by 1479, but by c.1500 a new image of Henry was in existence in the Minster, either at the choir screen or elsewhere. This would fit with the changing fortune of Henry's cult in the interim: by 1484 he had been reinterred at St George's Chapel, Windsor.⁷¹ The altar referred to in the c.1500 inventory would be a prime candidate for the location of a new image, as Marks has suggested, but it seems unlikely that this was officially dedicated to Henry VI, who was uncanonised, and who is referred to as 'King Henry' in the inventory, rather than 'St Henry'. Here it

⁶⁴ Raine, 1859: 208-10; Brown, 2003: 235.

⁶⁵ Brown, 2003: 235. Marks, 2012b: v-vi; Marks, 2012d: 630, n.51 (for the date of the current image).

⁶⁶ Marks, 2012b: v-vi.

⁶⁷ Raine, 1859: 82; 300-301. See also Gee, 1984: 343 and Brown, 2003: 235.

⁶⁸ Marks, 2012d: 629-30.

⁶⁹ '*unus pannus...ad pendendum pone altare nuper regis Henrici sexti...*', YMLA, M2 (2)d, fol. 9r. (Raine, 1859: 227).

⁷⁰ '*Johanni Paynter de Eboracum pro piccione j ymaginis henrici Regis* ['xx s' interlined] *xxj s. ii d.*', YMLA E3/36 (mem. 3, front). Marks, 2012d: 630.

⁷¹ Marks, 2012d: 608.

should be noted that there was never an altar officially dedicated to Archbishop Scrope, whose tomb in St Stephen's chapel and *de facto* cult were of great importance to the fifteenth-century devotional topography of the Minster. One possibility is that the inventory refers to the altar in the rood loft, which might also be interpreted as part of the choir, where Henry was one of those for whom Dean Andrews' chantry was endowed, and which may therefore have been associated more closely with the king as his cult grew. However, it seems unlikely that an image of Henry which was likely to have been commissioned for devotional purposes would have been set up in such a relatively inaccessible location, and we should therefore perhaps refrain from linking the c.1500 inventory reference with the fabric roll entry for John Paynter's work.

Nicholas Blakburn, a leading merchant of the city and mayor in 1412, and his wife Margaret, both requested to be interred before an image of the Virgin in the southern part of the Minster in their wills of 1432 and 1433 respectively, a decade after the lawyer John Southwell's request for burial before a Marian image, also described as 'in the southern part'.⁷² Miles Metkalf, another member of the legal profession, requested in his will of 1486 that he be buried 'afore Our Lady'.⁷³ Although Metkalf does not specify where the image is, Torre records his burial plot as being in the south transept of the Minster, giving details of the inscription, but does not match this with a numbered burial plot in his plan of the crossing and transepts.⁷⁴

Testamentary evidence and several fabric rolls give details of an image of Our Lady which may be that referenced by the Blakburns, Southwell, and Metkalf. Robert Esyngwald, Procurator General of the Court of York, requested burial in his will of 1443 before an image of the Virgin in the Minster 'where the people make offerings to the fabric fund', and where a marble stone had already

⁷² *'sepeliendum in ecclesia beati Petri eboracensis, in australi parte, coram ymagine Domine nostre ibidem, sub lapide meo marmorio ad hoc in eodem loco preparato'*, TE II:17 (BIA, Prob. Reg. 2, fol. 605r). *'...corpusque meum sepeliendum in ecclesia...beati Petri...sub lapide marmorio coram ymagine Domine nostre ex parte ex australi'*, TE II: 46 (BIA, Prob. Reg. 3, fol. 377r.). More background information on the family, and full transcriptions of the wills, are published in Rycraft, 2006 (esp.13-38). Cullum and Goldberg 2000: 222 cite the couples' requests for burial as being 'before the crucifix in York Minster': spatially, this is likely to be more or less correct if they are amongst this grouping, but it is somewhat misleading in light of the actual wording of the wills. John Southwell's will reads *'coram ymagine beate Marie ex parte austali'*, TE III: 90 (YMLA, D/C Prob. Reg. 1, fol. 217r.).

⁷³ TE, IV: 9 (BIA, Prob. Reg. 5, fol. 365r.)

⁷⁴ Torre, fol. 109r.

been put in place for him.⁷⁵ Working from Torre's record of Esyngwald's tombstone, which is number 74 in the section of the plan showing the south transept burials (Fig.64), John Browne suggested that the image was located on or close to the south-west side of the south-east crossing pier, and was the image known as the 'Virgin of the Red Ark [or Chest]', so-called because underneath the image stood a red chest for collecting donations to the Minster's fabric fund (Fig.65).⁷⁶

Browne also noted that the will of William Otterburn, sacrist, requested burial before the image of the Virgin '*ad Rubeum Arham*' only five months before Esyngwald: Torre records salient details of his will, and his tombstone may well be that adjacent to Esyngwald, marked as number 73 on Torre's plan, though Torre does not cross reference the two (Fig.64).⁷⁷ The three burials south of the two tombstones, marked numbers 70-72, and the significant cluster of burials to the west, marked as nos. 75-89, may include those of the Blakburns, Southwell, and Metkalf. However, most plots had no identifiable features for Torre's purposes. One that did, number 85, can be connected to another image, which we shall explore below⁷⁸. This suggests we should be alert to the idea that the clusters included burials connected to the image of the Virgin, but also some connected to at least one other image nearby.

An entry in the roll dated 1515-16 details payment to Ursinus Mylner for binding the books in the choir and painting the red chest under the image of the Virgin.⁷⁹ The chest is defined specifically as 'for receiving the offerings to the fabric' ('*pro elemosinis ad fabricam recipiendis*'), and could be that chest repaired in 1415-1416, which is described as standing 'next to the image of the Blessed Mary in the nave' ('*juxta ymaginem Beate Marie in navi ecclesie*'), a description which also may be indicative that the Virgin of the Red Ark was *in situ* nearly thirty years before it is referred to in the wills of Esyngwald and Otterburn.⁸⁰ The next entry in the roll for 1515-16 lists three 'quart', or quarters

⁷⁵ '*corpus meum sepeliendum in ecclesia beati Petri eboracensis coram ymagine beate Marie ubi populi offerunt ad fabricam ejusdem ecclesiae, sub lapide marmoreo ibidem pro me posito*', TE II: 90 (BIA, Prob. Reg. 2, 149v.) and see also Torre, fol. 102v for a summary in English.

⁷⁶ Browne 1847: I, 236. Torre, fol. 102v. Oakes, 2003: 37-38 discusses the presence of the red chest and its relationship to the fabric fund but was not aware of its location.

⁷⁷ Browne 1847:I, 236; Torre, fols. 102v and 160r. (YMLA D/C Prob. Reg. 1, fol. 256r.).

⁷⁸ Torre, fols. 102r-103v.

⁷⁹ YMLA E3/36 (mem. 3, front).

⁸⁰ YMLA E3/7 (mem. 4, front).

of a gallon, of gold, used to gild a star above the image; each painter who ‘painted and gilded the same star’ was paid 6s. 8d.⁸¹ An entry in the roll from 1518-19 states that £10 was given to two painters for their labour and materials, including bice, a blue pigment, whilst working on two images of the Virgin ‘with their tabernacles and histories’; one of these was the image at the red chest (*‘Duobus pictoribus pingentibus duas ymagines beate Marie cum ipsarum tabernaculis et historiis, unam ad rubeam archam...’*).⁸² The presence of entries related to the decoration of this image in both the roll for 1515-16 and 1518-19 suggests that it was significant in both status and size.

No further details are given regarding the iconography of the Virgin at the Red Ark. However, these references do tell us that the image was housed in a tabernacle, probably with a painted interior and/or painted exterior doors. The Hopperstad tabernacle, missing its four doors and now housing the Hove Virgin and Child, gives an indication of the effect of such framing (Fig.66). In particular, the silver and gold twelve-petalled rosette on the upper rear wall of the canopy is suggestive of the gold star above the Virgin at York.⁸³ The large (1.84m) door from Fåberg, c.1250 (Fig.67), with an image of St Peter on its outside and ‘bars and columns to hold lost carved images’ on the inside, was originally part of a tabernacle housing an image of the Virgin.⁸⁴ The interior carved images included the magi Balthazar and Melchior, and an angel, suggesting the scheme may have been scenes from the Virgin’s life. Such a scheme, in paint, may have constituted the ‘history’ of the Virgin of the Red Ark: Marks, quoting the evidence for the Red Ark Virgin’s tabernacle in a discussion of framing, has pointed out the popularity of such schemes on the continent.⁸⁵ A more salient example of the overall effect, but perhaps not size, of the York image and tabernacle, is suggested by the Brekke altarpiece (c.1475, Fig.68), showing the Visitation and Adoration of the Magi on the north side of the interior, and the Birth of Christ and

⁸¹ *‘Pro iij quartes lez auri pro deauratione j stelle super ymaginem beate Marie et cuidam pictori pro picione et deauratione ejusdem stelle vj s. viij d.’*, YMLA E3/36 (mem. 3, front). Here, the large amount of gold may have been due to it being in powdered form and suspended in a binding medium such as oil. I am indebted to Dr James Jago for this suggestion.

⁸² YMLA E3/37 (mem. 3, front). By the fifteenth-century ‘bice’ was used specifically as a noun to denote ‘blue’, rather than as an adjective meaning ‘dark’ as it had done in the fourteenth century. Howard, 2003: 50.

⁸³ Marks, 2004: 47; Blindheim: 2004a: cat. no. 1.

⁸⁴ Blindheim, 2004a: cat. no. 34.

⁸⁵ Marks, 2004: 243.

the Presentation on the south side.⁸⁶ There is no niche or obvious indications of fixings on the south-west side of the south-east crossing pier, suggesting the image and tabernacle were freestanding (Fig.65). The fabric rolls from 1432-33 onwards note the offerings taken from the red chest itself, giving us a *terminus ante quem* for its installation, although many of the surviving rolls from 1405-06 onwards refer to oblations ‘*de truncis*’, suggesting there were a number of collection boxes, one of which may have been the Red Ark.⁸⁷

The Virgin was not the only image in the vicinity of the red chest. The c.1500 inventory’s list of images includes an entry for the head (‘*caput*’) of St Everilda, ‘standing on four copper lions’, ‘gilded’ (‘*auratum*’), and ‘which remains at the red chest’.⁸⁸ According to the York Breviary, she was a seventh-century West Saxon noblewoman and nun given land by St Wilfred.⁸⁹ This is the only instance this *caput* is mentioned in any of the sources, although the c.1300 inventory of relics notes ‘the head of St Everilda the virgin wrapped in a linen cloth’ in ‘the feretory behind the high altar’, suggesting this was her skull, and ‘bones from the body of St Everilda the virgin and certain clothes of the same’ at the feretory at St James’s altar.⁹⁰

The location of the St James altar is unclear from the extant late medieval sources. The 1364 inventory notes an altar dedicated to both St James and St Katherine, though no precise location is given for it; a separate altar in this inventory is also recorded as dedicated to St Katherine and stated as being located in the crypt.⁹¹ Additionally, chantries were established at an altar of St James and

⁸⁶ The plinth, reading ‘*Sancta Anna*’, may be a latter addition or evidence that the Virgin and Child replaced an earlier image of St Anne and the Virgin and Child. Pers. comm. Henrik von Achen, January 2014.

⁸⁷ Stell: 116; 132; 165-66; 182; 196; 213; 235; 290; 307; 326, 342; 350-51; 379; 399; 415, 429; 443 (YMLA E3/ 12, 13, 15-19, 23-32). E3/14, for 1434-35, does not contain any record of oblations; E3/20 is missing its first membrane, therefore the entries for income (see Stell: 243); the first extant membrane of E3/21 is missing its heading, and as the first entries relate to expenditure, it may be missing a first membrane on which income was recorded. E3/22 does not record any oblations but is missing most of its entries on income. For ‘*de truncis*’, see Stell: 41; 52; 64; 85; 99 (YMLA E3/6, 7, 8, 10, 11). The first membrane of E3/9 is missing, and is therefore missing entries for income, which are usually given first.

⁸⁸ ‘*Caput sancte Everilde stans super quatuor leones de cupro auratum quod remanet ad rubeum cistam*’, YMLA MS M2 (2)d, fol. 5v. (Raine, 1859: 220).

⁸⁹ Lawley, 1883: 388-390.

⁹⁰ ‘*In magno feretro retro majus altare....In eodam feretro est caput sancte Everildis virginis involutum in uno panno lineo. In feretro ad altare sancte Jacobi sunt ossa corporis Sancte Everildis virginis et quaedam vestes ejusdem*’. YMLA MS Add. 1 fol. 166v.

⁹¹ YMLA MS M2 (4)g, fol. 37v (for St Katherine); fol. 41r. (St James and St Katherine). The latter calls into question Shiels’ contention that the altar of St Katherine was amalgamated with that of St

St Katherine in 1357 and 1363, but in each case no further clue as to its location is given.⁹² However, the 1347 will of William de Cotyngham requested burial before the altar of St Katherine and Torre notes his burial plot as being number 119 on the south side of the central aisle of the nave, and therefore reasonably close to the second bay from the east in the north aisle of the nave.⁹³ This bay is the location for the window depicting the life of St Katherine (n23; Plan 13) which was installed at the beginning of the fourteenth century and donated by Canon Peter de Dene (d.1322).⁹⁴ The window's installation was therefore part of the building of the present nave, c.1291-1360, and de Cotyngham's will and burial location suggest the existence of an altar of St Katherine there before the 1364 inventory. Might this altar in the nave have been dedicated to both St James and St Katherine, becoming more associated, if only colloquially, with the latter after the installation of the window? It must be remembered that the description of an altar or an image in a will might not necessarily match its actual dedication.

The probable reliquary function for the *caput* of Everida listed in the c.1500 inventory will be examined in Part Two, as will the significance of this hitherto little discussed saint. The c.1500 description invites comparison with extant continental reliquary heads encased in precious metal such as those of St Thecla and St Ursula from the treasury of Basel cathedral (c.1290-1300 and c.1300-1320 respectively; Figs.69 and 70).⁹⁵ The detail of the four copper lions was a common feature on continental objects: comparison may be made with the reliquary bust of St Pantalus, again from the treasury of Basel (after 1270, Fig.71) and the extant Virgin and Child reliquary given to the Abbey of Saint Denis by Jeanne d'Évreux in 1339, both of whose bases are set on gilded lions (Fig.72).⁹⁶

The c.1500 inventory also includes an entry in the section entitled 'Texts of the Evangelists [i.e. Gospels]' for 'a text with a crucifix, and images of Mary and John with a stone from the mount of Calvary' which also resided at the Red

James some time in the third or fourth decade of the sixteenth century: rather, it seems likely that the 'Chantrye of Seynte James', as described in the 1546 chantry survey, had been the altar of St James and St Katherine for nearly two hundred years: Shiels, 1999: 111; see also Page, 1895: 444.

⁹² Raine, 1859: 286.

⁹³ Torre, fol. 91r.

⁹⁴ Brown, 2003: 90.

⁹⁵ Husband, 2001: cat. nos. 40 and 41.

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*: cat. no. 39; Leniaud and Plagnieux, 2012: 102.

Ark.⁹⁷ The area in front of the south-west side of the south-east crossing pier can therefore be identified as the site of a devotional complex incorporating a number of objects: its significance will be explored in Part Two.

In contrast to the lack of evidence for the Virgin of the Red Ark on the south-west side of the south-east crossing pier, there is a large and elaborately decorated niche built into the south-east side of the south-west crossing pier, now holding an image of St Cuthbert presented by Flora Barstow in 1907 (Fig.73); the pedestal, incorporating an inscription, is also from 1907.⁹⁸ The niche is recorded in an engraving by J. Haynes in Drake's *Eboracum*,⁹⁹ and its placement suggests it to be a pre-Reformation feature. A late fourteenth to early fifteenth-century dating bracket can be assigned to it, based on the physical evidence showing that the Romanesque crossing piers were encased by later work, and documentary evidence describing work on the 'fourth column' in 1409, which Brown has associated with this encasement.¹⁰⁰ In 1907 Purey-Cust reported that the early twentieth-century statue 'replaces one of silver, which had filled that niche since the earliest days', though offers no documentary evidence to support this, citing only that James Raine 'used to speak [of the statue] in glowing terms'.¹⁰¹

However, there is evidence to support Raine's assertion this could have been the site for a pre-Reformation St Cuthbert image. Torre describes the burial plot marked as number 85 on the plan of the cross body, on the south-east side of the south-west crossing pier (Fig.64), as being formed of 'a broad blue marble...w[hich] has [had] Cuter foyles at each Corner an Escoccheon of Arms supported by 2 Roches, between 2 other Escoccheons & an Inscription plate at top'.¹⁰² He suggests that, presumably because of the design, the plot 'might be for William Roch': he then records the inscription of what must have been a separate brass which was for Roch and his wife.¹⁰³ Torre records the 1518 will of William,

⁹⁷ 'Textus Evangelici [written in left-hand margin]... *Unus textus cum crucifixo, ac ymaginibus Marie et Johannis cum lapide montis Calvarie. Ad archam rubiam remanet.*', YMLA MS M2 (2)d, fol.7v. (Raine, 1859: 223).

⁹⁸ Purey-Cust, 1907, 219. The niche is not mentioned in Brown, 2003.

⁹⁹ Drake, 1736: plate between 532 and 533.

¹⁰⁰ Brown, 2003: 195; 197-200.

¹⁰¹ Purey-Cust, 1907: 226. I have been unable to trace any note or discussion of this image in Raine's publications.

¹⁰² Torre, fol. 103v.

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*

in which he requests to be buried in the south aisle ‘ander [sic] Sanct Cuthbert’.¹⁰⁴ If Roch was buried in his desired location, this supports the theory that the niche was the location for a pre-Reformation image of Cuthbert. Additionally, the will of Robert Alan, dating from 1505, also requested burial before St Cuthbert.¹⁰⁵ Torre notes this detail of his will, but could not match it to any particular plot. It may be one of those with no identifiable features in the noticeable cluster to the south-eastern side of the south-west crossing pier, and therefore in close proximity to the site of the niche (nos. 75-92, Fig.64).¹⁰⁶

There was an altar dedicated to St Cuthbert in the cathedral, the location of which has been subject to debate, and Roch’s request and Torre’s identification of the probable location for his burial plot have significant implications for this. As Brown has noted, neither Fowler nor Gee was ‘able to offer a definitive location for the altar...at which [Bishop Walter] Skirlaw’s chantry was established’.¹⁰⁷ Gee suggests three possibilities: by the east window (I, Plan 13), the glazing of which Skirlaw funded before his death in 1406; near the St Cuthbert window in the south choir aisle (n7, Plan 13, glazed c.1440), or near the central tower, the building of which was also funded by Skirlaw, and where a display of his arms can still be found on the south face of the lower stage (Fig.74).¹⁰⁸ The fourteenth-century chronicler William de Chambre refers to Skirlaw’s chantry being established ‘in the south angle’ of the church (*‘ad australem angulum crucis dicte ecclesie’*).¹⁰⁹ Swayed by the evidence pointing to the central tower as the location for the altar, Gee located it against the north-east side of the south-west pier of the central tower, directly below the arms.¹¹⁰

¹⁰⁴ YMLA Prob. Reg. 2, fol. 128v., see also Torre, fol.103v., where Torre has ‘near the S isle near St Cuthbert’.

¹⁰⁵ Torre, fol. 159v.; YMLA Prob. Reg. 2, fol. 44v.

¹⁰⁶ 75-77 have no identifiable features; 78 featured an inscription to ‘Cantor Kirkbeius’, whom Torre does not have a corroborating will, but who was perhaps Thomas Kirkby, Prebendary of Ampleforth 1450-1476/77: see Neve and Jones, 1963: 28. 79-84 have no identifiable features. 85 is identified as belonging to William Roch, and 86 has an inscription that it was the plot of William and John Wandesford, brothers, who both seem to have been interred (*‘abierunt’*) 20th October 1487; 87-89 have no identifiable features, and 90 and 91 are post Reformation, belonging to Elizabeth and Thomas Ennys.

¹⁰⁷ Brown, 2003: 180.

¹⁰⁸ Gee, 1984: 346

¹⁰⁹ *Ibid.*; *Scriptores Tres*: 144.

¹¹⁰ Gee, 1984: 338.

However, Brown has suggested that de Chambre's comment does not necessarily refer to the central tower. Citing John Leland's account of Skirlaw's activities,

This Skirlaw made all, or a pease of the lanterns at Yorke Minster, cast out of the vaults of the isles of eche syde of the highe altar. For there be his arms sette.¹¹¹

she argues for the altar being located 'in the south-east transept, close to the foot of the St Cuthbert window'.¹¹² This is not convincing in light of the cumulative evidence of Roch's will and Torre's identification of his probable burial plot, as well as the niche in the south-east side of the south-west crossing pier, and the fact that Skirlaw's arms are directly above this crossing pier.

Further recourse to Torre's manuscript shows two burial plots close to the south-west side of the pier on the plan of the nave (numbers 87 and 88, Fig.75), and two burials against the south-east side of the pier on the plan of the crossing (numbers 90 and 91, Fig.64). Number 87 has no identifying features, while number 88 had an effigy of a knight in chain-mail and with armour by his side, and has been identified as Robert de Mauley (d.1331) from the heraldry of the shield to his left-hand side.¹¹³ Plots 90 and 91 have post-Reformation dates: number 91 is the plot of Thomas Ennys, who died in 1557, and number 90 that of his wife, Elizabeth, who died in 1585.¹¹⁴ This indicates that the floor-space directly below the niche on the south-east side of the pier was clear of burials during the late medieval period. Although Gee may have been right in positioning the altar to the north-east side of the pier, the south-east side is therefore also a possibility.

Two further images can be associated with the south transept. Simon Maynard requested to be buried by the image of St Christopher in his will of 1446.¹¹⁵ Torre notes his burial plot as being number 23 in the south transept on his plan of the crossing, situated to the north-east of the first pillar from the west on the west side of the transept (Fig.64).¹¹⁶ However, there is no evidence in the surrounding extant fabric for a painting, or a niche or corbel for a three-

¹¹¹ Toulmin Smith 1964: V, 128-29.

¹¹² Brown, 2003:180.

¹¹³ Torre, fol. 81r; Brown, 2003: 130.

¹¹⁴ Torre, fol. 104r.

¹¹⁵ *Ibid.*, fol. 99v.

¹¹⁶ *Ibid.*

dimensional image. An altar dedicated to St Christopher was located between the first and second pillars from the west on the north side of the nave and associated with the guild of St Christopher and St George,¹¹⁷ and although it is conceivable that Maynard was referring to an image of St Christopher associated with this altar and was buried in a location different to that which he specified, it is more likely that the image was in the south transept. This would be in line with the practice in parish churches, which ensured an image of this saint was visible near to the quotidian entrance and exit.¹¹⁸

The second image associated with the south transept is noted in Archbishop Booth's register, which includes an entry from 1458 granting an indulgence to members of the Guild of the Name of Jesus, 'newly founded' ('*noviter fundata*'), who attend mass and antiphons before the crucifix 'near the south door' ('*coram imagine crucifixi prope ostium australe*').¹¹⁹ How this relates to the later references to a 'new crucifix', noted above, will be explored in Part Two.

There is less evidence for images in the north transept than in the south transept. Torre notes the burial plot of John Horbiry, who died in 1478, and asked that his body be buried 'in the north part of the Minster, before the images of St John the Baptist and St Anthony', as number 40 in the north transept on his plan of the cross-body, facing the first pillar on the north-east side of the north transept (Fig.62).¹²⁰ A possible location for the images may be the niches incorporated into the screen-arch (c.1415) between the north-east crossing-pier and the transept's pier, now holding early twentieth-century statues (Fig.76). The other Marian image noted in the 1518-1519 fabric roll as being painted, along with the Virgin of the Red Ark, is described as being located at the 'entrance of the north aisle of the choir' ('*ad hostium insulare aquilonaris chori*').¹²¹ This may explain the cluster of burials in this area on Torre's plan of the cross-body near to John Horbiry. Plots 41-52 and 56 are all unidentified, and we can speculate that the

¹¹⁷ Raine, 1859: 279-80; on this guild see White, 1987.

¹¹⁸ Marks, 2004: 100.

¹¹⁹ Smith (ed.), 1999: 117 (BIA, Arch. Reg. 20. fol. 200r.). My thanks to Professor Christopher Norton for this reference.

¹²⁰ Torre, fols. 106r-v; Brown, 2003: 203.

¹²¹ YMLA E3/37 (mem. 3, front).

image may have occupied one of the other niches in the screen-arch.¹²² There is no further evidence which we can identify securely as referring to this image. For instance, the 1525 will of Richard Willoughby, priest, includes a bequest of twelve pence to ‘one ymage of oure Lady standding be northe the where dore in the Mynster of Yorke’.¹²³ This may relate either to the image of the Virgin at the entrance to the north side of the choir, or the Virgin of the Red Ark. However, the fact that these two images were painted at the same time and with the same materials, including gold, suggests a decorative similarity between them, and perhaps one of status too. The relationship between these two images will be explored further in Part Two.

The only surviving three-dimensional image related to the ‘north part’ of the Minster is not in the north transept proper: this is the trumeau Virgin and Child on the exterior of the doorway into the Chapter House from the vestibule, which has been dated on a stylistic basis to the last quarter of the thirteenth century, possibly as early as c.1275-85, and depicts the Virgin as standing on a serpent and a lion (Psalm 91:13; Fig.77).¹²⁴ The heads and faces of both the Virgin and Christ have been restored after they were subject to iconoclasm during the Civil War;¹²⁵ in 1634 images of saints Peter and Paul are also recorded in a written account of the building as being in the vicinity of the Virgin and Child, and were most likely located within the niches in the spandrels left and right of the doorway and subsequently destroyed by iconoclasm (Fig.78).¹²⁶ Remains of gilding are still present on the bottom folds of the Virgin’s mantle, suggesting, as Dawton has noted, the veracity of Drake’s assertion that it was originally gilt.¹²⁷ In the Chapter House itself, the only evidence for images are the thirteen plinths above the doorway. It has been suggested that images of Mary and the apostles or Christ and the apostles formed the scheme of statues here.¹²⁸

¹²² 41-47 have no identifiable features; 48 had previously incorporated the plates of two figures, according to Torre, and 49-56 (the last being the small square next to the north-west side of the north-east crossing pier), have no identifying features. Plots 53-55 are not on the plan, nor are they listed in the text. Torre, fols. 106v-107r.

¹²³ *TE V*: 204 (BIA, Arch. Reg. 27, fol. 158v).

¹²⁴ Dawton, 1990: 48-9; Brown, 2003: 74. On this iconography see Morgan, 1991: 89-92.

¹²⁵ Brown, 2003: 73.

¹²⁶ Dawton, 1990: 48.

¹²⁷ Drake, 1736: 476; Dawton, 1990: 48.

¹²⁸ Brown, 2003: 74.

4.iv *The Nave*

Browne notes that in William Johnson's will of 1530 he requests burial 'afore the ymage of Sanct Petur standyng in the midst of the church dore at the west end',¹²⁹ and Torre's plan of the nave shows a number of burial plots in the vicinity of the door (nos. 1-12, Fig.75), though none of them can be matched to Johnson's request.¹³⁰ The central west door jamb incorporates an elaborate pedestal and canopy which can be identified as the location for Johnson's image of St Peter (Fig.80). Browne's wording as to where the image 'formerly stood' suggests that it may have been empty when he was writing, and the present image of St Peter is likely to be a Victorian addition. Browne also posits that a crucifix and accompanying figures of Mary and John were once placed in the large central niche above the gable of the west door and in the two large niches to either side of it (Fig.81), which are now filled with modern statues of the Virgin and Child and St Etheldreda and St Helen to the south and north respectively.¹³¹ This is due to references in a number of the early fabric rolls to oil burning '*ante crucem in navi*'.¹³² We shall consider this in Part Two.

A partial medieval sculptural survival in the form of mutilated statues of the Virgin and Child flanked by censing angels can be found above another doorway, in the second bay from the west in the nave, which led to the now demolished chapel of St Mary and All Angels, built by Roger Pont l'Évêque between 1177 and 1181 (Fig.82).¹³³

Alison Clark requested burial in front of a Marian image in 1502, where it is described as being between the shrine of St William and 'Haxay Gray', probably the tomb of Thomas Haxey, treasurer of the Minster 1418-24.¹³⁴ His burial plot is number 149 in the central aisle on Torre's plan of the nave (Fig.75).¹³⁵ Torre notes that the inscription on plot number 140 stated that William Clerke and his wife Alice were interred there.¹³⁶ The manuscript numbering is corrupt in this area on the plan of the nave burials, and Torre

¹²⁹ Browne, 1847: I, 139.

¹³⁰ Torre, fol. 82v.

¹³¹ Browne, 1847: I, 139.

¹³² Stell: 38, 50, 61, 74, 82, 97, 108 (YMLA E3/5-11).

¹³³ The chapel was probably demolished in 1547. Brown, 2003: 107; 298.

¹³⁴ *TE IV*: 4 (YMLA, D/C Prob. Reg. 1509, 2, fol. 82r.)

¹³⁵ Brown, 2003: 210.

¹³⁶ Torre, fol. 95r.

appears to have renumbered several plots, but 140 appears to be that which is second from the north, third 'row' from the east. This image may have been at the altar of St Frideswide, where a chantry for Thomas Pearson, sub-dean of York, was founded in 1490: the chantry inventory for 1520-21 states that it possessed an image of the Virgin.¹³⁷ In the 1543 inventory what is probably the same image is described in more detail as 'our Ladye with her Son in her armes, sette in case of woodde', suggesting it was either a *Sedes sapientiae* or, more likely within the sixteenth-century context, an image of Our Lady of Pity.¹³⁸ There is potential for the image mentioned in Alison Clark's will to be that which belonged to the chantry. If this is the case, it suggests that an image perhaps of a significant size, and permanently on display, possibly an altarpiece, could belong to, or be in the custody of, a chantry. The *Vesperbild* in a painted wooden tabernacle in the Liebfrauenkirche in Halberstadt (c.1400) is suggestive of such an image (Fig.83).

4.v. *Images in Unknown or Uncertain Locations*

The locations for a number of images listed in the c.1500 inventory are not specified. The first entry in the section for images is for a silver gilded image of the Virgin 'seated on a throne', weighing 19 lbs., suggesting an object of significant size.¹³⁹ Also listed is another image of the Virgin, 'de auro', weighing three and a half ounces and 'xxd.' and said to have been given by Thomas Ebden 'for putting on the eastern end of the shrine of Lord Richard Scrope, lately Archbishop of York' ('*ad deponendum in fine orientali feretri domini Ricardi Scrope quondam Archiepiscopi Ebor*').¹⁴⁰ The use of the future passive participle 'deponendum' indicates that the image did not then reside at the *feretrum*, which was most likely his tomb, located in St Stephen's chapel (Plan 11, no.7). This suggests that a number of the objects within the inventory perhaps resided in the sacristy, located in the westernmost of the three chambers in the angle of the south choir and transept (Plan 11, no.9).¹⁴¹ The entry also highlights that the

¹³⁷ Raine, 1859: 284.

¹³⁸ *Ibid.*

¹³⁹ 'Ymages beate Marie quarum una argentea deaurata sedet in cathedra ponderans xix lb.,' YMLA MS M2 (2) d, fol. 5v. (Raine, 1859: 220).

¹⁴⁰ *Ibid.*

¹⁴¹ Brown, 2003: 174-76.

inventory was concerned with listing images of varying sizes and potentially varying functions, a theme we shall explore further in Part Two.

No location is given for another image of the Virgin in the inventory, specified as holding a book in her left hand and with the arms of ‘lord le Scrope’ at its base; this was clearly part of an image complex depicting the Annunciation, as the next two entries are for an image of St Gabriel, also with Scrope arms at its base, and a silver jar with a lily in it.¹⁴² It is notable that the materials from which the images of the Virgin and Gabriel were made or with which they were decorated are not specified in the inventory, but the silver lily-pot is. This leaves open to question whether the primary criterion for inclusion in the inventory was that the images were made from, or covered by, precious materials.

A further image is listed in the inventory as displaying the arms of ‘lord le Scrope’: an Assumption (*Assumpcio*), ‘with jewels, standing on four columns’.¹⁴³ This is not suggestive of an example of the iconography’s most common extant medium in England, that of the alabaster panel.¹⁴⁴ Rather, it suggests a three-dimensional object encrusted with jewels, though here again its material is not recorded. The lack of differentiation between any of the members of the Scrope family points to one figure being the donor of the Annunciation and Assumption images, or perhaps an unawareness of which specific member of the family that was. An earlier entry in the section of the inventory listing *Cruces* makes explicit reference to Stephen Scrope, 2nd Baron Scrope of Masham (d.1406), as the donor of a gold cross, but also John Scrope, 4th Baron Scrope of Masham (d.1455) as the donor of another.¹⁴⁵

A silver-gilt image of St Margaret and the dragon is recorded in a c.1510 addition to the list, vividly described as showing the saint with a cross in her right hand and book in her left; standing on a green dragon on a green hill, with the

¹⁴² ‘...ymago beate Marie virginis cum libro in manu sinistra et armis domini le Scrope in fundo ponderans [blank]...ymago Sancti Gabrielis cum armis domini le Scrope in fundo ampulla argentea cum lilio in eadem ponderans [blank]’, YMLA MS M2 (2) d, fol. 5v. (Raine, 1859: 220). Discussions of the iconography of the Annunciation in England are notably absent from the studies of Marks and Morgan, but aspects of its iconography have been highlighted by others, principally using continental examples. See Marks, 2004: 121-56; Morgan, 1991; 1993; 1994; 1999; Robb, 1936; Van Dijk, 1999; and on the specific iconographical detail of Mary’s book, Miles, 2011.

¹⁴³ ‘...Assumpcio beate Marie virginis cum jocali stans super quatuor columpnias cum armis domini le Scrope ponderans [blank]’, YMLA MS M2 (2) d, fol. 5v. (Raine, 1859: 220).

¹⁴⁴ Marks, 2004: 148.

¹⁴⁵ YMLA MS M2 (2) d, fol. 5r. (Raine, 1859: 218-19).

arms of Archbishop Thomas Rotherham (d. 1500) on its shoulder, suggesting he was the donor.¹⁴⁶ Again, though not suggestive materially of the image, an extant late fifteenth-century French alabaster image is suggestive of the form of the York example (Fig.84). Another 1510 addition, this time in the section listing relics, is an image of St Peter ‘with a relic in his left hand’ (*‘cum una reliquia in manu sinistra’*).¹⁴⁷

In 1509 Humfray Maners, a ‘Gentilmann’, requested burial, ‘if it may be hadde, paing therefor vj s viij d’,¹⁴⁸ before an image of St Gregory of Pity, probably a depiction of the Mass of St Gregory incorporating a figure of Christ as the Man of Sorrows.¹⁴⁹ No location is given for the image. An altar dedicated jointly to St Nicholas and St Gregory was in the crypt by 1364, when services there were suspended, and the altar of St Nicholas was later the most southerly chapel on the east side of the north transept.¹⁵⁰ However, chantries are recorded as being associated specifically with an altar of St Gregory in both 1366 and 1483, therefore it appears that the dedication of the crypt altar was split when it was moved after 1364.¹⁵¹ The north transept can therefore be suggested as a possible location the altar of St Gregory, and the image mentioned in Maners’ will as well. However, this remains speculative and based only on the presence of the altar of St Nicholas in the vicinity: it may be that the altar of St Gregory was located in another part of the interior once the dedication split.

4.vi. Conclusion to Part One

Chapters I and III have, respectively, outlined the relevant primary sources pertaining to Durham Cathedral Priory and York Minster, and discussed the values and limitations of the sources, both general and specific. These chapters also set out the methodologies for approaching the sources for the purpose of this study. Chapters II and IV used the evidence for images within these sources, and

¹⁴⁶ *‘Imago sancte Margarete argentea et deaurata, cum cruce in manu dextra et libro in sinistra, stans super dracone veridi jacente super viridium montem, cum pede argenti deaurati, cum armis domini Thomae Rotherham nuper archepiscopi Eboracum super humerum draconis’*, YMLA MS M2 2 (d), fol. 5v. (Raine, 1859: 220).

¹⁴⁷ YMLA MS M2 2 (d), fol. 6v.

¹⁴⁸ *TE V*: 6-7 (BIA, Prob. Reg. 8, fol. 63r.).

¹⁴⁹ Schiller, 1971: II, 227-28.

¹⁵⁰ Gee, 1984: 340.

¹⁵¹ *Ibid.*: 344.

comparative extant images, to build up the topographies of images at both institutions. We shall now analyse this evidence in Part Two of the thesis.

CHAPTER FIVE

IMAGES OF CHRIST

5.i. *Introduction*

The work of historians such as Miri Rubin and Eamon Duffy has emphasised the christocentric character of religion in late medieval England, saturated with devotion to the Passion and, at its heart, centered on an encounter with Christ concealed in the form of the eucharist: the real, fleshy presence of God under the guise of a ‘fragile, small, wheaten disc’.¹ Paradoxically, in a world where matter was sanctified by the Incarnation, images *revealed* Christ’s body through the use of materials such as wood, stone, and precious metal, without being Christ himself. However, this distinction could be far from clear cut, as suggested by miracles involving moving crucifixes, bleeding hosts, and the existence of *archeiropoieta*.² Though multivalent in interpretation, on one level they are all evocative of the desire to encounter Christ more immediately, more closely, and in the flesh: even face to face (cf. 1 Corinthians 13:12).³

The evidence set out in Part One allows us to assess how Christ was represented in images at York Minster and Durham Cathedral Priory, from both qualitative and quantitative points of view. At both institutions, Christ with his mother, in infancy and adulthood, life and death, was depicted in the form of Virgin and Child images and those known as, or suggestive of, Our Lady of Pity. Other images related to Christ’s Passion and with iconographies usually only depicting the figure of Christ himself were also present at both institutions, such as the image of ‘Seint Gregory of Pytye’ at York (as noted above, probably an *Imago Pietatis*) and the Bound Rood at Durham, whose description in the *Rites* is suggestive of a depiction of Christ moments before the crucifixion. However, what is most noticeable and intriguing at both sites is the number of images of Christ on the cross and the variety of their locations, and it is these images for

¹ Rubin, 1991: 1; Duffy, 1992.

² For example, Wormald, 1937-38; Ward, 2011.

³ On this theme see the essays in Kessler and Wolf, 1998, especially Wolf, 1998; and Morello and Wolf, 2000, especially Wolf’s introduction on 19-21.

which we have the fullest evidence. For this reason, and in light of a wide body of extant scholarship on the cross, they will be the focus of this chapter, though the discussion will also incorporate analysis of the other iconographies, especially as they allow for comparisons and counterpoints. Furthermore, this evidence allows for engagement with a number of important themes: audiences, accessibility, liturgical and extra-liturgical use, the motivations for image patronage, the cross as a political as well as a sacred object, and its materiality.

Following the organizational principle of location, this chapter will comprise a number of case studies, beginning with an analysis of the rood above the high altar at York. It will then turn to the *Triumphkreuze* at York and Durham, situated over the choir screen and the rood screen respectively; the Black Rood of Scotland, and finally the image of St Saviour in the nave at Durham, the rood on the interior of the west front at York, and the Holy Cross in the Galilee chapel at Durham. After the analyses of these christological images, an exploratory section will examine Durham's *Vierge ouvrante*, Our Lady of Boulton, whose image of the crucifix was taken out and used during the Good Friday service.

5.ii. *The York Minster High Altar Rood*

We have seen evidence from the thirteenth-century inventory in the York Gospels and entries in the Minster's fabric rolls making direct reference or alluding to the presence of a rood above the high altar at York. This was a far from unique feature in medieval English cathedrals, but one that has received little scholarly attention. The evidence at York allows us to consider it and its functions in detail, building on the work of Christopher Norton, who has considered the presence of a rood in this position briefly in relation to the eastern arm's stained glass, but not connected it to this evidence.⁴ Although the earliest documentary evidence dates from c.1275-1300, in the form of the York Gospels inventory, it relates to a rood commissioned by Archbishop Roger de Pont l'Évêque in the twelfth century. Evidence from late Anglo-Saxon and Anglo-Norman sources attests to the presence of roods above the high altars at Peterborough abbey, Winchester cathedral priory, the abbey of Bury St Edmunds, and the then abbey (later cathedral priory) at Ely as early as the mid-eleventh century, suggesting that

⁴ Norton, 2005.

Roger's rood could have been a replacement for an earlier object.⁵ Figures of Mary and John are listed as accompanying some of these roods, and although none of the York sources mentions such figures, we can be almost certain that these standard flanking features were present. The fifteenth-century evidence for a new rood-beam as part of the construction of the new high altar reredos at York suggests the enduring presence of a high altar rood, and although there is no direct evidence that the rood for which this beam was made was Roger's, in the absence of any evidence to the contrary, it is possible that it was retained and used throughout the later medieval period. The rood was perhaps taken down during the rebuilding of the choir c.1394 - c.1420, and this fifteenth-century evidence should perhaps be seen in the context of its reinstallation.⁶

Evidence from other institutions demonstrates the high altar rood's popularity well into the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries: they were central to the sculptural schemes of the late fifteenth-century monumental screens behind the high altars at Winchester and the abbey at St Albans (Figs.85 and 86), and the Islip Roll of 1532 shows a rood, flanked by figures of Mary, John, and two angels, above the high altar screen at Westminster Abbey (Fig.87).⁷ The incorporation of roods into the screens at Winchester and St Albans supports Christopher Wilson's idea that images were increasingly enclosed in the tabernacles of reredoses and screens from the fourteenth century onwards, but the evidence from York suggests that the rood there was on a beam on top of the screen, as demonstrated by Christopher Norton and Pat Gibbs' reconstruction (Fig.88). This, combined with the image of the rood towering above the screen at Westminster in the Islip Roll, suggests that literal incorporation or enclosure of high altar roods into screens or reredoses was by no means universal.⁸

A more inventive way of framing the high altar rood appears to have been adopted at York. Norton has argued that the great east window (installed c.1405-1408) provided 'a glittering backdrop to the crucifixion', and formed the central

⁵ Peterborough: *L-B* II: 328 (3454); Winchester: *L-B* II: 655-66 (4700); Bury St Edmunds: *L-B* I, 136 (506) and *L-B* I: 135 (501); Ely: *L-B* I: 417 (1545); the *Liber Eliensis*, III, 50 confirms this is a high altar rood group: see Fairweather, 2005: 354.

⁶ Brown, 2003: 176; 208-09.

⁷ For discussions of the Winchester screen, see Lindley, 1989 and 1993. For the St Albans screen, see Lindley, 2001, and for the Westminster rood and screen, see Binski, 1995a: 148-52.

⁸ Wilson, 1980: 95. Norton, 2005: 178; 180, n. 26, supports the idea that the rood was on top of the new fifteenth-century screen.

panel of a 'giant triptych' with the St William window (c.1415) in the north-east transept and the St Cuthbert window (c.1440) in the south-east transept (Fig.89).⁹ He also notes that the rood and the high altar itself were located at 'the intersection of a cross formed by the central vessel and the eastern transepts'.¹⁰ The altar's importance was therefore emphasised on both vertical and horizontal planes, by both an object within the building and the building itself, the latter an architectural manifestation of the great importance attached to the shape of the cross and its dimensions throughout the medieval period.¹¹

There has been little discussion of the possible model(s) for the high altar roods at York and elsewhere in England, and why they were so keenly installed in so many of the great cathedrals and abbeys of England in the eleventh century.¹² As Forsyth has noted, crucifixes, often of life-size proportions and made of or covered in precious metals, were present on the Continent in the later Carolingian and the Ottonian periods.¹³ In terms of the specific location above the high altar, Barbara Raw has dismissed as an early model the golden cross above the *aedicule* of the church of the Anastasis in Constantine's complex of churches in Jerusalem. This cross is described in Adomnán's late seventh-century narrative of Arculf's journey around the major pilgrimage sites in the Holy Land, but not noted on his plan (Fig.90).¹⁴ Raw regards the cross as being merely 'decorative, intended...to symbolize the glorified Christ'.¹⁵ Relating the Anastasis cross to the apsidal jewelled crosses at sites such as Santa Pudenziana in Rome (c. 390; Fig.91) and St Apollinaire in Classe at Ravenna (c.6th century; Fig.92), she argues that high altar roods such as those donated by Archbishop Stigand (d. 1072) had a 'quite different meaning' and indicated 'a change in religious beliefs'.¹⁶ She suggests that the presence of a crucifix with a *corpus* linked the high altar with Christ's death instead of his Resurrection, and a moving away from the early Church's

⁹ Norton, 2005: 178-79. On the east window see French 1995, and on the St William window see French, 1999.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*: 177.

¹¹ Ladner, 1983, esp.198, 202; O'Reilly, 1987, esp. 158; Binski, 2004: 201-03.

¹² For example, Dodwell, 1982 gives much of the written evidence for their presence, and Cragoe, 2005: 22-4 describes the late Anglo-Saxon situation in broad terms, but goes back no further.

¹³ Forsyth, 1972: 73; 77-8.

¹⁴ Meehan, 1958: 44. For a detailed study of the *aedicule*, see Biddle, 1999, and for a discussion of the plan of the complex accompanying Adomnán's description, see O'Laughlin, 2012, esp. 22-32.

¹⁵ Raw, 1990: 50.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*: 50-51; for the changing theological landscape, see 167-78.

concentration on the Resurrection as the means of salvation to the eleventh-century concentration on Christ's death as the means to eternal life.¹⁷

However, *cruces gemmatae* such as that at Santa Pudenziana, as well as those in the Old English poems such as *Elene* and *The Dream of the Rood*, had connotations of Christ's death as well as of his resurrection, as Ian Wood has recently articulated. This is primarily through their material and historical references to the reliquary of the True Cross venerated at the church of Golgotha on Good Friday, as described in Egeria's pilgrimage account from her travels around the Holy Land c.381-84,¹⁸ and to evidence for the successive crosses that commemorated the site of Golgotha itself.¹⁹ Wood suggests that while the western *cruces gemmatae* were never intended as *actual* representations of either the reliquary or the Golgotha cross, they were intended to be connected imaginatively to the True Cross and its site by viewers, both those who had been to the Holy Land and those who had not, as a reminder of what they had seen or a glimpse of what they had not.²⁰

This invites us to interpret high altar roods at York and elsewhere in England in a more nuanced way, as drawing on an already established tradition of apsidal crosses not necessarily focused solely on glorifying the Resurrection, but also on emphasising the historical and material reality of the Crucifixion, one that we can suggest did become more pronounced with the addition of the *corpus*. The use of precious metals in the production of these high altar roods appears to be particularly suggestive of this tradition. It therefore also begs the question of the relationship between high altar rood and *Triumphkreuze*, the Golgotha cross usually having been discussed in relation to the latter in previous scholarship. This is a question to which we shall return shortly.

As Ellen Ross' study has demonstrated, Christ's humanity, and especially his physical suffering at the Crucifixion, was increasingly emphasised in the later middle ages in multivalent ways inviting nuanced responses.²¹ This emphasis

¹⁷ Raw, 1990: 50.

¹⁸ This reliquary was taken by the Persians in 614, returned in 630, and taken to Constantinople in 636. Wood, 2006: 7.

¹⁹ Wood, 2006: 9, esp. fn. 49; 10. See also Wilkinson, 1971: 136-37, and Meehan, 1958: 48. The Santa Pudenziana cross is depicted on a hill, a detail Wood strangely does not make clear when advancing his argument, as it would strengthen it.

²⁰ Wood, 2006: 11.

²¹ Ross, 1997, esp. 41-66 for discussion of visual representations.

would have served only to deepen the significance of the high altar rood at York, and those elsewhere, where they functioned as a reminder of the historical sacrifice of Christ that was re-presented during the sacrifice of the mass, and the body of Christ that was present in the eucharistic wafer on the altar. However, at York the iconography of the framing east window placed the historical sacrifice of Christ and the sacrifice at the high altar in a much wider context from the early fifteenth century onwards. As Norton has noted, the window's figures and scenes from the Old Testament, New Testament, and history of the Church meant that the rood could be interpreted as lying 'over the whole history of the world as represented in the East Window [sic] in its two phases separated by the crucifixion, *ante gratiam* and *sub gratia*'.²²

Though popular, high altar roods such as that at York were never considered compulsory, a point which serves to suggest further that they did not necessarily indicate a 'change in religious beliefs', as Raw has characterised it, but rather a conscious choice of emphasis. At the cathedral priory of Christ Church, Canterbury, and St Augustine's Abbey, Canterbury, images of Christ in Majesty rather than roods stood above the high altars. The former is described by the Christ Church monk Gervase (c.1141-c.1210) as being part of the topography of Anselm's choir, destroyed in the 1174 fire, and the latter is shown in Thomas of Elmham's *Speculum Augustinianum*, c.1410-c.1413 (Fig.93).²³ This arrangement is also implied by the New Minster *Liber Vitae* drawing of Canute and Emma's donation of a cross (c.1031), where the figure of Christ in Majesty is flanked by St Peter and the Virgin above the royal couple's donation (Fig.94).²⁴

In both cases at Canterbury, the images were joined by shrines, and at St Augustine's two crosses flanked six books below the image (one of the books is likely to have been the St Augustine's Gospels), with two arm reliquaries amongst them; at Christ Church a gilded cross stood between two columns.²⁵ The cross was therefore not absent at either institution in Canterbury, but the visual emphasis was on the resurrected Christ, and they were part of wider displays of objects around the high altar which advertised the history and identity of each

²² Norton, 2005: 178.

²³ *L-B*, I: 220-21 (804); Thomas of Elmham's illustration is discussed in Binski and Panayotova, 2005: cat. no. 115.

²⁴ Later documentary evidence records Canute only as donating a cross and two other 'large' images. See *L-B* II: 656 (4701).

²⁵ Stubbs (ed.), 1879-80: I, 13.

institution. Likely (and unsurprising, given the institutions' Roman origins) models for the Canterbury images of Christ in Majesty may have been the apsidal images on the *fastidium* at St John Lateran, described in the *Liber Pontificalis* and said to have been installed by Constantine, and also the apse mosaic at Old St Peter's.²⁶ The sixteenth-century watercolour of Innocent III's (1198-1216) modified version of the latter, shows Christ in Majesty (possibly replacing a *Traditio legis*) above a *Hetoimasia* and a depiction of the Lamb (Fig.95).²⁷

The close and complex relationship between image and relic evident in consideration of high altar roods, the reliquary of the True Cross, and the cross on Golgotha becomes even more pressing when considering the presence of relics in Roger's high altar rood at York. Though mention of a reliquary function in relation to high altar roods is not common in the documentary evidence from England, there is evidence for other crucifixes containing relics. Thomas Rudborne's description of Canute's cross given to New Minster notes that it contained the relics of 'many saints', and a tenth-century crucifix at Ely is also noted as containing relics of saints Vedastus and Amandus, for example.²⁸ These instances contrast with the character of relics deposited in crucifixes on the continent: in particular, Carolingian and Ottonian examples are recorded as holding fragments of the True Cross and other *brandea* associated with Christ.²⁹

Such incorporation of relics of other saints and/or *brandea* within crucifixes, and within early *Sedes sapientiae*, has been characterized by Belting as a bid to counteract the images' 'lack of reality', due to the absence of bodily relics of Christ and Mary; he contrasts this quality to sculpture which enclosed a primary relic of a saint.³⁰ Whilst this may be true, in the case of the inclusion of relics of early martyrs in Roger's high altar rood, and their recording in the c.1275-1300 inventory, we can also propose specific institutional meanings to this act, and the relics' presence in relation to the rood's position.

²⁶ *LP* I: 172.

²⁷ Iacobini, 2005: 50. See also Kessler, 2002: 3-4.

²⁸ *L-B* II: 656 (4701); *L-B* I: 413 (1528).

²⁹ For example, the Narbonne Crucifix contained a relic of the True Cross; Forsyth, 1972: 78. The Ringelheim Cross contained stones from the Holy Sepulchre in its head, and the Anno Cross held a fragment of the column to which Christ was tied during the Flagellation. The Gero crucifix contained a Host, which Fisher points out would function as a relic in this context. See Fisher, 2006: 59, n. 21. At 48-52 she considers the Gero crucifix in detail.

³⁰ Belting, 1994: 299-302.

It is highly likely that the relics were brought from Rome by Roger himself: he travelled to Rome at least twice, the latest documented instance being in 1154, when he received the pallium.³¹ This donation would no doubt have been intended to demonstrate both Roger's largesse as a patron and York's links to Rome. The c.1275-1300 inventory, whether copied from an earlier inventory or not, and its placement in the York Gospels, indicates a conscious wish to keep the knowledge of the rood's contents alive. The combination of the local, the universal, and the idea of sacrifice present in the relics contained in the rood is similar to the main themes of the later glazing of the eastern arm of the Minster, which Norton has convincingly demonstrated was focused on 'York Minster as the mother-church of the whole northern province, and on the relationship of the Northumbrian church to the church universal'.³² If Roger's high altar rood was the one present over the high altar in the fifteenth century, the significance of the rood as the spatial and theological centrepiece of the eastern arm was even deeper than Norton has suggested.

At Durham, the crucifix and accompanying images of Mary and John given by Earl Tostig and Judith in the mid-eleventh century may have been located at the high altar, but there is no later evidence for a monumental rood in this location. The Neville Screen was certainly built to accommodate and display images, but the *Rites* suggests that the dominant images in the vicinity of the high altar were those of the Virgin, St Cuthbert, and St Oswald. Like the image complexes at the high altars at Christ Church and St Augustine's, Canterbury, the Durham arrangement suggests the possibility of a flexibility in emphasis, and the deployment of carefully chosen images in order to make the high altar a site of the creation and reminder of institutional identity, as Belting has proposed in relation to the large-scale continental altarpieces of the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries.³³ As the Canterbury evidence suggests, there must have been a cross of some sort at Durham, on the high altar during mass, or on a retable directly above the altar, especially considering the customs and legislation concerning altar crosses, to which we shall now turn, but the *Rites* mentions neither, perhaps because the object was not permanently located on the altar.

³¹ Barlow, 2004: 832-33.

³² Norton, 2005: 170; 178.

³³ Belting, 1994: 452.

Regardless of its size and context, as a reminder of this historical sacrifice of Christ, the York high altar rood functioned in much the same way as other images of the crucifixion of varying sizes placed above or directly on altars in different media. Cragoe has outlined late Anglo-Saxon evidence for such crosses, including the New Minster *Liber Vitae* drawing of Cnut and Emma's gift of a cross, pictured on what must be an altar, and mention in Lanfranc's *Decreta* of a cross being set in its place in the choir before Mass, possibly having been used in the procession beforehand.³⁴ The precept that each altar should *possess* a cross was acknowledged only in the late twelfth-century treatise on the liturgy by Lotario de' Conti (later Innocent III), which was said by Conti to be a reflection of contemporary Roman practice, and was enacted in England as early as 1224, being included in the statutes of Bishop Peter de Roches of Winchester.³⁵

In considering the existence of altar crosses from at least the late Anglo-Saxon period, and likely scale of the high altar rood at York and its relative height above the altar, the most salient question is perhaps *for whom* did it act as a reminder of Christ's sacrifice? Images directly on or above the altar, such as the Westminster Retable and the painted retable associated with St Faith's altar, Westminster Abbey (Fig.96), have been interpreted as being primarily for the benefit of the celebrant and his attendants during the liturgy.³⁶ Furthermore, Raw has suggested that the late Anglo-Saxon monumental roods 'would have provided an admirable focus for a liturgical drama' such as that described by Amalarius of Metz (d. c.850) in his *Liber officialis*.³⁷ Here, as Raw notes, the mass is interpreted as the drama of Christ's life, with the deacons cast as the disciples, and sub-deacons, 'facing the celebrant across the altar' as the holy women accompanying Christ at the Crucifixion.³⁸ They were to raise their heads at the prayer *Supplices te rogamus*, the moment when Christ's death is recalled, 'gazing at his beloved body as long as it hangs on the cross'.³⁹ Suger's golden crucifix at St Denis was decorated with gems on its reverse side, and its front, with its image

³⁴ Cragoe, 2005: 27-8. The reference in the *Decreta Lanfranci* occurs in relation to the procession before Mass on Rogation days. For this, see Knowles and Brooke, 2002: 78.

³⁵ *PL*: 217, cols. 811A-B. On this see also Binski, 1995b: 51.

³⁶ Binski, 1995a: 152-67 and 167-71 and 2004: 150-67. See also Williamson, 2004: 365-67 on the crucifix below St Faith.

³⁷ Raw, 1990: 184; Hanssens, 1948-50: II, 328-30.

³⁸ *Ibid.*

³⁹ '*aspicientes in dilectum sibi corpus, quousque pendent in cruce*' (trans. Raw); Raw, 1990: 184; Hanssens, 1948-50: II, 342-43.

of Christ, is specifically noted as being ‘in the sight of the sacrificing priest’; in relation to this, references to two candlesticks in the preceding passage suggest that the precept set out by Conti was already practice at St Denis in the first half of the twelfth century.⁴⁰

However, the height of the rood at York, by c.1420 on the beam above the new screen, suggests that as well as those in the immediate vicinity of the high altar, it was also, or even more, likely to have been for the benefit of those further back in the choir: Norton specifically considers the view ‘from the stalls in the choir’, for instance.⁴¹ Closer examination of the Islip Roll’s crucifixion group, its height, and the presence of what seems to be a panel or mural of the crucifixion directly above the altar, plus the scale of the screens at St Albans and Winchester, both of which have spaces for a retable immediately above the altar, suggests that a celebrant and attendants would focus on the smaller-scale depiction of the crucifixion directly in front of them during the liturgy (Figs.85, 86, 87).⁴² Indeed, the baldachin over the high altar in the Islip Roll drawing indicates that even at the point of the elevation of the host, the celebrant would not be able to see the Westminster Abbey high altar rood. There was perhaps more scope for the monumental rood to be within the field of vision elsewhere, such as at Winchester and St Albans, where the rood was integrated with the screen.

The high altar rood therefore allowed a greater number than just those in the immediate vicinity of the altar at York to make the visual connection between Christ’s historical sacrifice and the sacrifice of the mass, increasing the sense of the eucharist as a fundamentally corporate form of worship, an especially important function at the altar which was the focus for the institution’s collective worship, the site where it created and renewed its identity through the liturgy.⁴³ Norton has argued that the mass, in the context of the high altar rood and the east window at York, brought the ‘salvific work of God’ into the local church and centred time and space on the ‘redemptive sacrifice’ of Christ, meaning ‘sacred history and sacred space [were] united’.⁴⁴ Yet importantly, this can also be viewed the opposite way. By framing the high altar rood with the east window’s

⁴⁰ *‘in conspectu sacrificantis sacerdotis’* (trans. Panofsky). Panofsky, 1979: 58-59.

⁴¹ Norton, 2005: 178.

⁴² Lindley, 2001: 258 considers the possibility that a silver-gilt retable of images of Christ and the saints may have been in place directly above the altar.

⁴³ On the Mass as a corporate act in the parish context, see Bossy, 1983 and Duffy, 1992: 91-95.

⁴⁴ Norton, 2005: 178.

portrayal of the history of the world and the holy company of heaven in the tracery, the idea of the corporate nature of the eucharist was *widened out* to enable those present physically in the Minster to join in the worship of God by those outside York in both time and space, much as the priest joined in with the corporate worship of God by the angels during the *Sanctus* at mass.

At York, this audience would have comprised primarily clergy, but the laity may also have enjoyed some access to the choir as well. This occurred at other secular cathedrals such as Exeter and Salisbury, and the Sarum Rite specifically notes that the laity in the presbytery should be included in the *Asperges*.⁴⁵ Moreover, at other times the eucharistic connotations of the rood would surely invite from the laity the ‘liturgically-structured’ responses proposed by Williamson.⁴⁶

At monastic institutions the choir was usually the preserve of the community, but here too there could be scope for visual access to the high altar and its rood. For example, Lindley has pointed out that the chantry chapel of Abbot Wallingford at St Albans, located to the south-west of the rood and screen, is made with iron grills and therefore intended to be partially transparent, enabling the separation of the monks in the choir and the laity in the choir ambulatories, but allowing the latter to see the high altar: a glimpse of the high altar rood was perhaps also possible.⁴⁷ At York too, the high altar rood is also likely to have been for the benefit of those outside the choir, advertising the high altar’s location, especially from the choir ambulatory and retrochoir. These would be the sites of significant lay footfall due to the presence of the shrine of St William behind the high altar and, from 1405, the tomb of Archbishop Scrope in St Stephen’s chapel.⁴⁸

The significance of the high altar rood’s location and its primary audience of members of the Minster’s community was surely the impetus behind Archbishop Roger’s donation, but he was also no doubt aware that he was working within a tradition of patronage where the cross was a particularly favoured gift. Aristocratic or royal donation of crosses was not unusual, as we have seen, but more importantly, Anglo-Saxon and Anglo-Norman documentary

⁴⁵ Orme, 1986: 22-23; Orme, 2007: 276; 280. Frere, 1898: 53-54.

⁴⁶ Williamson, 2004: 381.

⁴⁷ Lindley, 2001: 267.

⁴⁸ Brown, 2003: 141.

sources note that high altar roods were donated by archbishops and abbots. Yet the reasoning behind these donations has received little comment. Like archbishops and abbots such as, respectively, Stigand and Leofric (1057-66, the donor of Peterborough's high altar rood), Roger would have been aware not only of the political expediency of gift-giving, but also of the salvific potency of the rood as a gift. The community would be reminded of him every time the rood was seen, creating an enduring link between him and the institution, and it could also act as a spur to pray for his soul.⁴⁹ This idea of intercession is also suggested by the drawing of Canute and Emma's donation of a cross in the New Minster *Liber Vitae*, a book specifically used by the community to remember those for whom they were to pray (Fig.91).⁵⁰ The c.1275-1300 inventory's placement in such an important manuscript as the York Gospels, explicitly stating that the high altar rood was Roger's commission, meant that it perhaps worked in some way as a textual equivalent of the New Minster drawing. However, Simon Keynes has pointed out that, as a product of the New Minster, rather than the royal court, the *Liber Vitae* image promoted the institution's links to the divinely appointed royal couple just as much, if not more so, than it was 'royal propaganda'.⁵¹ In a similar way, the presence of the relics of Roman martyrs in Roger's high altar rood promoted both his, and the Minster's, links to Rome. This mutually beneficial relationship that donation of an image could engender is one that could be found in both monastic and secular cathedrals, and we shall explore it more deeply in relation to two of the images in the sources from Durham, the Black Rood of Scotland and Our Lady of Boulton.

5.iii. *The Triumphkreuz or 'Magna Crux'*

A rood on or above the screen between nave and choir or nave and chancel became a universal feature in institutions from cathedrals to parish churches during our period.⁵² Surviving examples, especially those in Scandinavia and Germany, have long garnered attention from continental scholars, and those still *in situ*, such as that at the cathedral of Sts. Stephanus and Sixtus, Halberstadt

⁴⁹ For the political context of Stigand's gifts, see Cowdrey, 2004. Simon Keynes has related Canute's gift to New Minster as 'ingratiating' himself with the institution: Keynes, 2004: 154.

⁵⁰ Raw, 1990: 63.

⁵¹ Keynes, 2004: 155; 157.

⁵² Cragoe, 2005, esp. 32-33, and Marks, 2011: 211.

(Fig.28), attest to the imposing nature of the image and its flanking figures within the cathedral interior.⁵³ Recently, the *Triumphkreuz* has been discussed as part of wider examinations of the screens on or above which they were usually placed.⁵⁴ This methodology echoes the usual approach within the English context, where none but a few fragments of these roods are extant, but plenty of screens are still *in situ*. Focus has therefore fallen on the latter.⁵⁵ The ‘lost’ roods in the English context have received some attention, notably by Brieger, and those in the parish context have most recently been explored by Cragoe and Marks; those in the cathedral context have usually been employed more for the purposes of contextualisation than as the focus for discussion.⁵⁶

Part One noted evidence for a ‘*magna crux*’ above the ‘*pulpitum*’ at York in the c.1275-1300 inventory of relics, where it is stated to have been commissioned, like the high altar rood, by Archbishop Roger de Pont l’Évêque, and evidence from later wills attesting to the presence of a rood above the choir screen in the fifteenth century. Part One also set out the *Rites*’ description of the ‘roode’ and its flanking figures above the rood screen at Durham, which ran across the central aisle of the nave immediately west of the crossing. Although the Durham evidence indicates that the image was part of a wider complex including Mary, John, and two angels, and evidence from elsewhere suggests this combination was the norm,⁵⁷ it is notable that the York evidence is specifically related to the rood itself, and, as we shall see, the *magna crux* is also singled out in liturgical sources. This suggests the flexibility within which the rood could be interpreted, and gives us precedent to concentrate on it here.

Flexibility in visual and devotional interpretation is matched by fluidity in the naming of this image in medieval sources, as the paragraph above suggests. Hausscherr has pointed out that the term *crux triumphalis* was used specifically for the cross in this position in learned discourse such as the *Speculum de Mysteriis*

⁵³ Most prominently, *LCI IV*: cols. 356-59; Hausscherr, 1979; Lutz, 2004; Krosen and Steensma, 2004: 214-37; Beer, 2005.

⁵⁴ Jung, 2000; Jung, 2006; Jung, 2013 (on the German and French contexts); Nilsén, 2003 (on the Swedish context).

⁵⁵ For example, Bond and Camm, 1909; Hope, 1917; Vallance, 1947; Williams, 2008. On extant fragments see Marks, 2011: 211, fn. 3. Marks, 2012a discusses the twelfth-century fragments of Christ’s head and right foot from South Cerney, Gloucestershire, and Townsend, 2007: 109-111 the figure of Christ from St Anthony’s, Cartmel Fell.

⁵⁶ Brieger, 1942; Luxford, 2002; Cragoe, 2005; Marks, 2011; Marks, 2012a. An exception is the short discussion in Munns, 2010 (83-89), whose focus is confined to the Anglo-Norman period.

⁵⁷ Marks, 2011: 211.

Ecclesiae, attributed to Hugh of St Victor (c.1096-1141), and the *Rationale* by Durandus (c.1230-1296), and is therefore suggestive of a singular function and character.⁵⁸ Whilst this term is not used in any of the sources from York and Durham, the c.1275-1300 inventory does distinguish between the high altar *crux* and the *magna crux* above the *pulpitum*, preserving some differentiation. Yet Haussherr also notes that *crux triumphalis* could be used to describe objects outside the context of the church interior; and one of the York wills refers to it simply as the ‘roode’.⁵⁹ This fluidity in medieval terminology, also reflected in modern scholarship’s use of the terms *Triumphkreuz* and ‘rood’, therefore invites reconsideration of its function, especially in relation to other roods. For the purposes of clarity, throughout this discussion the term *Triumphkreuz* will be used, though its value will not go unquestioned.

As in the case of the evidence for high altar roods, although the earliest documentary evidence for the *Triumphkreuz* at York dates from the last quarter of the thirteenth century, and the evidence from Durham is much later, other sources suggest these are likely to have been *in situ* from a much earlier date. We noted in Part One, for instance, sources which attest to the commissioning or presence of *Triumphkreuze* above screens at English institutions from the third quarter of the eleventh century at St Augustine’s, Canterbury, Christ Church, Canterbury, and Beverley Minster.⁶⁰ As Cragoe has noted, Archbishop Lanfranc’s *Decreta* also assume the presence of a crucifix above the entrance to the choir.⁶¹ The erection of a *Triumphkreuz* in Beverley Minster by Archbishop Ealdred (1061-1069) is particularly interesting for our purposes, as one might expect that York, as its mother church, would have had one by this time, and that Roger’s twelfth-century *Triumphkreuz* was therefore quite probably a replacement for an earlier object.⁶²

Brieger has suggested a connection between the eleventh-century eucharistic controversies involving Berengar and the increasing popularity of the

⁵⁸ *PL*: 177, 337D. Neale and Webb, 1893: 28 (Bk I, Ch. 41). Haussherr, 1979: 137.

⁵⁹ Haussherr, 1979: 137.

⁶⁰ For St Augustine’s, Canterbury, *L-B I*, 175 (653); for Christ Church, Canterbury, *L-B I*: 179 (665); for Beverley Minster, *L-B I*: 86 (326).

⁶¹ Cragoe, 2005: 23, fn. 14; see also Knowles and Brooke, 2002: 24, 28, 36-40, 62, 70, 86-88, 86-98, 106.

⁶² Brieger, 1942: 88-89. Beer, 2005: 347-49 summarises the evidence from the English context, though notably does not include that pertaining to Roger’s rood.

Triumphkreuz.⁶³ Yet there were certainly crosses in the naves of institutions in pre-Conquest England. As Raw has noted, the Ramsey Abbey record for 1043 mentions ‘the station before the cross in the nave’, and several studies have drawn attention to the physical traces for monumental stone roods on the east walls of the naves of parish churches at Bitton, Gloucestershire, Bibury, Gloucestershire, and Bradford on Avon, Wiltshire, marking the entrance to the chancel.⁶⁴ Similarly, by the late tenth and early eleventh centuries in continental institutions, monumental sculpted roods such as the Gero Crucifix (Fig.97) or *cruces gemmatae* were positioned on freestanding columns or pedestals, on an axis with the Holy Cross altar usually located in the east end of the nave: that commissioned by Bishop Bernward for the monastery of St Michael’s, Hildersheim, was located behind the altar, for example: the extant column at Essen’s *Damenstiftskirche* gives an idea of the proportions of such columns (Fig.98).⁶⁵

The position of these roods on columns has been interpreted as part of a process of the ‘growth upwards’ of crosses displayed on or behind the Holy Cross altar into the more familiar *Triumphkreuze* above the screen, as Holy Cross altars eventually came to be incorporated into the west side of the screen.⁶⁶ Even earlier crosses associated with the Holy Cross altar have also been cited as precursors of the *Triumphkreuz*, most notably the large-scale cross marking the altar *Sancti Salvatoris ad Crucem* on the Plan of St Gall (c.820, Fig.99).⁶⁷

What might have been models for these precursors of the *Triumphkreuze*? Hausscherr acknowledges that the term *crux triumphalis* appears to have grown from the presence of the *arcus triumphalis*, separating the nave and sanctuary of early Christian churches, but plays down the role of the cross in the artistic programmes of these early examples, citing, for instance, the lack of a cross at the vertex of the triumphal arch of San Paolo fuori le Mura (mid-fifth century, Fig.100).⁶⁸ Noting that the cross most prominently appears in the apses of early

⁶³ *Ibid.*: 89. Marks, 2012a: 188 also notes the *Triumphkreuz*’s increasing popularity in the eleventh century.

⁶⁴ For Ramsey Abbey, *L-B* II, 361 (3585); Raw, 1990: 45, 53; Cragoe, 2005: 22-24; Marks, 2012a: 189.

⁶⁵ Fisher, 2006; Jung, 2013: 47 (for the Gero crucifix). Hausscherr, 1979: 136.

⁶⁶ Bandmann, 1962: 398-99.

⁶⁷ Hausscherr, 1979: 132.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*

Christian churches, such as that at Santa Pudenziana, and that they reference the cross on the site of Golgotha as well as the Sign of the Son of Man (Mt 24:30), he acknowledges this combination of ideas is important for later medieval *Triumphkreuze*, though ‘no direct line of tradition is evident’ between the two.⁶⁹ Similarly, Manuela Beer has been cautious in drawing a line from either early monumental crosses or apsidal mosaic crosses to the *Triumphkreuz*.⁷⁰

However, both Bandmann and Raw convincingly trace the model for nave altars dedicated to the Holy Cross back to the church at the site of Golgotha in Jerusalem.⁷¹ It is reasonable to suggest, in light of the plentiful evidence from the likes of Egeria and Adomnán for the successive crosses set up on the site of Golgotha, that like the high altar rood, they can be interpreted as prominent early models of the precursors of the *Triumphkreuz*, more so than Beer has argued.⁷² Thanks to Wood’s argument, we can also posit another, related, model: the reliquary of the True Cross, again underplayed by Beer.⁷³ This suggests that the *cruces gemmatae* located on or behind Holy Cross altars, and the early Anglo-Norman gilt-clad *Triumphkreuze* were, like apsidal crosses and high altar roods, referencing not only the site of the Crucifixion, but also the materiality of the objects most intimately related to it: indeed, in the latter case, the cross itself.

In the context of a tradition of common models for both high altar roods and *Triumphkreuze*, Archbishop Roger’s commission of two crosses, both performing a reliquary function, gains even more significance. It also suggests the roods were deliberately conceived of as a pair. More chronologically and geographically closer precedents for Roger’s twin roods are suggested by Aethelwulf’s ninth century dream-vision of roods above the nave and east altars of an imaginary church,⁷⁴ and in real-life, the two silver crucifixes commissioned by Leo III (795-816) for Old St Peter’s, one placed *in medio basilicae*, and the other *juxta altare majore*.⁷⁵ Roger may have seen those in St Peter’s during his visits to Rome.

⁶⁹ Haussherr, 1979: 132.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*; Beer, 2005: 249-56.

⁷¹ Bandmann, 1962: 398; Raw, 1990: 46-48.

⁷² Beer, 2005: 251-55.

⁷³ *Ibid.*: 250-51.

⁷⁴ For the text see Campbell, 1967: lines 710-38. See Gem, 1983: 14 and Munns, 2010: 87-88 for discussion of the crosses.

⁷⁵ *LP* II: 11; 13. On these crosses see Brieger, 1942: 86.

These possible common models and documented twin commissions suggest the *Triumphkreuz* and the high altar rood had a similar status and had similar purposes. To what extent was this true, for whom, and how? Answering this question requires us to examine not only the *Triumphkreuz*, but also the architectural and liturgical features with which it was usually associated: the choir screen (*pulpitum*) or the rood screen, and the Holy Cross altar.

Usually in conjunction with a choir or a rood screen, the *Triumphkreuz* served to mark the major point in the ecclesiastical interior between the spaces of the nave – and at secular institutions often the crossing as well - and the more eastern parts of the interior of the building, especially the choir and presbytery. However, the exact location of both *Triumphkreuz* and screen was not uniform throughout institutions; moreover, it could change over time. At York, the *pulpitum* mentioned in the c.1275-1300 inventory as that above which Roger de Pont l'Évêque's *Triumphkreuz* stood is likely to have been that built during Roger's arch-episcopacy and located one bay east of the extant mid-fifteenth century choir screen which runs between the eastern crossing piers.⁷⁶ The late fifteenth and early sixteenth-century references to the *magna crux* above the *pulpitum* suggest that the *Triumphkreuz*, whether Roger's or a later replacement, was moved when the extant choir screen was built. At Durham both *Triumphkreuz* and rood screen were located west of the crossing, with a second screen, a choir screen, partitioning the choir and the presbytery from the crossing on the latter's east side (Plans 1-5). This two-screen arrangement was common at monastic institutions in England, for reasons to be explored shortly below.

The *Triumphkreuz* and screen were not necessarily positioned together at secular institutions either, though this was unusual. At Wells, the *pulpitum* was moved from a position between the west crossing piers to between the east crossing piers in the second quarter of the fourteenth century as part of work on the new choir, but the *Triumphkreuz* was retained in its position above the former site of the *pulpitum* and incorporated into the inverse arch of the architecturally innovative strainer arches at the east end of the nave.⁷⁷ Though anomalous in terms of secular institutions, like the location of *Triumphkreuze* above rood screens in monastic institutions, the arrangement at Wells demonstrates that it

⁷⁶ Pers. comm., Christopher Norton, May 2013.

⁷⁷ Vallance, 1947: 82.

could be spatially distinct from the entrance to the choir, and, importantly for our purposes, suggests that the overriding concern in its positioning was that it could be seen clearly from the nave.

Jacqueline Jung's work has concentrated on re-evaluating the role of the screen in continental institutions as a unifying rather than divisive architectural feature. Within this she acknowledges its partitioning, concealing effect, but also its ability to render the choir visible to the laity through tantalising glimpses from open doors, adding to the spectacle of worship for those looking in from the nave, who were invited 'to soar above... to peer into... to plunge through...[a screen's] openings'.⁷⁸ However, evidence from the English context reiterates that this partitioning was meant to be a deliberate division in some important respects, both practical and symbolic, for the institutions' communities. The division between the nave and the areas to the east of it at Durham, permeable only by lockable gates and doors, was especially important not only for the purposes of security, especially with the riches of St Cuthbert's shrine and the flow of pilgrims to consider, but also, in relation to its monastic character, as a tangible sign of, and aid to, the enclosure of the community itself, as Peter Draper has pointed out.⁷⁹ Jung has noted Durandus' concern that clergy be shielded from from the laity lest the latter pique the vanity of the former and prove a 'distraction'.⁸⁰ Yet Gervase of Canterbury's comments regarding the discomfort of his fellow monks' separation from the laity only by a 'low wall',⁸¹ perhaps akin to those enclosing the choir stalls at San Clemente and Santa Sabina in Rome,⁸² during the rebuilding of the choir at Christ Church, Canterbury, remind us in a more personal way that this kind of division was actively desired by monks themselves in the English context, and its presence had a psychological effect on the conduct of religious life that was most likely highly important.

The separation of the choir from the crossing by a second screen at Durham, and at other monastic institutions including Christ Church, Canterbury, further shielded the community from pilgrim and other activity in the nave when

⁷⁸ Jung, 2013: 25.

⁷⁹ Draper, 2003: 84-85.

⁸⁰ Jung, 2013: 25. For Durandus' comment, see Neale and Webb, 1893: 62-63 (Bk. III, Ch. 35).

⁸¹ *L-B I*, 218-19 (801).

⁸² Jung, 2013: 18.

they were participating in the daily round of services.⁸³ This was a function the screens at York and other secular institutions also fulfilled without the presence of a second screen; the extant York screen in particular suggests they could do so through their solidity, and also through their iconography, with royal figures ‘guarding’ the entrances to the choir and suggestive of a symbiotic and even legitimizing relationship between the community and royalty, reinforced each time the community entered into the choir. This is vividly suggested by the images of bishops and kings described as populating the rood screen at Durham (see pp.67-68).⁸⁴ Additional security and seclusion in line with the screens was afforded by the gates and doors spanning the entrances to the choir ambulatories at secular institutions such as Exeter and Wells, which allowed control of the flow of lay persons in the eastern arm.⁸⁵

Within this context the *Triumphkreuz* could be interpreted as an image of relatively little importance for the communities when they were in the choir, where only the back of the image and its accompanying figures might be visible when they faced westwards. Yet the Halberstadt rood beam is carved on both sides, and, as Beer has noted, an image of Christ in Majesty was formerly placed on the eastern side of the Halberstadt *Triumphkreuz*, suggesting that this was a sight-line of particular importance (Fig.101).⁸⁶ The *Triumphkreuz* was also an integral image in the liturgical life of the communities at York, Durham, and elsewhere through its use as a station of veneration shortly before the culmination of the regular processions which preceded high mass on Sundays, and which also formed part of other services throughout the liturgical year.⁸⁷ Here, we can propose that for those who were to enter into the choir in the final stage of the procession, the *Triumphkreuz* had a similar purpose to the rood at the high altar in that it anticipated the latter. Moreover, this processional veneration also anticipated the sacrifice of the mass that took place before the high altar rood. As

⁸³ Draper, 2003: 79, 81.

⁸⁴ Royal figures also decorated the *pulpita* at Christ Church, Canterbury, Old St Paul’s, Salisbury, and Wells. Vallance, 1947: 14. On this theme see most recently Slater, 2014, esp. 100-102 on Durham.

⁸⁵ Orme, 2007: 280-83; Vallance, 1947: 82 (on the thirteenth-century pulpitum at Wells); Ayers, 2004: 285 (on the fourteenth-century screen at Wells).

⁸⁶ Beer, 2005: 258.

⁸⁷ For more on the history, forms and meanings of liturgical processions, including extensive discussion of those of the Sarum Rite, see Bailey, 1971, esp. 12-26 and 93-111. As Bailey notes, the Sarum *Processional* ‘is the only extant fully-rubricated processional of the Middle Ages’. Bailey, 1971; x.

C. Clifford Flannigan has noted, the performance of processions was an emotional as well as an intellectual endeavour, validating an institution and its hierarchy, and reinforcing individuals' beliefs and sense of being part of a cohesive group.⁸⁸ In light of this, just as the *Triumphkreuz* anticipated the mass visually, the procession itself can be characterised as anticipating the corporate nature of its celebration; in addition, both can be seen as acts of liturgical drama, the procession the prologue to the play, so to speak.⁸⁹

Reference to the *Triumphkreuz*'s function within processions is cited as early as the eleventh century, in Lanfranc's *Decreta*, and later liturgical texts and physical evidence attest to the importance of *Triumphkreuze* in this capacity at York, Durham, and elsewhere.⁹⁰ The York *Processional* includes the rubrics '*In eundo ante Crucem*' and '*In statione ante Crucem*' throughout.⁹¹ Until 1736 the nave floor at York included the circular paving stones that marked the processional way up the centre and either side of the main aisle from the west door to the west crossing piers: Torre's plan preserves some of these on his plan of the nave (Fig.75).⁹² At Durham, the conjectural procession route identified by St John Hope and mapped on to a plan of the priory in Fowler's edition of the *Rites* includes a route taking the procession up both sides of the central aisle of the nave, stopping in front of the rood screen, carrying on through the doors flanking the Jesus altar (which the *Rites* states specifically as being 'for the Procession to goe furth and comme in at'), and then joining to become one line before entering the choir.⁹³

Jung is right to call attention to the fact that in many ways such screens, and the area around them, could unify both places and people, and this occurred even within the liturgical procession. The reading of bidding prayers, facing the people, at the station in front of the *Triumphkreuz* integrated the processing community with the lay people present in the nave into one petitioning body, and

⁸⁸ Flannigan, 2001: 35, 37, 39.

⁸⁹ Reynolds, 2000: esp. 129-31.

⁹⁰ Knowles and Brooke, 2002: 24, 40, 86, 96, 106 (the last describes the rubric for receiving a visiting dignitary). Cragoe, 2005: 44 (fn. 14) includes these references in a more general list of rubrics in the *Decreta* which mention the *Triumphkreuz*.

⁹¹ Henderson, 1875: 135, 137, 140, 143, 144, 145-47, 180-81, 189. Unlike the Sarum *Processional*, this has very terse rubrics. See Bailey 1971: x. For discussion of the character of the liturgical offices of the Use of York, see Salisbury, 2008.

⁹² For the designs at other institutions, see Vallance, 1947: 16-18.

⁹³ *Rites*, 302-03.

in instances where the laity could join the clergy in the choir for the mass, such as Salisbury, this anticipated the corporate act of worship.⁹⁴ The liturgical procession could include other unifying rituals: at Salisbury, for instance, on the Feast of the Relics, ‘the relics were washed and an inventory of them read in English as the procession waited [before the *Triumphkreuz*]’.⁹⁵

Following Eliade and Van Gennep’s characterisations of the threshold as both a boundary and site of communication between worlds, Jung has also argued that the screen was a bridge between sacred zones, and therefore a place of paradox, communication, and passage.⁹⁶ The *Triumphkreuz* embodied this: the figure of Christ was ‘the site on which contradictory qualities - dead and alive, human and divine, in pain and healing, disgusting and gorgeous - coexisted’.⁹⁷ Rightly, she notes the symbolic significance of the act of going under the *Triumphkreuz*, whether in the context of a procession or not, and cites the words of Ludolph of Saxony (d. 1377), a Carthusian, which indicate that the action was interpreted as akin to the journey of redemption itself: ‘whoever wants to go into the choir must pass beneath the cross; for no one can enter from the Church militant into the Church triumphant except by means of the cross’.⁹⁸

In the English contexts of cathedral and great abbey, the presence of *Triumphkreuze* over the rood screens and figures of Christ in Majesty above the high altars at Christ Church and St Augustine’s, Canterbury, is highly suggestive of Ludolph’s idea, and of a movement from the earthly realm to the New Jerusalem. Most importantly (and strangely absent from Jung’s argument) the *Triumphkreuz* and its location above the doorway punctuating the screen would also call to mind Christ’s declaration of *himself* as a sacred boundary to be ‘walked through’, especially appropriate in the context of processions: ‘I am the door. By me, if any man enter in, he shall be saved: and he shall go in and go out, and find pastures’ (John 10:9).⁹⁹

⁹⁴ Vallance, 1947: 16. Bailey, 1971:14-15.

⁹⁵ Bailey, 1971: 15.

⁹⁶ Jung, 2013: 45; Eliade, 1959: 25; Van Gennep: 15-25, esp. 17-18.

⁹⁷ Jung, 2000: 632.

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*: 633; Jung, 2013: 46.

⁹⁹ Brieger notes the importance of this biblical reference in relation to the Naumburg west choir screen’s crucifix, which is positioned on the post and lintel of the choir door. Brieger, 1942: 95-6. Ironically this is the screen and crucifix Jung discusses in particular detail in much of her work, esp. Jung, 2013: 80-91.

However, it is in the context of the laity in the nave who did not, or could not, cross the threshold and attend mass in the choir that the *Triumphkreuz* most clearly *did* have a similar status and purpose to the high altar rood. For Jung, the *Triumphkreuz* could be not merely a reminder of the eucharist, but a substitute for it. The laity were, she has argued,

enjoined - and expected - to draw the connection between the sculpted image of the crucified Christ on the screen, the historical body of Christ represented by the sculpture, and the Eucharistic bread behind but on an axis with it...the body of Christ on the screen subsumed and became the body of Christ in the Host just as, paradoxically, it concealed it.¹⁰⁰

More recently, she has characterised the *Triumphkreuz* in more general terms as ‘a focal point for beholders both during and outside the mass’ in light of the presence of the altar usually placed immediately to the west of the choir screen, or incorporated into its western side.¹⁰¹ At Durham, the presence of the *Triumphkreuz* above the rood screen, with the Jesus altar situated immediately west of the screen, meant that the laity in at least the east end of the nave *did* have the possibility of a view of the eucharist as well as the monumental sculpted body of Christ. This was an arrangement that, as we have seen, was not present at the high altar at Durham, where the visual focus was on cultivating a sense of institutional identity for the community itself through the presence of images of the patronal saints (see p.58). In contrast to the high altar arrangements, the combination of the *Triumphkreuz*, the christological and apostolic iconography of the sculptural programme on the rood screen, and the Passion iconography on the inside of the Jesus altar’s retable, opened on feast days, ensured that the site’s visual focus was firmly on the historical body of Christ and the significance of the eucharist. Like the high altar rood at York, for those who were some distance from the altar below it, the *Triumphkreuz* acted as a reminder of the eucharist made present there. The Jesus altar retable, certainly on feast days, most probably functioned in a similar way for those in the altar’s more immediate vicinity, its iconography inviting meditative consideration not only of the crucifixion itself, but the whole story of the Passion. However, clearly from the *Rites*’ description,

¹⁰⁰ Jung, 2000: 634.

¹⁰¹ Jung, 2013: 48.

its sumptuous material and the spectacle of its display contributed to its attraction as well.

Rather than acting primarily as an anticipatory or connecting image at Durham then, for the laity the *Triumphkreuz*, and the Jesus altar, preserved the spatial and iconographical distinctiveness of the nave. Indeed, the description of the spectacle of the opening of the retable seems to indicate that it was a specific devotional destination, and the concentration on Passion and eucharistic imagery, and the Holy Name of Jesus, was certainly pertinent to the devotional concerns of fifteenth-century lay piety.¹⁰² In effect, the laity had their own altar at the east end of the nave at Durham, dominated by the *Triumphkreuz*, with one major caveat: by virtue of the restrictions on women's access east of the blue marble line in the nave, this altar was not physically accessible to women.

The segregation of women in some form was not unusual in sacred contexts, especially at monastic institutions, but the proscription at Durham was singular in its strictness, and its manifestation on the floor of the interior.¹⁰³ This rule, if it was enforced as strongly as the *Rites* claims, meant that women would usually view the *Triumphkreuz* from a considerable distance, from the other side of the boundary delineated by the blue line. It would have acted therefore both as advertising the site of the Jesus altar to them, and a site of particular devotion, but one that was physically unreachable. In the peculiar case of Durham, it is therefore worth considering what purpose and status the roods and other images of Christ in the west end of the nave and Galilee Chapel had, especially for women: this is a topic which we shall turn to below.

Altars usually located below the *Triumphkreuz*, often dedicated to Holy Cross and specifically associated with, or designated for, the laity's use, were present at other cathedrals, both of monastic and secular status, and great abbeys in England.¹⁰⁴ At York, the evidence neither for an altar below the *Triumphkreuz* nor one dedicated to Holy Cross is clear-cut. Alcuin mentions that Archbishop Aethelberht erected an altar dedicated to 'the martyrs and to the Cross' in the

¹⁰² On the development of the cult and feast of the Name of Jesus and its character, see Pfaff, 1970: 62-83. The cult 'had a liturgical aspect from probably around the middle of the fourteenth century'. The Holy Name of Jesus was officially declared a feast in the province of York in 1489.

¹⁰³ See, for instance, Hall, 1974: 339 (specifically in relation to the Italian context); Aston, 1990; French, 2005; Tibbetts Schulenburg, 2005 (esp. 186-193). Binski, 2004: 228-29.

¹⁰⁴ Sparks, 1997: 121-24 (Christ Church, Canterbury); Vallance, 1947: 44-5 (Norwich); 89 (St Albans), 79 and 82 (Salisbury); Orme, 1986: 22-23; 26 (Exeter).

Anglo-Saxon Minster, but gives no indication of its location.¹⁰⁵ Christopher Norton has speculated that an altar dedicated to Holy Cross stood in the east end of the nave in the eleventh-century building (Plan 6, no.3), and that St William's tomb's was positioned to the west of it, mirroring the usual arrangement of Holy Cross altars and ecclesiastical burials at other institutions. He has also suggested that by 1300, with the beginning of the rebuilding of the nave, when St William's tomb became an increasingly popular destination for pilgrims, the Holy Cross altar may have been moved to stand between the chapels of St William and St Michael on the east side of the south transept (Plan 14, G and H). The indulgence for the Guild of the Name of Jesus dating from 1458, which mentions the crucifix '*prope ostium australe*', may, in his opinion, refer to a crucifix at this altar, the door being the main south door and the main entrance into the Minster for the laity.¹⁰⁶

The chantry inventories are no more explicit. The 1364 inventory lists two chantries for the soul of William de Hamelton, dean of York (d.1307).¹⁰⁷ They are first described as located at an altar '*ad dorsum stallorum chori ex parte australi propinquius ostio vestibule [sic] noviter facte*', which is described further in the entry as '*iuxta et ante novum crucifixum in australi parte*'.¹⁰⁸ These chantries are described again in an entry later in the inventory as '[ad altare] *sub pedibus novi Crucifixi...iuxta et prope ostium vestibule [sic]*'.¹⁰⁹ Vallance assumed that this referred to the *Triumphkreuz*, which he regarded as being 'renewed' in 1364, and to an altar to the south of it.¹¹⁰ Notably, Vallance does not quote the inventory's use of the '*vestibulum*' as a point of reference, something which later readings have done, resulting in different positions being suggested. Gee positioned the altar in the south choir aisle, near to the entrance to the presbytery, while Jeffries has more recently positioned it in the south-west corner of the south-east transept, regarding the '*vestibulum*' as referring to the entrance to one of the vestries on the south side of the aisle, possibly that of the Zouche Chapel, the most easterly of the

¹⁰⁵ '*Ast altare aliud fecit, uestituit et illud/argento puro, pretiosis atque lapillis,/ martyribusque crucique simul dedicauerat ipsum*', Godman, 1982: 118-19, lines 1501-03.

¹⁰⁶ Pers. Comm., June 2013. Brown, 2003: 37.

¹⁰⁷ Neve and Jones, 1963: 6.

¹⁰⁸ YMLA, MS M(2) 4 g, fol. 36v.

¹⁰⁹ *Ibid.* fol. 38v.

¹¹⁰ Vallance, 1947: 83-84.

three chapels on the south side of the new fifteenth-century choir.¹¹¹ In the absence of any evidence for a new ‘*ostium vestibulum*’ elsewhere at this time, the reference to the ‘*novum crucifixum*’, which does not single it out as a new *Triumphkreuz*, and no corroborating evidence for a new *Triumphkreuz* at this time, one of these latter two positions is more satisfactory than Vallance’s proposition. It is possible that the 1458 indulgence may refer to this altar in the south choir ambulatory, considering the vagueness of its description of the location of the image, but it is also conceivable that this was a later, additional image and altar, or that it was the same image and altar as that referred to in the 1364 inventory, but moved to the south transept. This latter possibility would be particularly pragmatic once the building work in the south aisle of the choir was complete.

Evidence shows that an altar was dedicated to St Saviour in the rood loft by 1476.¹¹² A Holy Cross altar is listed separately in the 1548 inventory, and an altar dedicated to ‘the Trinitie and the Holy Crosse’ is also listed, but no location is given for either.¹¹³ It may be that by the sixteenth century there was a Holy Cross altar before the *pulpitum* and another in the south transept. Whether Roger’s *Triumphkreuz* was located above the successive *pulpita* from the time of its installation onwards, or was replaced at some point, remains open to speculation without further evidence. Certainly it was not unheard of for old *Triumphkreuze* to be reused elsewhere for devotional purposes in connection to the laity, as attested by the movement of the *Triumphkreuz* at St Albans in the early thirteenth century, under the abbacy of William of Trumpington.¹¹⁴

In spite of the absence of firm evidence for an altar below the *Triumphkreuz* at York, we can suggest that the *Triumphkreuz* was much more of a ‘connecting’ image than at Durham. This function would be especially pronounced when Roger’s *Triumphkreuz* was *in situ*, replicating the high altar rood in its donor, and most likely its materiality, as well as its reliquary function. The movement of Winchester’s high altar rood, given by Archbishop Stigand, to a new position above the screen in the late eleventh century indicates a similar

¹¹¹ Gee, 1984: 338 (no. 14); 343; Jeffries, 2000: 33-34.

¹¹² Brown, 2003: 235; Vallance, 1947: 84. The chantry endowment is quoted by Vallance as reading ‘*in solario {loft} coram ymagyne Sancte Salvatoris ex parte australi ecclesie*’. Page, 1897: 115.

¹¹³ Page, 1897: 116.

¹¹⁴ Riley, 1867-69: I, 287.

understanding of this connectivity and similarity in function: the image originally associated with the high altar and the sacrifice it represented was brought forward for those in the nave to see.¹¹⁵ At Exeter the old patronal image of St Peter, moved in the 1320s, was re-positioned at the entrance to the north choir ambulatory, a counterpoint to that of Mary at her altar under the *Triumphkreuz*, further underlining the idea that images associated with the high altar could be ‘brought forward’, materially but also imaginatively, for the benefit of those in the crossing or nave.¹¹⁶ In this case Peter and Mary perhaps acted as anticipatory images for images of the same figure at the high altar itself, accessible to the laity through the north choir ambulatory. The presence of such images, and other sacred objects such as the Book of Gospels and head reliquary of St Everilda at the south-east crossing pier at York, as well as rituals such as the reading of the relics at Salisbury, suggests that the *Triumphkreuz* could be the centre-piece of an image complex and devotional site that announced and nourished a sense of institutional identity as much as the high altar. In this case, however, it was done in front of the laity, fostering their sense of the corporate nature of worship and their place as part of the wider Body of Christ.

The dream-vision of Abbot Rupert of Deutz (d.1129), in which he describes an encounter with a crucifix that comes to life, ‘*confixum in loco sublimi, scilicet ubi de more consistebat, orantibus sive adorantibus proposita populis*’, (‘set up in a lofty place, of course where it is customarily fixed, and is displayed to the people for prayer and adoration’), cautions us against regarding the image as a focus for the clergy only within the bounds of the liturgy.¹¹⁷ This suggests that it could be the focus of individual, personal devotion, but also highlights the strong devotional pull it could exert for a member of a monastic order - in this case no less than an abbot. In this context, it is worth remembering that members of the community at Durham would have to venture west of the rood screen when presiding at the Jesus altar, and other altars in the nave and Galilee Chapel, and at York, the circulation of clergy was relatively free.¹¹⁸ Such occasions would provide scope for individual veneration, if only, as Lentes has

¹¹⁵ Cragoe, 2005: 23; Raw, 1990: 49. Hope, 1916-17: 88; *L-B* II: 659-60 (4724).

¹¹⁶ Orme, 1986: 26-27.

¹¹⁷ *PL*: 168, cols. 914C-915A. The dream-vision and its crucifix have been discussed by Jung in particular several times, most recently to support the idea of the presence of the *Triumphkreuz* in twelfth-century Germany: see Jung, 2000: 632; 2010: 218-20; 2013: 48, 52.

¹¹⁸ See, for example, *Rites*: 33.

put it, ‘a glance like a prayer in passing’, of the *Triumphkreuz* by members of each community.¹¹⁹

Roger de Pont l’Évêque’s donation of a *Triumphkreuz* was, like his donation of a high altar rood, typical of the pattern of *Triumphkreuz*-patronage at other institutions, where they were often donated by archbishops or abbots. In light of Rupert’s dream-vision, we should be alert to the idea that this could be within the context of a deep personal devotion to the crucified Christ. Ealdred was responsible for a *Triumphkreuz* at Beverley in the 1060s, Stigand for that at St Augustine’s, Canterbury, and possibly Lanfanc for that at Christ Church, Canterbury; it could also be the object of royal patronage, as Henry III’s 1250/51 commission for Westminster Abbey shows.¹²⁰ Aware of its spatial, theological, liturgical, and devotional importance, as with patronage of the high altar rood, *Triumphkreuz*-patronage seems to have demonstrated the potential largesse of such figures through the materiality of the image, especially the use of precious materials, which could also contribute to its affective power.¹²¹ As in the case of high altar roods, *Triumphkreuz*-patronage also linked the patron closely with the institution. Above the choir or rood screen, it announced this link to the laity and the institution’s community alike, integrating the donor into the liturgical rites before the *Triumphkreuz*, as well as the individual devotion for which it provided a focus. The lack of any indication of the donor of the Durham *Triumphkreuz* in the sources, especially the *Rites*, which describes it with great reverence and carefully gives the names of the donors of other images is, in this context, quite an anomaly and suggests that the donor was not necessarily known, at least by the late sixteenth century.

Burial of the *Triumphkreuz*’s ecclesiastical donor in the nave before the image permanently and very obviously associated one with the other.¹²² As Bandmann has noted, the early model for burials in this location can be proposed as those of the nobility before the door of the church of Golgotha.¹²³ At York,

¹¹⁹ Lentes, 2006: 365-66.

¹²⁰ Brieger, 1942: 93.

¹²¹ On this see Aston, 1987. See also Binski, 2001 and Binski, 2004: 201-05 on the problematics of the affective power of the crucifix in relation to its shape and the presentation of the figure of Christ.

¹²² For instance, Abbot Walter of Taunton at Glastonbury (d.1323). Luxford, 2005: 90 (see also Luxford, 2003, esp. 87, fn.8).

¹²³ Bandmann, 1962: 399. See also Adomnán on this: Meehan, 1958: 49.

Roger's burial location has never been identified. Suggestions have included the choir, for whose rebuilding he was responsible, and the chapel of St Mary and All Angels to the north of the north aisle of the nave, built under his auspices.¹²⁴ In Roger's time, the yet-to-be-canonized St William (d.1154) was already buried in the centre of the easternmost bay of the nave, possibly before a holy cross altar and *Triumphkreuz*; this perhaps affected Roger's decision to be buried elsewhere. In light of this, the installation of the *Triumphkreuz* may have had the additional function of enabling him to insert himself into an important area of the interior where he was perhaps unable to rest bodily.

Torre's plan and identification of the burial plots in the crossing of York Minster (Fig.62) show that by the fifteenth century, the space before the *Triumphkreuz* and the entrance to the choir was open to burial for the laity as well as clergy, suggesting that the Minster authorities were keen to allow this 'spiritual boon', as Marks has called it, to be available to a wider number of people.¹²⁵ Such widening of access in death also occurred at other cathedrals, such as Christ Church, Canterbury, where a small number of 'distinguished laymen' were buried in the nave in the thirteenth century, and there are a number of lay burials noted after the rebuilding of the nave in 1405.¹²⁶ Marks has demonstrated that in the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries the laity were also able to enjoy this privilege in the parochial context, accorded on the basis of their generosity, social status, or a combination of the two.¹²⁷ Those closest to the *Triumphkreuz* had 'ringside seats for the great liturgical feasts' and reaped the spiritual benefits of the funerary rites and obits for other parishioners that were performed on top of their graves.¹²⁸ Those requesting burial in the Minster were probably attracted to the same benefits played out on the bigger stage of the mother-church of the diocese, and indeed the province. In purely pragmatic terms, widening burial privileges was also probably a steady source of income for the Minster. As the will of Humfray Maners suggests, payment seems to have been required and so the benefits were therefore reciprocal (see p.124). Certainly, as demonstrated by

¹²⁴ Brown, 2003: 304n.

¹²⁵ Marks, 2011: 221. Michael Franklin has shown that while burial in a cathedral could be a privilege, burial in a cathedral cemetery could be mandatory for members of parishes under a cathedral's jurisdiction. Franklin, 1992: esp. 182-83.

¹²⁶ Sparks, 1997: 124.

¹²⁷ Marks, 2011: 218.

¹²⁸ *Ibid.*: 218-21.

the evidence from the wills of Chesman and Esyngwold set out in Part One, which specifically request burial before the *Triumphkreuz*, some of the unidentified plots on Torre's plan were for others who desired burial before it, but the continued presence of St William's tomb-shrine in the easternmost bay of the nave most likely had an influence on the choices of some as well. Perhaps the *Triumphkreuz* and the tomb-shrine together were seen as providing what we can term, following Marks, a double 'spiritual boon' for those buried at the crossing.¹²⁹

At Durham, the situation was very different. The *Rites* notes that early bishops and priors were buried, respectively, in the chapter house and the Centory Garth (outside, on the south side of the choir), and later men of both statuses were interred in the priory itself; monks and 'distinguished' lay men are noted as usually being interred in the Centory Garth, the latter of whom are described in the *Rites* as wishing to be buried there because of its proximity to St Cuthbert's shrine, even if outside the building.¹³⁰ The exception to what seems to have been a rule against the burial of lay persons in the interior was the burial in the nave of the two most important lay donors to the priory in the fourteenth century and their wives: Ralph Neville and Alice Audley, and John Neville and Matilda Percy.¹³¹ Their tombs are now on the south side of the central aisle (Plans 3-5, nos. 10 and 11). However, as Fowler notes, there is evidence to suggest that Ralph and Alice were first buried in the prestigious space in front of the Jesus altar and the *Triumphkreuz* before their bodies were moved and interred in what appears to be a new tomb in the second bay from the east in the nave, although this second location would still have meant that the tomb was in the vicinity of the Jesus altar and the *Triumphkreuz* above.¹³² The Durham chronicler William de Chambre's report of Ralph's negotiations with the prior regarding the burials refers to the altar before which he was to be buried as that of 'the great cross', suggesting that

¹²⁹ Marks, 2011: 221.

¹³⁰ *Rites*: 18, 22-3, 29, 30, 34, 40, 44, 51-60 (including descriptions of the rites of burial).

¹³¹ For background on the Neville family, see Young, 1996. Isobel Armstrong-Frost (Hampton), History of Art Department, University of York, is currently writing her doctorate on the Neville and Percy families and their patronage of art and architecture as a means of creating and projecting the images of their lordship. I am indebted to her for discussion of the Neville patronage in Durham Cathedral which she has investigated in her MA thesis: see Hampton, 2011.

¹³² *Rites*: 244.

the ‘Jesus altar’ was an alternative appellation for the same altar, and illustrating the fluidity with which altars could be described.¹³³

Such exceptional granting of burial rights underlines the influence the Nevilles exerted over the priory, and the priory’s willingness to acknowledge their most prestigious and prolific patrons, in the kind of reciprocity that Julian Luxford has argued characterised the patronal relationship between the nobility and Benedictine houses in the later middle ages.¹³⁴ In a similar fashion to the ‘bringing forward’ of images from the high altar discussed above, Hampton has noted that the iconography of window sXIX (see Plan 12), opposite the location of Ralph and Alice’s tomb, for which payment was made c.1413-23, may well have replicated the scheme of images in the main canopies of the Neville Screen.¹³⁵ As she suggests, the window is described in a c.1603 manuscript published in Fowler’s edition of the *Rites* as depicting the Virgin, flanked by St Oswald and St George on one side and St Cuthbert and St Christopher on the other, and the Virgin, St Oswald, and St Cuthbert are described in the *Rites* as being above the high altar: there are five main tabernacles in the Neville Screen itself, suggesting that the lights each corresponded to an image in the screen.¹³⁶ This, she argues gave the fifteenth-century Nevilles ‘symbolic access to that sacred space’ around the tomb of St Cuthbert which their recent ancestors patronised.¹³⁷

Hampton has also drawn attention to the fact that the window in the third bay from the east, also overlooking the chapel (sXX), contained in one of its two lights an image of God the Father and Christ ‘on his brest hanging one [sic] the crosse’, and has linked these with representations of the Trinity in family *mausolea* and the preambles of wills.¹³⁸ Whilst this may be true, in light of other Neville patronage it is more likely to be suggestive of the image of the Trinity inside Our Lady of Boulton, associated with the central chapel of the south transept. This would be especially apposite considering Hampton’s linking of the image of St Cuthbert in the other light, ‘with certaine armes of the neviles’, to John Neville, donor of the shrine base and Neville Screen, whose tomb is opposite

¹³³ ‘*fecit fieri coram altari magna crucis ubi tumulantur*’. *Scriptores Tres*, no. ccvi: 134.

¹³⁴ Hampton, 2011: 50; Luxford, 2005: 166-78.

¹³⁵ Hampton, 2011: 58.

¹³⁶ *Rites*: 110; Hampton, 2011: 66-67.

¹³⁷ Hampton, 2011: 66.

¹³⁸ *Rites*: 111; Hampton, 2011: 67.

the window, and who is, as shall be explored below, the likely donor of the image of Our Lady of Boulton.¹³⁹

The iconography of the glass therefore acted as a reminder of all the family's donations east of the rood screen and invisible from the nave. Hampton has proposed, rightly, that the audience for the windows would be members of the Neville family, living and dead, and those within the chantry chapel, such as the priest who said mass at the altar there and the prior whose pew was located there for the purposes of viewing the Jesus mass at the Jesus altar.¹⁴⁰ However, it is important to note that they would also be visible to laymen in the nave who would be able to view them through the 'Irone' which enclosed the chapel on the north side.¹⁴¹ In this context, they would serve to underline the Neville family's contribution to the cathedral priory, but also give glimpses of some of the most important images in the east end when the gates to the more eastern parts of the interior were closed, and/or laymen were attending mass at the Jesus altar.¹⁴²

The movement of the bodies of Ralph and Alice, which are likely to have been under brasses rather than in a raised tomb or tombs,¹⁴³ would allow for the view of the altar and *Triumphkreuz* from the west end of the nave to be uninterrupted. The only evidence for another burial in the vicinity of the *Triumphkreuz* is for that of prior Thomas Castell (d.1519), who is described in the *Rites* as being buried 'in ye body of the church being pictured from ye waiste vp in Brass in ye mydst of ye stone with his vercis or epitath vpon yt before the Jesus altar'.¹⁴⁴ The precise location of this burial is not known, but it is notable that desire for burial before the altar, rather than the *Triumphkreuz*, is mentioned in his will. Did the priory make an exception for one of its own, especially considering he asked for a marble slab, rather than a raised tomb or chantry chapel? Castell certainly paid handsomely for the privilege of association with the Jesus altar, leaving two mills to be remembered at the Jesus Mass there.¹⁴⁵

The Nevilles were also associated with another major rood in Durham cathedral priory: the Black Rood of Scotland. This rood's confusing history

¹³⁹ *Rites*: 111; Hampton, 2011: 67.

¹⁴⁰ *Rites*: 40; Hampton, 2011: 56; 66-67.

¹⁴¹ *Rites*: 40.

¹⁴² *Ibid.* 32-33.

¹⁴³ Hampton, 2011: 25.

¹⁴⁴ *Rites*: 34.

¹⁴⁵ *Ibid.*: 222.

allows us to consider ideas of patronage, the relationship between images and relics, and the rood as a political object in more detail. It is to this object which we shall now turn.

5.iv. *The Black Rood of Scotland*

As noted in Part One, an object described as the Black Rood of Scotland appears in the 1383 *Liber de Reliquiis*. An object is also described in the *Rites* as the Black Rood of Scotland where it is stated as being in the south choir ambulatory at Durham, ‘adjoining the pillar next to St Cuthberts Feretorie, next the Quire door on the south side’ (see p.62). The *Rites*’ account of the Battle of Neville’s Cross suggests that this monumental cross and a smaller object, which is most likely that listed in the *Liber*, were both taken from the Scots at the battle (see p.64).¹⁴⁶ Lynda Rollason, in the fullest consideration of the Black Roods in relation to their appearance in the Durham sources, has identified the smaller Rood as the cross-reliquary described in numerous other medieval sources as ‘the Black Rood of Scotland’.¹⁴⁷ This once belonged to Queen Margaret of Scotland, and, as she notes, the origin story attached to this object in the *Rites* concerning its appearance between the antlers of a hart was originally related to Queen Margaret of Scotland’s son, David I (1124-1153), rather than David II, with its precedents lying in the conversion-whilst-hunting stories of St Hubert (656-727) and St Eustace (d. c.118).¹⁴⁸ Moreover, she has highlighted convincing evidence that it was actually already in English hands at the time of the battle. Appropriated by Edward I in 1296, along with the Stone of Scone, the Rood appears to have been regarded by him as symbolic of his overlordship of Scotland, in addition to being valued as a relic.¹⁴⁹ Rollason asserts that, contrary to a reference in the *Lanercost Chronicle* for 1328, the object was not returned to the Scots before 1346 and therefore ‘cannot have been captured at Neville’s Cross’, citing in support of this a memorandum published in Palgrave’s 1836 *Ancient Kalendars of the Exchequer*

¹⁴⁶ *Rites*: 210-11.

¹⁴⁷ Rollason, 1998: 58.

¹⁴⁸ *Ibid.* Watson, 1906-07: 36.

¹⁴⁹ The Stone of Scone was placed in Westminster Abbey, but the Black Rood was kept with the Cross of Neygt (Neyth) and the ‘cross of S. Elene of Scotland’, according to the 1307 inventory of the king’s goods. The Cross of Neyth was appropriated from the Welsh in 1283 and had a similar political status for them as the Black Rood did for the Scots. Both were used by Edward as relics on which important Scottish noblemen and clergymen swore fealty to him. Watson, 1906: 40; Rollason, 1998: 58-59.

which states that on 7th January 1346 it was removed from the Tower of London to be ‘kept by the side of the king’.¹⁵⁰ She speculates that it was sent north from the Tower of London by Edward III either before the battle ‘to help in the negotiations which were in prospect, or to aid in resisting the expected Scottish invasion’, or after the battle, ‘as a thank-offering’.¹⁵¹ Rollason suggests that after its appearance in the 1383 *Liber*, it may have been attached to St Cuthbert’s banner, therefore ‘disappearing as a distinct item’, as reference to it is not found in any later sources.¹⁵²

Within the context of Rollason’s findings, it is difficult to ascertain to what extent these mis-attributions and potential historical inaccuracies in the *Rites*’ account of the objects known as the Black Rood of Scotland are down to a confusion of sources, the vicissitudes of local tradition, or authorial innovation. Yet what has hitherto escaped notice is that the fantastical cross-origin story, the use of the cross in battle, and the capture and offering at the shrine, are also joined in the *Rites*’ account of the battle itself with other motifs which suggest that the objects are being consciously presented within the context of the wider, and related, traditions of the cross as a means of conversion, as a talisman in battle, and as a *tropaeum*.

The precedent for these traditions is Constantine’s vision of the ‘*signum crucis*’ in the sky, his dream of Christ commanding him to brandish the symbol in battle against Maxentius in the form of a *labarum*, and the subsequent placing of the *labarum* in the hand of a new statue of Constantine erected in the Basilica of Maxentius: as Schmitt has noted, here, the cross not only functioned as a sign of military victory, but also as an opposing sign in relation to the idols of Constantine’s adversaries.¹⁵³ More immediately relevant in the context of Durham, where St Oswald’s head was buried with St Cuthbert and Bede’s body

¹⁵⁰ Rollason, 1998: 60-62. The actual memorandum from which Palgrave transcribed is no longer extant, although as Rollason notes, E.L.G. Stones’ analysis of Palgrave’s text states that ‘there is no good reason to suspect the dating of the document in Palgrave. The memorandum reads: ‘*Cruce aurea que vocatur la Blackrode Scot*’. Memorandum quod vij Januarii anno regni regis Edwardi tercii a conquesto xix...capta fuit quidam [sic] cruce aurea que vocatur le Blake Rode Scoc’ de quadam magna huchia infra Turrim London’ per thesaurarium...[fuit] per eosdem domino Waltero de Wetewang’ custodi garderober ejusdem regis custodienda juxta latus regis virtute cujusdam littere sub privato sigillo regis...’, Stones, 1959: 174-75. See also Maxwell, 1913: 260, for the Lanercost Chronicle’s reference.

¹⁵¹ Rollason, 1998: 61-2.

¹⁵² *Ibid.*: 65.

¹⁵³ Mommsen, 1908: II, 2: 827-29 (for Rufinus’ Latin version of Eusebius’ *Ecclesiastical History*). Schmitt, 2002: 169-170.

also lay, are the accounts by Adomnán and Bede himself of, respectively, the dream-vision granted to St Oswald the night before his battle against King Cadwallon of Gwynedd at Heavenfield, near Hexham, in 633/34, and his erection of a wooden cross immediately before this battle.¹⁵⁴

This cross is said to have been planted in the ground, held by Oswald himself, and the army then prayed to it for protection; subsequently its splinters were thought to be miracle-working, and a church was built to house the cross, which became a focus of pilgrimage.¹⁵⁵ Ian Wood has suggested that while we cannot be certain that Oswald really did erect a cross, or was deliberately emulating Constantine, especially as Adomnán, in his *Vita Columbae*, does not make reference to it in his account of the battle, ‘we can be reasonably certain’ that Bede had Constantine’s story in mind when composing his eighth-century account of the Northumbrian king’s actions in the *Ecclesiastical History*.¹⁵⁶ In turn, it seems reasonable to suggest that the community and noblemen involved in the battle (most notably, as will shortly be clear, Prior Fossor and Ralph Neville) were conscious of these precedents both during and after the battle, especially considering Oswald’s status as a patronal saint at Durham.

It is within this cultural patrimony that we should read the description of two other crosses related to the battle, both erected in its aftermath. One was a stone cross

on the West syd of ye Citie...[erected] for ye victorie had thereof, shortly after ye battell of Durhham in ye same place where ye battell was fowghte called & knowen by ye name of Neivells Crosse which was sett vpp at ye cost and charge of the Lord Raph Nevell being one of ye most excellent and cheiffe in ye said battell & feild...¹⁵⁷

This cross had a ‘stalke’ three and a half yards high, and ‘in every second square was ye Nevells crosse in a scutchion being ye Lord Nevells armes’; on top of this was a boss ‘being eight square round about’, the squares showing, alternately, the ‘Neivells Cross in a scutchion in one square, & ye Bulls head having no scutchion in an other square’.¹⁵⁸ On top of this was a crucifix

¹⁵⁴ Anderson & Anderson, 1961: I, 8a-9b; *HE*: III, 1, 2.

¹⁵⁵ *HE*: III, 2; O’Reilly, 1987: 156.

¹⁵⁶ Wood, 2006: 4.

¹⁵⁷ *Rites*: 27.

¹⁵⁸ *Ibid.*

the picture of our saviour christ crucified with his armes stretched abroad, his handes nayled to ye crosse and his feete being naled vpon ye stalke of ye said crosse belowe, almost a quarter of a yerd from aboue ye Bosse, with the picture of our Lady the blessed Virgen Mary of ye one syde of him & the picture of St John the Evangeliste on ye other syde most pitifully lamenting & beholding his torments and cruell deathe...very artificially& curiously wrought all together & fynly carved out of one hole entyre stone...¹⁵⁹

Martin Roberts' recent suggested reconstruction gives us an idea of the appearance of the monument (Fig.102).¹⁶⁰ The description ends by emphasising again that it was named 'Neville's Cross' as a memorial to the battle and the memory of Ralph Neville.¹⁶¹ The other was set up by the prior and monks, described as

a faire crosse of Wood [erected] in ye same place where they standing with ye holie Relike [of Cuthbert's corporax cloth] made ther praiers... being a faire crosse of wood fynely wrought & verie larg & of highte two yeardes which there long stode...in memory of the said holy Relique after the said victorie atchieved dyd (in there tymes of recreac'ion as they went and came to & from Bearparke to ye Monasterie and Abbey of Durham) make there humble and sollemne praiers to god and holie St Cuthbert at the foote of ye said crosse in perpetuall prays & memory for ye said {victory} and recoverie of the said battell.¹⁶²

The description ends by recounting that it was destroyed sometime within the last thirty-five years, after the Suppression.¹⁶³

Certainly the use of crosses, as well as sacred relics, banners, and other images, was a familiar and integral part of medieval warfare: at the Battle of the Standard at Northallerton in 1138, where the English defeated David I on lands belonging to St Cuthbert, the Standard itself was a ship's mast, to which was attached a Host, described as *Dux Belli*, and the banners of St Peter, St John of Beverley, and St Wilfred.¹⁶⁴ However, it is important to note that the main narrative thrust of the *Rites'* account of the battle of Neville's Cross does not emphasise the power of the cross, or Christ, over the Scots, but rather Cuthbert's

¹⁵⁹ *Rites*: 28.

¹⁶⁰ On the methodology used for this reconstruction, see Roberts, 1998.

¹⁶¹ *Rites*: 28.

¹⁶² *Ibid.*: 29.

¹⁶³ *Ibid.*

¹⁶⁴ The most recent exploration of this phenomenon is Gerrard, 2011: 105-126. For the Battle of the Standard, see 112-117.

importance and his power as an intercessor. Prior Fossor was, as the Hogg Roll's account of the battle states, instructed in a vision the night before to take Cuthbert's corporax cloth and place it on a spear point, fashioning a banner; this was to be taken by Fossor and the monks to Readhill, where they were to stay, praying for the English, until the end of the battle.¹⁶⁵ Indeed, in the Hogg Roll's account, the battle is couched in terms of a personal attack on Cuthbert, his lands, and the priory as an institution; his corporax cloth is, in effect, pitted against the reliquary cross as a spiritual weapon, and it is he who 'wins' victory for the English and, ultimately, the cross for his own shrine.

In regard to the monumental Black Rood, as named by the *Rites*, Rollason argues that the text 'is unreliable', contending that whilst 'it is possible that the author of the *Rites* is correct and Lord Neville did make a thank-offering to the shrine of St Cuthbert in 1346 and the gift he gave was a large rood... the author is mistaken in asserting that this was the Black Rood of Scotland'.¹⁶⁶ This short dismissal of the monumental Black Rood is insufficient for this study's purpose. Firstly, it should be noted that the various manuscripts of the *Rites* in fact do not specify explicitly that Ralph himself donated the monumental Black Rood, or even 'a large rood': he is not mentioned in MS Cosin B.II.11's description of the rood in the south choir aisle at all, for example.¹⁶⁷ It is only in the mid-seventeenth century manuscripts of the *Rites* that Ralph is singled out as the one who offered the 'Jewells and Banners' to St Cuthbert's feretory; MS Hunter 45 adds to this list of offerings 'ye holy rood crosse which was taken on ye Kinge of Scotts'.¹⁶⁸ However, the singular focus on Ralph as the gift-giver of jewels, banners, and the 'holy rood crosse', which is likely to refer to the small reliquary cross, as well as the Hogg Roll's assertion that the 'crosse... taiken vpon him [King David]...' as well as jewels, banners, and 'ye blacke Rude... sett vp..in ye south alley' were thank-offerings given to the shrine, does raise the question of Ralph's relationship to the monumental Black Rood.¹⁶⁹ Additionally, the descriptions of the two roods in the earlier manuscripts of the *Rites* (the Hogg Roll and Cosin B.11.II) and their shared name between the *Rites* and the 1383

¹⁶⁵ *Rites*: 23.

¹⁶⁶ Rollason, 1998: 61.

¹⁶⁷ *Rites*: 18.

¹⁶⁸ *Ibid.*: 6.

¹⁶⁹ *Ibid.*: 25.

Liber suggest that there was a relationship between the two objects, and this merits investigation.

Might it be possible that the monumental Black Rood was named so in the *Rites* because it was in fact intended, or regarded, as a copy of the smaller reliquary cross, or at the least to be deliberately associated with it? It is possible that the monumental rood could have been carried into battle by the Scots, perhaps precisely *because* the small reliquary-cross was in the hands of the English, and was then captured and set up near the shrine. Indeed, Fowler speculates that the smaller cross may have previously resided in the monumental rood: in this it can be compared to the Imperial Cross of the Holy Roman Empire, which held the holy lance and a particle of the True Cross.¹⁷⁰ Imbued with the sacred potency of this reliquary function, the monumental rood was perhaps deemed particularly apt to take into battle, and also, apt to display if it were captured. However, there is no subsequent evidence to suggest that the monumental Black Rood was used as a *theca exterior* for the small reliquary cross once it was in the possession of the cathedral priory.

The possibility remains that the monumental Black Rood was commissioned and set up by the community itself some time after the battle as a thank-offering similar to the wooden cross set up where they stood during the battle with St Cuthbert's corporax cloth. In this case, the monumental Black Rood perhaps only later became conflated with the immediate post-battle thank-offerings of which we read in the *Rites*. Alternatively, Rollason may be correct in characterising the monumental rood as a thank-offering given by Ralph Neville, but it was perhaps one that was commissioned at his behest, again perhaps some time after the battle, rather than captured and set up in its immediate aftermath.

Regardless of its origin, the possibility that the monumental Black Rood was donated by Ralph Neville should not be easily discounted. For Ralph, it would be a particularly expedient gift. Donation of the monumental Black Rood would imitate the more precious small reliquary cross that Edward III sent northwards, acting as Ralph's own equivalent thank-offering. As probably the first major donation by the Neville family to the cathedral priory, the Black Rood would at once signal his involvement in the victory over the Scots, his closeness

¹⁷⁰ *Rites*: 211; Beck, 2009: 51-52.

to Edward, and his worthiness as a patron to the cathedral priory. An extra layer of piquancy, surely not lost on Ralph, would be added to the gift of the rood in this context considering that the Neville arms was composed of a saltire.¹⁷¹

Ralph's keenness to underline his involvement in the battle through a visually potent object is also suggested in his commission of the cross at the site called Neville's Cross. As J. Linda Drury has noted, this was named 'Neville's Cross' at least twenty-three years before the battle that later took its name, and it had probably been the site of a way-marker for hundreds of years.¹⁷² Neither Rollason nor Drury consider whether, or how, the monumental Black Rood of Scotland and the new Neville's Cross might have been related, but it seems reasonable to suggest that they probably were. The monumental Black Rood of Scotland, if it were captured at the battle, and especially if it were donated by Ralph Neville, would effectively bring the site associated with the battle into the interior. The new Neville's Cross heralded out in the lands a few miles from the cathedral priory, and close to the battlefield, the symbol so intimately associated with the English victory, the symbol which, in the form of the reliquary Black Rood, lay as an offering at Cuthbert's shrine. If Ralph was the donor of the monumental Black Rood, the outdoor cross would also, in turn, be suggestive of his significant donation within the interior, close to the shrine, and would reiterate his relationship to the cathedral priory and to St Cuthbert himself.

Drury's analysis of the new Neville's Cross goes only so far as to compare it with the monks' cross erected at Readhill. She notes that Ralph was, in making his from stone rather than wood, and four times as high, 'doubtless making a statement' about his role in the battle relative to that of the monks.¹⁷³ The extent to which size mattered in the relationships between these crosses, particularly the monumental Black Rood and the reliquary cross, is difficult to ascertain. The former is described unreliably in one of the later manuscripts of the *Rites* as 'a Yard and five quarters long', as noted in Part One (see p.64); the latter is described by Aelred of Rievaulx as 'the length of the palm of the hand'.¹⁷⁴ The copy of measurements could be a prime factor in replication, especially if they were an important factor in the original. For example, the rood in an apsidal

¹⁷¹ Drury, 1998: 87.

¹⁷² *Rites*: 84; 86.

¹⁷³ *Ibid.*: 87.

¹⁷⁴ Freeland & Dutton, 2005: 63.

chapel at Bury St Edmunds, according to its *Liber Albus*, was said by some to have been there before the monks; an alternative provenance given is that it was commissioned by Abbot Leofstan (1044-1065) after he had venerated the *Volto Santo* in Lucca on his way to Rome. There, he had obtained the ‘measure’ of the miracle-working figure.¹⁷⁵ Similarly, *ex-votos* at saints’ shrines, usually made of candle-wax, often replicated not just the shape but also the size of limbs and other body parts in need of, or granted, healing.¹⁷⁶

However, gifts of trindles or *rotulas*, where the candle wicks were of the length or circumference of the afflicted body part (or even whole person) were inventive ways in which the measurement was incorporated into an *ex-voto*, and others could be scaled-up or scaled-down representations, especially in the case of objects too large for actual-sized replicas to be made, such as ships.¹⁷⁷

Conversely, in the case of the monumental and the smaller Black Roods, a monumental version of a small reliquary cross would be easily visible to more people within the context of the shrine of St Cuthbert and its surrounding area, particularly at times when the relic cupboards at St Cuthbert’s shrine were closed, functioning as a testament to the saint’s intercessory powers and his political allegiance to Edward III.¹⁷⁸

How did the two Black Roods relate materially? In the *Rites*’ account of the supernatural origins of the small reliquary cross, there is a suggestion that its material was suitably other-worldly: ‘no man knowing certely what mettall or wood ye said crosse was mayd of’.¹⁷⁹ Aelred described the reliquary in detail as

...made with surpassing skill out of pure gold; it opens and closes like a box. In it can be seen a portion of the Lord’s cross, as has often been proved by the evidence of many miracles. It bears the image of our Saviour carried [sic; probably ‘carved’] from the most beautiful ivory and is marvelously adorned with gold ornaments.¹⁸⁰

In the 1307 inventory of Edward I’s goods it is said to be ‘In a casket sealed above with the sign of the cross...constructed of gold, with a gold chain, in a

¹⁷⁵ James, 1895: 161; Dodwell, 1982: 211-12.

¹⁷⁶ Blick, 2011: 34-37.

¹⁷⁷ *Ibid.*: 34. For more general discussion of the significance of the *ex-voto*, see Freedberg, 1988: 153-160, esp. 153.

¹⁷⁸ *Rites*: 5.

¹⁷⁹ *Ibid.*: 22.

¹⁸⁰ Freeland & Dutton, 2005: 63.

casket with a wooden interior and with its outer side of silver gilded over' and in the 1346 memorandum transcribed from Palgrave it is described simply as '*crux aurea*'.¹⁸¹ However, the 1383 *Liber* describes it as '*crux nigra*', without further details. Watson suggests that the silver appearance of the exterior noted in the later records may have been due to the gold rubbing off; if so we can add that its blackness, as described in the 1383 relic list, may have been the result of oxidization.¹⁸² The monumental Black Rood is described as being 'of silver', with flanking figures of Mary and John; they and the Christ-figure wore crowns of gold. The manuscript adds in the detail that the figures were 'smoked black', suggesting staining by smoke.¹⁸³ Drury has speculated that Ralph's stone monument at Neville's Cross 'may have been painted and gilded when new', giving the illusion of precious metal.¹⁸⁴ Rather than dealing with strict 'copies' of the small reliquary Black Rood of Scotland then, it seems that these objects, related to one another if not in size then, to a certain degree, through their materiality, were in dialogue with one another. Like Wood's argument regarding apsidal crosses and the reliquary of the True Cross in Jerusalem, it was perhaps imaginative connections that were primarily meant to be made between them, reinforcing the links between the Neville family, the cathedral priory, the English victory, and the power of St Cuthbert.

5.v *Nave Images*

The nave has been branded by Paul Binski as the most 'superfluous' part of any Benedictine church for the purposes of the institution, its main function being as a processional route.¹⁸⁵ Dawn Marie Hayes has drawn attention to the more general delineation of the nave as a distinct space, less sacred in character, and specifically associated with the laity. This, as she has noted, is shown in the discourse of twelfth and thirteenth-century continental churchmen, including Durandus and Jacobus de Voragine, for whom ideas concerning gradations of sacred place were intimately linked with ideas concerning the body, 'human,

¹⁸¹ Stones, 1959: 174-75.

¹⁸² Watson, 1906-07: 30.

¹⁸³ *Rites*: 19.

¹⁸⁴ Drury, 1998: 87.

¹⁸⁵ Binski, 2004: 173-74.

social, and eucharistic', and especially the sexual use of the human body.¹⁸⁶

Within this, the nave was equated to those in the married state, the chancel to the continent, and the sanctuary with virgins.¹⁸⁷ More recently, Roberta Gilchrist has applied Hayes' approach to her analysis of Norwich cathedral priory.¹⁸⁸

In practice, the nave at monastic and secular institutions of cathedral status encompassed a range of liturgical and non-liturgical functions. The western nave was often the site of the consistory court, but also the site of the font.¹⁸⁹ From the thirteenth century onwards, evidence from English contexts shows that naves of cathedrals and great abbeys contained a proliferating number of altars and chapels, more secular imagery, and an increasing numbers of burials, especially of the laity, as evidence from Salisbury, St Albans, and Christ Church, Canterbury, attests.¹⁹⁰ Links between these phenomena cannot be fully explored here, but the salient factor was most likely the increasing importance of the doctrine of Purgatory in religious thought and practice, and thus the need to secure the intercessory prayers of others after death, often formalised in the foundation of a chantry, sited either at an existing altar or one created expressly for that purpose.¹⁹¹ Justin Kroesen's recent exploration of the proliferation of altars, focusing on the continental context, has drawn attention to the area west of the rood or choir screen as being a particularly favoured area for them.¹⁹² Indeed, evidence from Salisbury, Exeter, and Wells shows that many of the altars and chantry chapels were located towards the east end of the nave, and in the crossing and transepts: Nicholas Orme has commented that the 'spiritual atmosphere increased' as one walked eastwards at Exeter, for example.¹⁹³ At St Albans,

¹⁸⁶ Hayes, 2003: 3.

¹⁸⁷ *Ibid.*: 7, 18.

¹⁸⁸ Gilchrist, 2005: 236-261.

¹⁸⁹ For example, the consistory courts were held at Christ Church, Canterbury, 'underneath the vaults of the north-western tower', Sparks, 1997: 126; at Exeter, probably in the north-west nave chapel of St Edmund, Orme, 1986: 25; at Salisbury, in the space off the south-west corner of the nave, Brown, 1999: 2. The precise locations of fonts in these naves are not known: Orme puts that at Exeter in the second bay to the east on the south side of the nave (1986: 22-24; 2007, 277-78 (on its use)); the evidence for that at Canterbury notes only that it was in the nave (Sparks, 1997: 126); and at Salisbury it is known only as being in the west end (Brown, 1999: 189).

¹⁹⁰ Brown, 1999: 25-26; Binski, 2002: 275 (who notes that so great were the numbers of burials that in the fourteenth century the nave was repaved); Sparks, 1997: 124.

¹⁹¹ McNeill, 2011: 1-3; 14. See also Wood-Leigh, 1965, and on Purgatory, Le Goff, 1984 and Duffy, 1992: 338-376, esp. 370.

¹⁹² Kroesen, 2009b, esp. 150-52; see also Bacci, 2009, for an exploration of side and chantry altars in the Mediterranean region.

¹⁹³ Brown, 1999: 25; Ayers, 2004: 419-20; Orme, 1986: 22-24.

documentary evidence shows that three altars were consecrated between 1335-49 at the east end of the nave on the south side, and that they were moved further east, against the rood screen, in the fifteenth century.¹⁹⁴

Our discussion of the *Triumphkreuz* has suggested that the naves of late medieval English cathedrals and great abbeys were visually dominated by the monumental image of Christ on the cross; documentary and physical evidence from York, Durham, and elsewhere reminds us that other representations of Christ, especially Christ on the cross, were also present in the nave, often, but not always, associated with altars. Extant late thirteenth and mid-fourteenth century sacrist's rolls from Ely regularly note offerings at the 'cross at the font', for example.¹⁹⁵ The surviving wall paintings on the western sides of six of the pillars along the north nave arcade at St Albans each depict a crucifixion on top of a marian-related scene (Fig.103); at the top of the most easterly painted pier are the remains of an image of Christ *Pantocrator*.¹⁹⁶ They were executed c.1230-c.1310: the first five in a chronological order from west to east, the earliest being on the fourth pillar from the west and the latest on the eighth from the west, with the *Pantocrator* being executed after c.1310.¹⁹⁷ Though there is no direct evidence for the founding of altars or their use in these locations, Binski contends that because of their relative height from the floor, the iconographies of the murals, and the evidence for altars on the south side of the nave, at least one of which had a confraternity associated with it, the murals suggest the locations of altars which 'could perfectly well be intended for lay not monastic use', demonstrating, 'like a creeping tide-line', the advance eastwards of the lay presence in the nave, provision for which had been given in the twelfth century in the form of the chapel of St Andrew to the north-west of the nave.¹⁹⁸ These nave pillar murals serve to emphasise that the image of Christ on the cross would have been present at all altars present in the naves of York and Durham. Indeed, the chantry inventories from York list numerous textiles and panels depicting crucifixes, usually with accompanying images of Mary and John.¹⁹⁹ The altars with which these chantries were associated were concentrated in the east end of the nave,

¹⁹⁴ Binski, 1992: 266. See Riley, 1867-69: II: 362; Lloyd, 1873: 18, 59.

¹⁹⁵ 'De cruce ad fontem', Chapman, 1907: II, 100; 102; 124; 147; 149; 160; 172; 184.

¹⁹⁶ Binski, 1992: 252-61.

¹⁹⁷ *Ibid.*: 261. See also Roberts, 1993: 12-29.

¹⁹⁸ Binski, 1992: 275; Binski, 2004: 174.

¹⁹⁹ Raine, 1859: 274-306, esp. 280, 281.

particularly around the crossing piers and in the vicinity of St William's tomb-shrine (Plans 6-11, no.2); most likely their placement was also linked to the use of the south transept door as the main quotidian entrance to the Minster.

John Browne's suggestion that the three niches in the gable above the interior west doorway housed a crucifix and images of Mary and John allows us to consider the evidence for images at the west end of the nave in more detail (Fig.81).²⁰⁰ The carved angels near the gable's apex, possibly censuring though now both missing their hands,²⁰¹ are suggestive of the flanking angels in the *Rites*' description of the *Triumphkreuz* at Durham and Gervase's account of that at Christ Church, Canterbury.²⁰² However, the narrow central niche is ill-shaped for an image of the crucifixion. Sarah Brown has suggested a Marian image in this location, complementing a possible Marian image in the niche of the exterior gable and the Marian iconography of the west window.²⁰³ Another possibility is an image of Christ in Majesty, whose shape would be appropriate here, with accompanying figures of Mary and John, forming a Last Judgement scene. Flanking angels would not be out of place in this context, as both the New Minster *Liber Vitae* and Thomas of Elmham's drawing of the high altar Christ in Majesty demonstrate (Fig.93; see also the south transept tympanum of Chartres, c.1210-15, Fig.104). Moreover, there is precedent for this iconography on the exterior of the twelfth-century west façade, as Oosterwijk and Norton have outlined,²⁰⁴ and it is reasonable to suggest Archbishop Melton may have preserved this on the fourteenth-century interior façade.

Oakes has noted the gradual replacement of St Peter by St John in this grouping during the thirteenth century, with St John being the standard male flanking figure in later centuries.²⁰⁵ However, the presence of an image of St Peter on the trumeau below this west-doorway Last Judgement scene would preserve this earlier association, as well as underlining his role as the heavenly 'gatekeeper' and intercessor - one who was perhaps regarded as being devotionally more immediate thanks to the image's location on the trumeau, and by virtue of his patronal status at York. Here it is fruitful to consider the potential

²⁰⁰ Browne, 1847: I, 139.

²⁰¹ Brown, 2003: 112.

²⁰² *L-B I*: 179 (665).

²⁰³ Brown, 2003: 121.

²⁰⁴ Oosterwijk and Norton, 1990: 24.

²⁰⁵ Oakes, 2008: 71-80.

relationship between this west doorway image complex and the images further east in a similar way to that which Jung has explored the complementary architectural relationship between the screens of the east choir and the west choir at Naumburg cathedral.²⁰⁶ The west doorway's Last Judgement image complex would provide both a visual contrast and theological complement to the *Triumphkreuz* and its flanking figures of Mary and John, as well as the high altar rood and the altar's images of the Virgin and St Peter. Consideration of these image complexes therefore suggests that the 'sacred spine' identified by Norton in regard to the high altar rood, high altar, and St William's shrine²⁰⁷ can be extended along the entire length of the nave. Within this we can perhaps also include the East Window itself, as its visual theme is one which would complement that of the Last Judgement image complex.

The concentration of altars and images, all associated with the Passion, in the west end of the nave at Durham, and also further west in the quasi-nave like space of the Galilee chapel, the site not only of the 'marshalling point' for liturgical processions, but also, at least from the fourteenth century, the consistory court and Bede's shrine, and, in the fifteenth-century, Cardinal Langley's chantry and a font,²⁰⁸ contrasts sharply with the distribution of altars and images in the naves at York, and even the 'creeping tide line' at the Benedictine abbey of St Albans.²⁰⁹ The regular offerings at 'Holy Cross in the Galilee' and the existence of a guild associated with it,²¹⁰ offerings at the altar of St Saviour in the north-west corner of the nave from the 1480s onwards, as well as mid-sixteenth century references to a guild of the same name in the accounts of the almoner's estate and the Receivers' Books, unequivocally link both the images of Holy Cross and St Saviour which were presumably there with a lay audience.²¹¹ The swift fall in the returns from the collection box of St Saviour within five years during the 1480s and the paltry return of 4d. for 1535-36 suggests a distinct decline in the image's popularity, in line with the lower returns from other collection boxes (see Appendix 1).

²⁰⁶ Jung, 2013: 39-41.

²⁰⁷ Norton, 2005: 178.

²⁰⁸ *Rites*: 46; Halsey, 1980: 61-2; 71, fn. 22 and 26.

²⁰⁹ Halsey, 1980: 61-2.

²¹⁰ Harvey, 2006: 166.

²¹¹ *Ibid.*

There is no direct evidence for lay use of the images of the Bound Rood and Our Lady of Pity, which stood in the west end of the nave (Plans 3-5), and therefore near the north aisle entrance and an area accessible to both men and women. The latter image was often connected to marian devotion, but also invited meditation on the figure of the dead Christ in her lap, and the significance of the connection between mother and son: indeed, Belting has gone so far as to describe Mary as acting like a ‘monstrance’ in relation to Christ.²¹² The wainscoting that enclosed both altars raises the question of how visible they were, and when. However, there is little doubt that these relatively late iconographies would have had significant lay appeal, being in line with the more general late medieval growth and diversification of devotion to Christ and his Passion. In particular, the presence of the Bound Rood, depicting Christ shortly *before* the crucifixion, serves as an important counterpoint to the emphasis on images of the ‘Dead God’ that have been touchstones for some of the most influential continental works on the devotional image, and indeed late medieval English piety.²¹³ With the image of St Saviour in the north-west corner of the nave, possibly depicting an upright, open-eyed, and more ‘triumphant’ figure of Christ, as suggested in Part One (see p.79), and the distant *Triumphkreuz* at the east end of the nave, it is even possible that these images were employed for sequential meditation on salient stages of the Passion, a practice that the Passion retable at the Jesus altar and rood screen relief panels would also invite. The *Meditationes Vitae Christi*, whose English translation by Nicholas Love was ‘probably the most popular vernacular book of the fifteenth century’, exhorted a similar sequential pattern of meditating on stages of the Passion in line with the liturgical hours.²¹⁴

Considering the colourful explanation in the *Rites* that the Galilee was built specifically so that women could have a ‘lawfull...holie place’ to use, and the blue marble line between the second set of pillars from the west in the nave beyond which women could not venture, this concentration of images of Christ’s Passion in the west nave and Galilee is suggestive of a similar kind of ‘provision

²¹² Marks, 2004: 123; Belting, 1990: 84.

²¹³ Belting, 1990; Panofsky, 1927; Duffy, 1992: 234-56.

²¹⁴ For an early printed version of the *Meditationes* see Caxton’s edition: Love, 1484. Duffy, 1992: 235. For comment on the potential to construct narratives using roods and images of Our Lady of Pity in the parochial context, see Marks, 2004: 137.

hand in hand with segregation' that Binski has referred to in relation to St Albans, the power of St Cuthbert's alleged misogyny in particular stemming any hint of a 'creeping tide-line' of female devotion.²¹⁵ Certainly women's devotional appetites, and the potential financial benefits that could accompany it, were taken into consideration by even the most austere of monastic orders, as demonstrated by the provisions made for women's access to the crucifix in the lay brothers' choir at Meaux Abbey during the abbacy of Hugh of Leven, 1339-49.²¹⁶ Provision of an image of Holy Cross in the Galilee would in particular perhaps act as a substitute for the distant *Triumphkreuz*; however, there is no evidence for any of the images in Durham's nave or Galilee being installed *specifically* for a female audience.

Some movement eastwards of these images may have occurred. Eric Cambridge has suggested that the altars at which the Bound Rood and Our Lady of Pity stood may have originally been in the Galilee chapel, being moved into the nave during Cardinal Langley's early fifteenth-century remodelling of the latter, which involved piercing doorways through the altar niches which were in the north and south aisles in compensation for the blocking of the main west doorway by his chantry chapel.²¹⁷ The dedications of these two 'lost' altars are unknown, and Cambridge's theory raises the possibility that the provision of the two Passion-related iconographies at the altars in the nave may have been in line with rededications of the altars, in response to the popularity of similar images already in the Galilee chapel. As noted in Part One, the image of Holy Cross in the Galilee was a regular recipient of offerings, and the *Rites* notes that an image of Our Lady of Pity stood at the altar on the south side. On the other hand, if the image of Holy Cross '*vestiti*' was that of the Bound Rood, the Galilee may have been, at one time, the site of at least two images of Christ at different stages of his Passion. In either case, the movement of the altars and the presence of the Bound Rood and Our Lady of Pity in the nave would, at least by the mid-fifteenth century, allow for the veneration of Passion-related images out-with the confines of the Galilee chapel, by then densely packed with altars, Bede's shrine, and Langley's chantry chapel, but still in a space accessible to both men and women.

²¹⁵ *Rites*: 43; Binski, 2004: 172.

²¹⁶ Binski, 2004: 228-29.

²¹⁷ Pers. Comm., June 2014.

5.vi. *The Crucifix Within Our Lady of Boulton*

Our Lady of Boulton, the *Vierge ouvrante* donated by the Neville family and said by the *Rites* to have been associated with the altar of the same name in the south transept at Durham, was iconographically and mechanically unique within the cathedral priory. The presence of the crucifix within the outer Virgin and Child ‘shell’ highlights the potential fluidity between categories of fixed and moveable images, and highlights the nuances necessary in assessing the accessibility of images.

Usually hidden within the belly of the image of the Virgin, the crucifix was exposed on feast days as a surprising visual revelation of the means of salvation, rather than of the ‘divine foetus’ one would expect to find inside Mary’s body.²¹⁸ More detail concerning the use of the crucifix on Good Friday is given in the description of the rituals of that day found in the section on the choir in the *Rites*. A ‘goodly large crucifix of gold’, here not explicitly stated as that from within Our Lady of Boulton, was carried by two monks on a velvet cushion showing St Cuthbert’s arms to the lowest steps of the choir, where it was used for the ceremony of the Creeping to the Cross.²¹⁹ Afterwards it was carried to the Easter Sepulchre, on the north side of the choir, where it lay with another ‘picture’ of Christ ‘in whose breast they did enclose...the most holy and blessed sacrament’.²²⁰

The iconography of the ‘picture’ of Christ is given in the description of the Easter Sunday ceremony, and suggests it was a work of three rather than two dimensions, being

the resurrection with a crosse in his hand in the breast wherof was enclosed in a bright {‘most pure’ MS H.45} Christall the holy sacrament...the blessed host was conspicuous to the beholders...²²¹

²¹⁸ Katz, 2009: 218. Katz gives examples of images of the Virgin that do contain pictures or sculpted images of the Christ-child: 213-14. See also the catalogue in Radler, 1990: 51-119.

²¹⁹ *Rites*: 11.

²²⁰ *Ibid.*: 12.

²²¹ *Ibid.*

‘After the eluation of the said picture’ from the sepulchre, it was carried on a velvet cushion to the high altar, and then taken to the south choir door and processed under a canopy ‘round about the church’ until it was placed upon the high altar again ‘to remine untill the assencion day’.²²² Duffy has pointed out the popularity of statues, which also acted as monstrances, in the Easter ceremonies not just in cathedrals but also parish churches.²²³ The early thirteenth-century Visitation statuary group now at the Metropolitan Museum, New York, in which both figures have rock-crystal covered cavities embedded into their breasts, is suggestive of the ‘Christall’ described to enclose the sacrament (Fig.105).

The *Rites* does not state where this image of Christ was located at other times of the year. Following Young,²²⁴ John McKinnell has suggested that it was the larger figure (‘oure savioure’) from inside Our Lady of Boulton, although the presence of an image of Christ on the cross and a larger image of Christ holding it has no precedent in *Vierge ouvrante* iconography, and also contradicts the *Rites*’ assertion that on feast days the image was opened to reveal ‘the father, the sonne, and the holy ghost’, which occurs in the description of Our Lady of Boulton in the section on the south transept (see p.70).²²⁵ It seems more likely that Fowler is right in suggesting the larger figure inside Our Lady of Boulton was God the Father, indicating a Mercy Seat Trinity, which Katz has demonstrated was one of the two iconographies usually used for the interior of *Vierges ouvrante*, the other being a narrative scheme showing either the Joys or Sorrows of the Virgin.²²⁶ The image of Christ cannot easily be identified with any other image in the evidence from Durham. The Resurrection iconography may suggest a link to the St Saviour altar and collection box in the nave; alternatively it may be that the image was not used or displayed other than during the Easter season.

The theological sophistication of this iconography, visible in the south transept, would have been easily accessible to the monastic community. The regular payments for lights before the image suggest it was the marian image before which the antiphon was sung each evening.²²⁷ However, the *Rites* states that the image was opened ‘every principall Daie’ so that ‘every man’ might see

²²² *Rites*: 12-13.

²²³ Duffy, 1992: 30.

²²⁴ Young, 1967: I, 137-39.

²²⁵ McKinnell, 2011: 223.

²²⁶ *Rites*: 219; Katz, 2009: 199.

²²⁷ Katz, 2011: 79 mistakenly locates it in the north transept.

the inner iconography, indicating that its audience also encompassed the lay men who could venerate St Cuthbert's shrine.²²⁸ The open state of the *Vierge ouvrante*, revealing the gold crucifix, was therefore part of an orchestrated spectacle within the priory which served to heighten the importance of feast days. This also encompassed the raising of St Cuthbert's shrine cover, the opening of the reliquary cupboards, and the opening of the Passion retable at the Jesus altar. Other sensory embellishments were employed, such as the use of the principal organs over the rood loft.²²⁹ Such programmes of concealing and revealing images were not uncommon, and as well as signifying the importance of a feast they helped to create and sustain devotional interest. Paul Crossley has demonstrated the intricacies of the sequences of exposure of the altarpieces, images, and relics throughout the liturgical year in the late fifteenth-century choir at St Laurence, Nuremburg for example.²³⁰ Importantly at Durham, the south transept location for Our Lady of Boulton meant that it was not accessible to women in either its closed or open state, a significant point considering that *Vierges ouvrantes* elsewhere could be designed specifically to appeal to women, as Elena Gertsman has convincingly argued.²³¹

A different kind of pattern of concealing and revealing was perhaps also at work in relation to Our Lady of Boulton and its interior iconography. The c.1603 description of the stained glass in the south transept states that the second light of the window above the altar showed 'ye picture of our Lady of Bolton [sic], with a gold mase in her hand and a crowne of gold on her head, a monke vnder her feet, k'eling & praying with eleuated hands'.²³² This suggests the image was depicted in another medium and was potentially visible in its closed state as well as its

²²⁸ *Rites*: 30.

²²⁹ *Ibid.*: 5; 16.

²³⁰ Crossley, 1998: 165-182.

²³¹ Gertsman's discussion focuses on the Quelven *Vierge ouvrante*, in Notre-Dame de Quelven in Brittany, which includes seven episodes depicted in compartments within the image (the Last Judgement, Flagellation and Deposition, the Three Marys at the Tomb, the Harrowing of Hell, the Crucifixion, and the *Noli me tangere*). This number corresponds to the number of compartments understood to be in a woman's uterus according to medieval medical theory, going some way to undermining Katz's characterisation of the *Vierge ouvrante* as going through a process of 'corporeal erasure' in its opening; the episodes include women prominently, even depicting St Ann in St John's place at the Crucifixion. Gertsman's conclusion in analysing this iconography is that the image 'was clearly conceived to appeal to a female audience'. Katz, 2009: 215; Gertsman, 2011: 244-45.

²³² *Rites*: 113; noted by Marks, 2004: 198.

open state on feast days, and in some form throughout the liturgical year, even during Lent, when images were usually covered.

As well as supporting the notion that Our Lady of Boulton was of particular devotional value to the monks of the priory, this stained glass depiction supports Katz's assessment that *Vierges ouvrantes* 'frustrate vision...for the two states, can never be seen simultaneously, except in reproduction', but it also contradicts her assertion that 'only through memory could the premodern viewer call to mind the entire object, interior and exterior'.²³³ It also has implications when considering the manipulation of the image. Katz emphasises throughout her work 'the haptic as well as the optic' qualities of the *Vierge ouvrante* and assumes that the manipulator, opening and closing the image, and the viewer were the same person.²³⁴ However, the *Rites* indicates that those men who viewed the image in its open state were viewers only, not manipulators, and it does not give details as to who was responsible for its physical manipulation. It would be sensible to suggest that this may have been a duty of the sacrist, considering payment for the light before the image was recorded in his accounts. We can propose, therefore, that the closed image in the stained glass may have acted to allow the viewer, whether monk or layman, to imagine the act of opening the three-dimensional image as part of their meditation, and its theological message. At the least, it cleverly emphasised its change in state, and the novelty of the iconography within.²³⁵

The Neville family's role as donor of the *Vierge ouvrante* was a constant feature in the presentation of the image, as the detail of the escutcheon on the stone suggests, in a kind of heraldic tagging also present on the Neville Screen. A likely candidate for the precise donor is John, third Baron Neville, who spent time on the continent in Castile, Brittany, Gascony, and Aquitaine during his military and administrative career, especially in the service of John of Gaunt; he may well have encountered examples of the image at this time.²³⁶ Those documented by Katz show concentrations in Castile and central France, in some cases in major institutions: one was located in Sigüenza Cathedral, Guadalajara, for instance, and

²³³ Katz, 2009: 208-09.

²³⁴ *Ibid.*:197; Katz, 2011:74.

²³⁵ On the wider issue of the physical manipulation of images, see Williamson, 2011: 121-28, esp.123-24.

²³⁶ Tuck, 2004: 506-507.

another in Notre-Dame in Paris.²³⁷ In light of John's role as the donor of a new shrine-base for St Cuthbert and the Neville Screen, his potential donation of Our Lady of Boulton suggests a wider programme of Neville family patronage in the 1370s than has hitherto been recognised. The donation of this image, and especially its liturgically significant crucifix, would also associate it with the earlier Neville family donation of the monumental Black Rood of Scotland, discussed above.

While the liturgical use of the crucifix has been noted and described by several scholars,²³⁸ only Katz has explored a line of reasoning for its use. She states that

[habitually it] could not have been seen, and thus met the criterion that a Lenten cross remain invisible from the first Sunday of Lent until its unveiling on Good Friday...The *Vierge ouvrante* sculpture itself was tangential to the ceremony,...employed not for its Marian associations nor for the novelty of its moving parts, but rather as the sculptural equivalent of the drapery used to camouflage free-standing crucifixes. Yet in doing so it highlights another aspect of the Virgin's somatic bond to her son, as her cabinet-body performs the role of winding sheet shrouding an adult corpus rather than a womb enfleshing a divine fetus [sic].²³⁹

Whilst this explanation may have some validity, especially as it suggests a relationship between the iconography of the *Vierge ouvrante* and the more common iconography of Our Lady of Pity, it is not entirely satisfactory. It may have been *precisely* the fact that the crucifix was sometimes hidden, but visible on feast days throughout the liturgical year, and that the crucifix was part of a rare and revered image in its own right, not to mention its material value and the fact that it was donated by the major lay patron of the priory, which rendered it suitable for the ceremony. Moreover, as the 1383 *Liber* shows, there were other crosses that could easily have been covered and used in the ceremony, including those enclosing a fragment of the True Cross, and significantly, the small Black

²³⁷ Katz, 2009: 218-19. Katz notes that nearly all those documented images north of the Pyrenees depicted the Mercy Seat, whereas many of the Iberian examples contain sculptural reliefs showing the Joys of the Virgin, or the Passion. Katz, 2011: 66. See also Radler, 1990: cat. nos. 12 and 13 for Spanish examples.

²³⁸ Young, 1967: I, 136-39; Camille, 1989: 219; Marks, 2004: 199; McKinnell, 2011: 223.

²³⁹ Katz, 2011: 79.

Rood of Scotland, suggesting that particular crucifixes were suitable for particular purposes.²⁴⁰

The use of the crucifix elevated the Neville family's act of patronage in donating the *Vierge ouvrante*, directly integrating them into the priory's liturgy, much as the drawing of Canute and Emma's gift of the cross to the community at New Minster illustrated in the *Liber Vitae*, and the illustration itself, integrated them into the community's liturgy. In the case of the Nevilles, that this occurred on one of the most important dates of the liturgical year, when the gold crucifix was used as a *simulacrum* for the wood of the True Cross, gave it a gravity and piquancy the like of which those who patronised the parochial roods and rood screens discussed by Marks could perhaps only dream.²⁴¹

5.vii. *Conclusion*

This analysis of the evidence for images of Christ at York Minster and Durham cathedral priory has highlighted both the number and the particular importance of images of Christ on the cross at both institutions. It has demonstrated that within both interiors, and in relation to the evidence from other institutions, there were considerable differences and idiosyncrasies in the locations, character, and meanings of monumental roods, even within the context of the universal image of the *Triumphkreuz*. In particular, analysis of the Black Rood of Scotland and other roods related to the battle of Neville's Cross has highlighted the capacity for the image of Christ on the cross to be as much a political as a sacred object.

However, at both institutions we see some similarities. Consideration of the Jesus altar retable at Durham, as well as the crucifix in 'the south part' of York Minster, and the images of Holy Cross, St Saviour, and the Bound Rood in the Galilee Chapel and nave at Durham has drawn attention to lay use and possible institutional provision of images of Christ for the laity.

The donation of two crucifixes over the course of two generations by the Neville family is suggestive of the overall pattern of accumulation of images of Christ, particularly crucifixes, over time at Durham. However, the evidence for the image of the Bound Rood in the south-west of the nave in particular suggests

²⁴⁰ *Account Rolls* II, 425-439.

²⁴¹ Marks, 2011: 218-19. On the ceremony at Jerusalem which provided the model for this, see Egeria's description in Wilkinson, 1971: 155.

an expansion both in space and in the range of iconographies of Christ as well, in tune with the wider pattern within English piety of increasing devotion to the Passion in the fifteenth century.

Accumulation over time is also a theme at York, as suggested by the evidence for the 'new' crucifix 'in the south part' and the possibility of the installation of a Last Judgement programme in the niches of the interior west wall. Yet here the theme of retention and the particular value of certain images is also important. Iconographically, a Last Judgement sculptural scheme would have retained a scheme that was present on the twelfth-century façade; materially, there is a strong possibility that Archbishop Roger's roods were both still in use in the sixteenth century, if not necessarily both in their original positions.

The appellation of images such as Our Lady of Boulton and those known as Our Lady of Pity, both of which which incorporate figures of Christ as well as Mary, suggest their Marian focus, although Mary's focus was usually on the figure of Christ: theologically, she functioned as *mediatrix*. It is to images of Mary, with and without her son, to which we shall now turn.

CHAPTER SIX

IMAGES OF MARY

6.i. *Introduction*

The iconography of the *vierge ouvrante*, and the studies of it by Melissa Katz, respectively display and dissect some of the paradoxes at the heart of the medieval cult of Mary, suggesting how different aspects of the Virgin's identity could appeal to different audiences. This protean nature is rooted in her crucial yet enigmatic role in the Gospels, and was taken to dizzying heights in medieval exegesis.¹ The evidence set out in Part One demonstrates that there was a striking number and variety of images of the Virgin in both Durham cathedral priory and York Minster, both in terms of their locations and their iconographies, yet also several examples where either location or iconography are uncertain or unknown, such as, respectively, the Assumption image donated by 'Lord Scrope' and the Virgin at the Red Chest in York Minster. The concentration of images which were associated with altars and chapels, often, but not always, dedicated to the Virgin is also notable. This is particularly the case at Durham, where images of the Virgin were associated with at least five altars (the high altar, Our Lady of Boulton's altar, Our Lady of Pity in the nave, St Saviour in the nave, and Our Lady of Pity in the Galilee Chapel). The number of images which were sited at locations which can be characterised as thresholds in both interiors is also arresting.

This chapter will firstly explore the High Altar images of the Virgin, also including discussion of portable images of Mary, evidence for which we have in at least one instance in relation specifically to the high altar at York. Secondly, it will discuss the images sited in spaces dedicated to the Virgin at both York and Durham in relation to the architectural phenomenon of the Lady Chapel, and finally, the chapter will consider the images of the Virgin sited at 'threshold' locations. It will examine the interplay between the emphasis on different facets of the Virgin's identity, the images' locations, and their potential audiences.

¹ Graef, 1985: 174; 229-33.

This structure cuts through image complexes of which the Virgin was a part, such as the Rood Group. However, it does draw attention to the potential for an accumulation of images of the Virgin, and/or construction of Marian images complexes across a variety of media, within different spaces at both institutions.

6.ii *High Altar Images of the Virgin*

Part One set out evidence for images of the Virgin associated with the high altars of both York and Durham. At York, an image of the Virgin is referred to in the c.1300 *Statutes*, and in later sources is noted as being stood on the south side of the high altar. It is referred to in various sources: the fabric rolls, which note the cost of four candelabras to be placed before the image, Robert Este's will, bequeathing 20 marks to the image's gilding in 1493, and the 1519 Presentment, which notes that candles before the image were sometimes not lit during services. This image can likely be identified with that in the c.1500 inventory, for which a (lenten) cloth is listed. However, the only evidence for the image of the Virgin associated with the high altar at Durham is in the *Rites*, which states that it was made of alabaster and 'right on' the altar, flanked by saints Cuthbert and Oswald, usually taken to mean that they filled the Neville Screen's central three tabernacles.

The different placement of the high altar Virgins at the two institutions is suggestive of their relative status. At Durham, the Virgin was the co-dedicattee of the cathedral priory, along with St Cuthbert.² That the Virgin was the *principal* dedicattee at Durham is suggested not just in the order of the dedication, mirroring her higher theological status in relation to St Cuthbert, but also by the *Rites*, which notes that 'the principall feast...was the assumption of our lady'.³ The only reference to changes in the visual presentation of the high altar at Durham in relation to the important feast of the Assumption is that the 'dayly ornaments that were hunge both before the altar and aboue' were changed from their customary 'red uelutt', embroidered with flowers and 'many goodly pictures besides', to those of 'white damaske', decorated with pearls and precious stones, making them 'more rich and gorgeous to behould'.⁴ These were apt in colour and material in

² Arnold-Foster, 1899, I: 19; III: 111.

³ *Rites*: 7. On this feast in relation to other Marian feasts see Graef, 1985: 133-38.

⁴ *Ibid.*

relation to the Virgin and the Assumption: white was associated with purity, and pearls and the precious stones evocative of the heavenly Jerusalem into which she was assumed (Rev. 19-21).⁵ This suggests that the connotations of the ornaments may have encouraged the image of the Virgin to be viewed on the feast day as Queen of Heaven, amongst whom would number saints Cuthbert and Oswald, whose images were flanking hers. This would be even more vividly suggested to the monks at the high altar and in choir during their celebration of the liturgy on this day, particularly during the *Sanctus* of mass, when they would be able to identify themselves with the angelic host with whom they joined in the song.

This use of textiles suggests that the connotations of image complexes and their surrounding area could be modified not by any change in the images' physical appearance, but in that of the surrounding material culture. This, we can propose, was especially pragmatic if the image of the Virgin were housed in one of the tabernacles of the Neville Screen, as any modification of the image itself would be difficult. It also provides a contrast to the use of textiles in the form of garments used to dress images of the Virgin which corresponded to the colours of the liturgical calendar. Although no colours are given for the garments listed in the York inventories in relation to the Lady Chapel Virgin and Child, it is a distinct possibility that they were to be used at different points during the liturgical year, as evidence for different coloured garments from the parochial context suggests.⁶

The *Rites* does not specify the iconography of the image of the Virgin at the high altar, and no details are given in the c.1603 description of the stained glass of the depiction of the Virgin in the central light in the easternmost Neville chantry chapel window, whose iconographical programme may have mirrored that of the high altar arrangement (see p.155). There is a slim possibility that the high altar image may have been, by the time the *Rites* author(s) encountered it, a depiction of the Assumption, the Coronation, or an elision of the two, with the Virgin crowned, and that the textiles were especially enhancing an already established, ever-present, image of the Virgin in her role as Queen of Heaven. This would not be out of place considering that the Coronation was present at Durham in the Galilee Chapel wall painting from c.1300, and the increasing

⁵ Woolgar, 2006: 162-63.

⁶ Marks, 2004: 201; 203.

popularity of the iconography in England into the fifteenth century, which may have made it suitable as the iconography of the alabaster high altar Virgin.⁷ However, Salisbury, a secular institution dedicated specifically to the Assumption of the Virgin, and whose Marian images we shall discuss further below, does not appear to have had an image of this iconography associated with the high altar.⁸

The c.1603 text lists some stained glass images simply as ‘our blessed Lady’, whereas others add the specific detail ‘with Christ in her armes’.⁹ However, the description of the image in the window of the altar of Our Lady of Boulton mentions only a ‘golden mase’ in her hand, suggesting that the author of the description of the glass was not noting down every Virgin and Child as such, and that we should not discount the presence of a Christ-child in the Neville window depiction, or indeed as part of the high altar image’s iconography, despite its absence in the written record.¹⁰

Furthermore, we know that a two-dimensional Anglo-Saxon Marian image of great significance was in close proximity to the high altar at Durham: the Virgin and Child incised onto St Cuthbert’s coffin (698, Fig.106). Though not visible due to the coffin’s enclosure in at least one other wooden container by the time of its translation to the area behind the high altar in 1104, its continued imaginative importance to the institution throughout the late medieval period should not be underestimated.¹¹ The description of the iconography of the shrine cover in the Hunter 45 manuscript of the *Rites* notes that it depicted a Virgin and Child on its west end, suggesting that it may have been modelled on knowledge of the depiction on the coffin, which was also at one of its ends.¹² The *Gesta Abbatum*’s description of the St Albans *feretrum* notes that it also depicted a

⁷ Marks, 2004: 148 (primarily on the Assumption); see Zarnecki, 1950 and Heslop, 2005, for discussions of the origin of this iconography in England, and Morgan, 1994 on the development in the fifteenth century of the iconography of the Virgin crowned by the Trinity. More recently, as part of a wider consideration of the theological and visual development of the idea of the bodily Assumption, Schmitt has discussed the emergence of simultaneous depictions of the Assumption and Coronation, often shown in a lower and an upper register respectively, in manuscript illuminations of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. See Schmitt, 2006, esp. 170-76.

⁸ Wordsworth, 1901: 160.

⁹ For example, compare paragraphs one and three, *Rites*: 109.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*: 113.

¹¹ Kitzinger, 1956: 203. The importance of this depiction in the context of Anglo-Saxon sculpted Virgin and Child images has been discussed by Jane Hawkes, who has argued that its closest extant iconographic parallel is the late eighth-century Dewsbury fragment, and speculates that knowledge of St Cuthbert’s shrine and its importance in the pre-Viking period may have influenced the carving of the fragment. Hawkes, 1997: 118, 127-28.

¹² *Rites*: 4-5; Kitzinger, 1956: 203-07; 248-64.

Virgin and Child on its west end, raising the possibility that this was a common iconography for this location on a shrine or a shrine cover, yet we also cannot discount the idea that St Cuthbert's coffin was a touchstone for this practice.¹³ Moreover, while the Durham shrine cover's iconographical scheme recorded in the *Rites* does not exactly mirror that of the coffin, they do share a number of iconographic traits, suggesting there was perhaps some deliberate desire to allude to the coffin's scheme.¹⁴

The orchestrated visibility of the cover's Virgin and Child, and the shrine itself, is indicated by the *Rites*' descriptions of the workings of the cover and of the altar at the shrine's west end. They state that the altar was served only on St Cuthbert's day: on this feast, and others, 'in the time of deuine seruice they were accustomed to drawe the couer of St Cuthberts shrine'.¹⁵ As in the case of other late medieval shrines, cords and loops of iron were attached to the shrine cover and a pulley system was used to raise the cover, with bells also attached so that people were alerted to the uncovering.¹⁶ The cover is said to have had at each corner two rings 'made fast, which runn vp and downe on fower staves of Iron when itt was in drawinge vpp which staves were fest to every corner of ye Marble yt St Cuthbert's coffin did lye vpon'. This is presumably an allusion to the shrine base paid for by John Neville, but it is unlikely that the original coffin itself was exposed, considering Reginald of Durham's description of the coffin itself being placed in a wooden container and then an outer coffin.¹⁷ The cover 'was locke [sic] to keepe it close but att such tymes as was fitt to show itt'.¹⁸

¹³ Riley, 1867-69: I, 189.

¹⁴ The coffin's incised iconography depicted twelve figures of apostles and five archangels respectively on each of its long sides; the Virgin and Child on one of its ends, with the other end depicting the archangels Gabriel and Michael. A Christ in Majesty was incised on the coffin lid, surrounded by the symbols of the Evangelists. The iconography of the shrine cover in the *Rites* is described as gilded, with four 'lively' images on either side; Christ in Judgement, seated on a rainbow, on its east end, suggesting an iconographically similar, yet differently placed, image to that on the coffin lid; a 'picture of our Lady and our Saviour on her knee' on the cover's west end, and the top of the cover showing 'carved worke cutt owte' with dragons and other beasts. Kitzinger, 1956: 203-212; *Rites*, 5.

¹⁵ *Rites*: 4.

¹⁶ Similar systems were in use at Christ Church, Canterbury, Westminster Abbey, Winchester, and, most infamously, at Bury St Edmunds, where the ropes burnt through during the 1465 fire, sending the cover down over St Edmund's shrine, thus leaving him 'walled about in fire, as in an oven...[yet] scathless'. See Nilson, 1998: 40, and for Bury St Edmunds, James, 1895: 207, 210.

¹⁷ Raine, 1835: 90. I am grateful to Dr Jane Hawkes for this reference.

¹⁸ *Rites*: 5.

These descriptions suggest that the shrine cover's Virgin and Child was visible to pilgrims and to the community when in the shrine area. Nilson has convincingly questioned the assumption of previous scholars such as Coldstream that shrines were visible from the areas further west, especially the choir and presbytery,¹⁹ and because of the height and solidity of high altar screens such as the Neville Screen, we should be cautious in suggesting any visibility of the shrine cover in the presbytery and choir when it was on its base. However, it would perhaps be partially visible west of the screen when the cover was raised, as the hanging of the contemporary shrine cover demonstrates (Fig.4). The Virgin and Child would therefore hover above or behind the Neville Screen, providing an imaginative, if not necessarily clearly discernible, complement to the high altar image complex, reinforcing the relationship between the Virgin and the other dedicatees of the institution. The associations would be particularly strong if the high altar image of the Virgin were in fact a Virgin and Child, replicating the basic iconography of the west end of the shrine cover and the coffin itself.

Alabaster became fashionable in the cathedral context during the middle of the fourteenth century and was used as a medium for high-status tomb effigies and sculpture.²⁰ The use of this medium for the high altar Virgin suggests a desire on the part of the institution, and, perhaps also John Neville, to ensure that the high altar was fittingly arrayed with a Marian image that enjoyed rich temporal and spiritual connotations, perhaps while retaining the institutionally significant iconography of the Virgin and Child. As well as alabaster being considered precious in itself, as Nigel Ramsay has noted, it could also be evocative of the characterisation of the Virgin in monastic writings as *turris eburnea*, a factor cited by Richard Marks as pertinent in relation to the fourteenth-century trend for white and unpolychromed sculpture, including those images of the Virgin known as *Albae Mariae*, and a tradition in which the Durham high altar image of the Virgin should perhaps also be seen.²¹ The high altar image's gilding, and the colour on the Neville Screen itself, may well have made any unadorned alabaster more visually arresting.²² It is not inconceivable that the Toldeo Cathedral *Virgen*

¹⁹ Nilson, 1998: 81-86; Coldstream, 1976: 16, 23.

²⁰ Ramsay, 1991: 36, 29.

²¹ *Ibid.*: 29; Marks, 2004: 154-56.

²² This point of the contrast between the alabaster and polychromy and gilding is made more generally by Marks, 2004: 156.

Blanca (second half of the fourteenth century) or a similar continental image, provided inspiration for the Durham high altar image, considering John Neville's travels in France and Spain.

The presence of a freestanding, semi-polychromed alabaster Virgin and Child at the parish church of St Edmund's, Blunham, Bedfordshire and dating from c.1350 (Fig.107) suggests that Durham was not necessarily at the forefront of this innovation in material, although Blunham's association with the priory of Bury St Edmunds provides a possible Benedictine provenance for the image, and may explain its early appearance in this context.²³ Prior Fossor's commission of alabaster images of the Virgin and the Trinity for the altar of saints Nicholas and Giles in 1374 suggests a similar desire to make use of this fashionable material in the context of preparations for his death, and it may well be that we should detect Fossor's influence, either in life or posthumously, in the choice of the alabaster images at the high altar as much, or perhaps even more so, than John Neville's.

The arrangement of images at the high altar described in the *Rites* may have been similar to that which was in place before its installation in 1380. This has been suggested in general terms by Christopher Wilson's argument for the enclosure of images in reredoses during the fourteenth century,²⁴ but also specifically in relation to the Neville Screen by David Park. Park has posited that the arrangement of images in the north central aisle altar recess of the Galilee Chapel originally included a sculpted marian image, later replaced with the image of Our Lady of Pity described in the *Rites*, flanked by the extant painted images of saints Cuthbert and Oswald on the jambs of the north central aisle altar recess, and therefore 'mirroring' a high altar arrangement.²⁵ Certainly evidence from elsewhere, cited by Marks in connection with the proliferation of Marian images in the parish context, suggests that this arrangement, or a forerunner of it, especially the presence of an image of the Virgin, may have been in place at the high altar at Durham as early as the late twelfth century. Most notable is the association of an image of the Virgin with the high altar at the secular cathedral of Old Sarum, another institution dedicated to her, as early as c.1179.²⁶ Also of importance is the association of images of the Virgin with principal altars in

²³ Marks, 2004: 69. On the church at Blunham, see Page, 1912.

²⁴ Wilson, 1980: 95.

²⁵ Park, 1990: 22; 1993: 62.

²⁶ '*...alterium iuxta magnum altare ante imaginem s. Mariae...*', *L-B* II: 483 (4064).

parish churches dedicated to her in the south of England from as early as the late twelfth century, and certainly by the mid thirteenth century.²⁷

However, there is evidence that images of the Virgin and Child were associated with altars dedicated to her in England from as early as the first quarter of the eleventh century, and in a high-status monastic context. The *Liber Eliensis* states that during the time of Abbot Aelfsige (d. c.1019), a laymen named Leofwine financed work on the south wall of the church and commissioned an altar in honour of the Virgin.²⁸ Above it stood a gold, silver, and gem-encrusted Virgin and Child, the throne being ‘as long as a man’ (*tronum ad longitudinem hominis*) and ‘of inestimable price due to its size’ (*inaestimabilis praetii...magnitudine videbatur*), but subsequently destroyed by William I.²⁹ A later chapter of the *Liber Eliensis* states that a gold and silver image of the Virgin and Child, seated in a throne and of ‘marvelous workmanship’ (*mirabiliter fabrefactam*), was commissioned by Abbot Aelfsige and taken by William, though its description suggests it may have been Leofwine’s image: this says something about the potential for the blurring of lines in regard to the attribution of patronage, and is worth remembering in relation to Fossor and Neville.³⁰

The dedication of the cathedral priory at Durham to the Virgin, and her presence in the form of images on the high altar and in the Galilee by 1200, would be apt in light of the increasing importance of the Virgin in the liturgical and devotional life of the Benedictines during the twelfth century.³¹ As Morgan has noted, throughout the century, the theological and devotional writings of Anselm on Mary had a notable influence in monastic spheres, and importantly for our purposes, Anselm’s *Orationes* appear in two manuscripts of devotional texts which have been associated with twelfth-century Durham, one of which has been dated to as early as c.1125, suggesting that an Anselmian influence may have helped to fuel the visual presence of the Virgin there.³²

²⁷ Marks, 2004: 73.

²⁸ Fairweather, 2005: 156-58.

²⁹ *L-B I*, 1530: 414. Dodwell, 1982: 215, notes that if the throne were ‘as long as a man’, then the image of the Virgin must have been around seven foot high: this is possibly an exaggeration.

³⁰ *L-B I*, 1551: 419.

³¹ Morgan, 1999: 122-23; Greatrex, 2004: 160-61. On the influence of this in the parochial context, see Marks, 2004: 42.

³² Morgan, 1999: 127. The manuscripts are Cambridge, Jesus College MS 76 and London, Society of Antiquaries MS 7. The latter was in the Cathedral Library at Durham by the fourteenth century; an earlier association with Durham is proposed by Bestul, in light of the highlighting and

The York arrangement, suggested by the *Statutes* and the twin Lenten cloths for the Virgin and St Peter, and more clearly by Robert Este's reference to the image of the Virgin '*stantis ad finem magni altaris...ex parte australi*', is typical of that which became customary during the mid to late thirteenth century in England, in which the patron saint stood to the north of the altar and the Virgin, if she was not the patron saint, to the south, or to the north if she was: this, as Marks notes, is recorded as early as 1240 at the royal chapel of St Peter ad Vincula in the Tower of London, where earlier images of both were *in situ*, although their arrangement unknown.³³ In the nineteenth-century, Waterton and Browne both regarded the high altar as being primarily associated with the Virgin, based on the evidence of the candles being lit before her image during services.³⁴ The Virgin may have had some kind of quasi-patronal status, or the vestige of it, as well as carrying connotations of the Church Universal, which Marks has suggested for images of the Virgin usually residing in this position.³⁵ An Anglo-Saxon church of St Mary in the vicinity of the cathedral is noted in the eighth-century work of Alcuin, and Christopher Norton has suggested that this was on the site of the later chapel of St Mary and All Angels, to the south of the Anglo-Saxon cathedral dedicated to St Peter, and to the north of its Romanesque replacement (Plan 16).³⁶ A dual connotation of the local and universal for both the images of the Virgin and St Peter, the latter on the north side of the high altar, would also be apt in relation to the wider theme of the place of York Minster within the wider Church that pervaded the decoration of the fifteenth-century east end of the cathedral, as explored in the previous chapter (see pp.127-37). We shall explore this point further in relation to St Peter in the next chapter.

As suggested in Part One, one of the images of the Virgin listed in the c.1500 inventory may be the same as that listed in the will of Henry, Lord Scrope, which he bequeathed specifically to the high altar. Was this bequest intended to be a new south-side high altar image of the Virgin? The date of Henry's will, 1415, means that the bequest was made as the new high altar and its surroundings

capitalisation of Cuthbert's name in the two prayers addressed to him. See Bestul's introduction to his edition of MS 7: Bestul, 1987: 10,11,13.

³³ Marks, 2004: 61; 73.

³⁴ Browne, 1847: I, 175; Waterton, 1879: I, 80.

³⁵ Marks, 2004: 77.

³⁶ Norton, 1998a: 14.

were being constructed,³⁷ and it is possible that it was intended thus.

Alternatively, it was perhaps intended as part of an image complex comprising the Virgin and saints Peter, Paul, and John the Baptist *additional* to the patronal and Marian image combination at either side of the high altar. The Nevilles' part-financing of the Neville Screen, and most likely the images associated with it, therefore suggests a precedent for the Scrope bequest in location if not necessarily function, and similar patterns of patronage in relation to these two noble families.

The c.1500 inventory's description of a silver-gilt image of the Virgin 'which the *ebdomadarius* carries daily to mass at the high altar, weighing 5lbs, 11 ounces' is also likely to be an additional image of the Virgin from that mentioned in Este's will. The description suggests a similarity in function to the two-sided oak 'Doppelrelief' of the Virgin and St Stephen from Halberstadt's cathedral of saints Stephen and Sixtus (beginning of the fifteenth century; Fig.108), which was designed to be placed on a pole and used in processions on feast days, evocative of the saints 'floating' in heaven above the community and congregation.³⁸

However, unlike the dual Halberstadt image, which reinforced the association of the Virgin and one of the institution's patronal saints, the regular procession to the high altar with this image of the Virgin at York and no similar evidence for the procession of an image of St Peter potentially provides further evidence of the Virgin's particularly high status at York.

Although the evidence from York does not state that the image was placed on the high altar after its procession, evidence from elsewhere suggests this is likely to have been the case, further characterising the high altar as a site which regularly displayed multiple images of the Virgin. A 'silver gilt image of the Virgin weighing 4lb which he wished to be used on the high altar on major feasts' was bequeathed to Salisbury by William Aiscough, bishop from 1438 to 1450, for example.³⁹

This evidence from York and Salisbury also suggests that the availability of portable as well as permanently-sited images in the cathedral context enabled a change to the visual emphasis of the high altar *through an image*, rather than through the surrounding material culture modifying an extant image, as we have

³⁷ Brown, 2003: 208-09.

³⁸ Meller et. al., 2008: cat. no. 103; 346.

³⁹ Tatton-Brown, Lepine & Saul, 2013: 86. On the image of the Virgin usually at the high altar, see Reeve, 2008: 92-4.

suggested was the case at Durham. In addition, it highlights that in the case of portable images, it was precisely their potential for physical movement from one space to another, and the devotional and/or liturgical context within which this happened, which could deliberately encourage the ‘liturgically structured’ and/or ‘devotional’ responses which Williamson has elucidated, just as much as any flexible elements of the images’ iconography could encourage eucharistic and/or other devotional responses of a static image.⁴⁰ Indeed, this evidence from York suggests that there could also perhaps be images designated specifically for liturgical use, though this does not preclude devotional responses to them.

The processional use of such images at York is noticeably more frequent than that stipulated in the Salisbury bequest. However, it was perhaps by this very stipulation that Aiscough believed his bequest would have the most effect, meaning that his memory was inserted into the liturgy on the grandest liturgical occasions of the year, a feat comparable to that of the Nevilles at Durham in the use of the crucifix from Our Lady of Boulton during the Good Friday Creeping to the Cross. Here it is useful to note Christopher Norton’s suggestion that the images of the Annunciation and the Assumption in the c.1500 inventory at York, both bearing the Scrope arms, were images to be used at the high altar on certain occasions, along with a set of red tapestries and white hangings, and a carpet, again all bearing the Scrope arms and also recorded in the inventory.⁴¹ These unspecified ‘occasions’ may be taken to mean the relevant feast days of the Virgin: but would the community’s portable image of the Virgin be replaced by these on such days? It is particularly difficult to imagine the procession of the individual components of the Annunciation images of the Virgin, Gabriel, and the silver lily-pot, and it may be that these images were set up on the altar before the liturgy, acting as a kind of ‘moveable altarpiece’. In this context, the community’s image of the Virgin might retain its processional function, adding further to the potential Marian image complex on, and in the vicinity of, the high altar.

This consideration of Marian images at the high altar of both institutions, and particularly the multiple images of the Virgin at York Minster’s high altar, invites consideration of images in liturgical spaces particularly associated with the Virgin, and it is to these which we shall now turn.

⁴⁰ Williamson, 2004: 381; 383.

⁴¹ Norton, 2007: 196-97.

6.iii. *Lady Chapels and Their Images*

The indenture between de Thoresby and the Minster's Chapter of 20 July 1361, which, as Brown has noted, specifically mentions that there was 'no place suitable for the becoming celebration of the daily mass of the Virgin Mary', indicates that the new Lady Chapel at York was conceived as a space for the liturgical commemoration of the Virgin from the outset.⁴² The evidence for a designated Lady Chapel at Durham is not as clear cut, as Peter Draper has outlined.⁴³ In a charter dated to c.1180-89, Beatrice de Dyttneshale and her husband and son grant lights to burn around the body of St Cuthbert, and Beatrice is noted as signing it '*super altare Beate Marie in occidentali parte ejusdem ecclesie que Gililea [sic] vocatur*' rather than '*super altare Beati Cuthberti in ecclesia sua*', as is recorded in relation to her husband and son.⁴⁴ This indicates that although there was an altar dedicated to the Virgin there, it was known as 'the Galilee'. The account of Le Puiset's work in the chronicle of Geoffrey of Coldingham (d. c.1215), in which the work is said to have first been undertaken at the east end and moved to the west because of Cuthbert's displeasure, manifest in the cracks in the walls of the east work, does not specify it as being a Lady Chapel, though as Draper notes, 'there is no reason why the intended campaign should not have included provision for a Lady Chapel as well as improving access to the shrine [of St Cuthbert]'.⁴⁵ Yet the *Rites* suggests that the Galilee was regarded as a *de facto* Lady Chapel by the time of the Dissolution, being the location of the daily Lady mass, and implies that by then it was understood as always having been conceived as such: 'no Chappell being then erected to ye blessed Virgin Marie' at the time of its building by Le Puiset in the late twelfth century.⁴⁶

Draper's article provides a broad approach to the increasing trend for Lady chapels in the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries, in contrast to the more usual discussion of individual Lady chapels, in articles or as part of wider histories of individual cathedrals, which concentrate on their architecture.⁴⁷

⁴² Brown, 2003: 164; Raine, 1859: 174-75; Browne, 1847: I, 148-49.

⁴³ Draper, 1990: 137.

⁴⁴ Surtees, 1816-40: III, 393.

⁴⁵ *Scriptores Tres*: 11; Draper, 1990: 137.

⁴⁶ *Rites*: 43. Harrison, 1994: 213, notes that the chapel is usually dated to c.1175, but its use of chevron indicates that it could be closer to c.1165.

⁴⁷ For example, Coldstream, 1985; Maddison, 2003: 124-27; Bowers, 1993.

Importantly, he notes that the evidence from institutions such as Durham and Salisbury, where the east chapel was dedicated to the Trinity yet was the location of the Lady Mass, indicates that the Lady chapel as a discrete physical and abstract construction could be less than clear-cut in some important cases. Yet whilst linking the provision of space, whether formally or informally, with the increasing liturgical prominence of the Virgin, Draper does not address fully the relationship between Lady chapels and images of the Virgin within them. His only reference is to the addition of images to the altar of the Virgin at St Albans under Abbot William of Trumpton (d.1235), where ‘the new Lady chapel was not begun for some fifty years’ after this, thereby seemingly disassociating the two.⁴⁸

The relationship between Lady chapels and their images is also notably absent from Hearn and Willis’s discussion of the iconography of Salisbury’s Trinity Chapel as a Lady Chapel. They refer to the sumptuous decor and liturgy of many Lady chapels and their ‘lack of traditional church furniture such as stalls’, which combined to ‘promote an anagogical experience in the worshipper’,⁴⁹ but do not explore this potentially rich avenue of thought in relation to the interior fabric of Salisbury or any other great church, despite the fact that the chapels at Glastonbury and Walsingham, which they identify as models of the Holy Houses at Jerusalem and Nazareth, and which they argue acted as models for subsequent English Lady chapels, both housed miracle-working images of the Virgin.⁵⁰

In light of this gap in previous scholarship, and the wider theme of the Virgin’s various identities and roles, the evidence from York and Durham allows us to consider the presence of images of the Virgin in these spaces, their multiplicity and relative statuses, and their interaction with other media. It is noticeable that at York there appears to have been an accretion of images, a point also suggested by the fourteenth-century continuation of the *Chronica pontificum ecclesiae Eboracensis*, traditionally attributed to the Dominican Thomas Stubbs (fl.1343-81), which vividly describes how de Thoresby’s new Lady Chapel ‘*mirabili artis sculptura, atque notabili pictura peregit*’ (‘was carved with

⁴⁸ Draper, 1990: 141.

⁴⁹ Hearn & Willis, 1996: 40-41.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*

wonderous skill and painted with remarkable pictures').⁵¹ The evidence from Durham suggests a more complex chronology, and a pattern of accretion and replacement coloured by the absence of an architecturally central altar of the Virgin in the Galilee for most of our period until Langley's chantry chapel, which meant the Galilee then had two altars dedicated to the Virgin in the space. The *Rites*' lack of description of the Marian imagery in relation to Langley's chapel, in comparison to the altar of Our Lady of Pity in the north central aisle, importantly suggests that physical centrality did not necessarily mean devotional centrality, though this could depend on audience.

Draper has suggested that Hugh Le Puiset was perhaps particularly conscious of the provision of space for the veneration of the Virgin, in light of the fact that the late eleventh-century axial chapel at Winchester, where he had previously been archdeacon, may have been a Lady Chapel, therefore providing him with a precedent.⁵² Yet wider consideration of Le Puiset's biography gives us further reason to suggest he might have been particularly keen to provide space for the Virgin's veneration, and especially an image of the Virgin as a devotional and visual focus. He was Archdeacon of the East Riding and Treasurer of York Minster under Willam Fitzherbert, c.1143, when the extant image of the *Sedes sapientiae* was perhaps already in place (see p.105). Moreover, his hometown of Le Puiset lay only 38km south-east of Chartres, where devotion to the relic of the Virgin's tunic (given c.970) and the image of Notre-Dame-Sous-Terre, dated to c.1029 by Ilene Forsyth,⁵³ were integral to the cathedral dedicated in 1037.⁵⁴ The image was a *Sedes sapientiae*, as seventeenth-century textual and visual sources indicate (Fig.109), and a pilgrim badge from the twelfth-century suggests it was processed by being carried on a litter (Fig.110).⁵⁵

This important continental precedent, which surely would have been known to Hugh, as well as the Minster *Sedes sapientiae*, can be cited as additional reasons why a precursor to the image of Our Lady of Pity in the north central aisle of the Galilee Chapel may have been a sculpture rather than a painting. Park has suggested a sculpted *Hodegetria*, 'perhaps set beneath a canopy', as most likely to

⁵¹ Raine, 1879-94: II, 484, ls. 525-26.

⁵² Draper, 1990: 138-39.

⁵³ Forsyth, 1972: 110-11

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*: 106. On Hugh's biography, see Barrow, 2004.

⁵⁵ Forsyth, 1972: 107-08.

have been the iconography of the image, due to its ‘more satisfactory’ composition than a *Sedes sapientiae*, which he regards as too small in relation to the standing figures of St Cuthbert and St Oswald in the jambs of the recess.⁵⁶ However, these precedents, and the fact that a number of twelfth and early thirteenth-century extant *Sedes sapientiae* are over a metre high, suggests that we should not discount this iconography, especially as its usually elongated shape would suit the space between the surviving painted drapery.⁵⁷

To some extent the imagery of Bishop Anthony Bek’s seal reinforces Halsey’s suggestion that the chapel may have belonged to the bishop rather than the priory, as it shows Bek in a seated pose flanked by images of Cuthbert and Oswald, therefore perhaps echoing the arrangement of a centrally-placed *Sedes sapientiae*; the reverse of the seal certainly does echo the arrangement of the Coronation wall painting above, as David Park has noted (Fig.111).⁵⁸ However, the presence of collection box receipts within the sacristy’s rolls underlines the monastic community’s continued involvement in the space, and particularly with its images, until the sixteenth century. The presence of a sculpted *Sedes sapientiae* in the Galilee from the twelfth century was therefore perhaps a combined product of the importance accorded to Mary specifically in relation to her role at Durham, as the principal dedicatee, but also its cathedral priory status, bringing together Le Puiset’s acquaintance with specific extant *Sedes sapientiae* at secular institutions such as Chartres and York, and her importance in the wider textual and visual devotional life of the Benedictines in the twelfth century.

This presents a more complex history of transmission of devotion to the Virgin and images of her to that which Nigel Morgan has discussed principally as emanating from Benedictine to secular institutions and then to the laity, and principally through the media of manuscript illumination.⁵⁹ Rather, the ‘Le Puiset connection’ suggests that transmission could work the other way, and also highlights the potential importance of sculpture as a mode of this transmission. It is certainly reasonable to suggest that sculpture would have been far *more*

⁵⁶ Park, 1990: 22. For fourteenth-century examples of this iconography, see Foregeard, 1995.

⁵⁷ Forsyth, 1972: 156-203; nos. 87, 90, 103, (*La Diège*), 105, (*Notre-Dame de Saint-Denis*), 108 (*Notre-Dame de Nantilly*).

⁵⁸ Halsey, 1980: 62, and see also Cambridge, 1992: 22-23. Park, 1990:23.

⁵⁹ Morgan, 1999, esp. 134-36.

important as an accessible medium of transmission to lay society than the psalters Morgan examines in detail.

Hugh Le Puiset and Roger de Pont l'Évêque have both been characterised as 'bent on self-aggrandizement' during their overlapping time in ecclesiastical power.⁶⁰ In this light, we can suggest that the building of the Galilee Chapel, if it was intended to provide space for veneration of the Virgin, might possibly have been a response to the recent addition of a Lady Chapel at crypt level at the east end of York Minster.⁶¹ Norton has proposed that documentary evidence recording a fire in the Minster in 1137 (*conflagratio*) actually refers to the consecration of this Lady Chapel (*consacratio*).⁶² Within this architectural context at York we can explore possibly the most arresting evidence for images of the Virgin in our two institutions. This is the *Sedes sapientiae* relief found in the east wall of York Minster, and the chantry inventory listings of an image of the Virgin and Child 'in alabaster' associated with the Percy/Thoresby chantry at the Virgin's altar in the Lady Chapel, its garments, its crowns, the silver plates for the Virgin's feet, and the necklaces and rings which were most likely *ex-votos*, as indicated by the bequests of similar items in the wills of Thomas Karr and John Carre to the same image.

The possible origin and preserved but damaged state of the extant *Sedes sapientiae* merit some comment. Norton has suggested that it is the original Virgin and Child image from the twelfth-century Lady Chapel in the east end.⁶³ The niche in which the York *Sedes sapientiae* was found, sited at eye-level to the north of the altar of the Virgin, is an original feature of the wall of de Thoresby's fourteenth-century Lady Chapel, and accommodated the image exactly, suggesting it was set there deliberately.⁶⁴ Rather than being a damaged or redundant image 'to be done away with', or used as 'rubble-filling' after being the target of iconoclasts, as Richard Marks has suggested, it seems that it was either placed there for the purposes of display, perhaps from the mid-fourteenth century

⁶⁰ Barrow, 2004: 526.

⁶¹ Norton, 'The Minster in 1212': Public Lecture, University of York, 29th November 2012.

⁶² *Ibid.*; Norton sets out the evidence for a consecration, but does not link it specifically to a new Lady Chapel in Norton, 1998b: esp. 198; 203-04.

⁶³ Norton, 'The Minster in 1212', 2012.

⁶⁴ I am grateful to Prof. Norton for this suggestion, and details of the relationship between the size of the image and niche, and the nature of the niche itself, which is currently inaccessible due to the restoration of the east window.

until being damaged at the Reformation, a theory Norton supports, or carefully ‘interred’ when de Thorseby’s Lady Chapel was built.⁶⁵

The missing heads and hands are suggestive of the image being ‘killed’, but could also be interpreted as a mode of ‘decommissioning’. Pamela Graves has drawn attention to the late medieval and early modern importance of the head and the hands in theological and social discourse, and argues that this importance was mirrored in the importance of the head and hands as favoured *loci* of punishment within the legal system, and thus contributed to both body parts being particular targets for iconoclasts.⁶⁶ However, this discourse also suggests another explanation for the partial destruction of the *Sedes sapientiae*. It was perhaps not deemed apt for the fourteenth-century Lady Chapel, and so its ‘life-signifiers’ ritually removed: unlike a wooden image, which could be burned, incorporation into the east wall might have been deemed a fitting place of rest for a stone relief, but also a salient marker of continuity between the old and the new.⁶⁷

A useful counterpart to the possible history and status of this image that accentuates the relative value that could be placed on old images is the way the South Cerney fragments of the head and right foot of Christ were, as Marks has recently noted, ‘carefully preserved and incorporated into the wall of the church’.⁶⁸ This, combined with the lack of repainting, has led him to suggest that they were ‘walled up’ not at the time of the Reformation, but at the end of the twelfth century when architectural changes and enlargement of the church would have necessitated a larger *Triumphkreuz*.⁶⁹ Evident wear of the small toe of the foot fragment has led Marks to propose it may have been caused by touching and kissing in acts of devotion, and the image to have been particularly venerated, the fragments being retained perhaps because they were ‘considered as relics’ and, when interred, took on ‘a new function as agents of sacred continuity’.⁷⁰

Perhaps the most pressing question raised by the York evidence, and Norton’s theory of its placement, is whether the *Sedes sapientiae* and the Virgin and Child in the documentary sources, notably the chantry inventories and wills,

⁶⁵ Marks, 2004: 258.

⁶⁶ Graves, 2008: 37; 40-43.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*: 42; 39. The phrase ‘life-signifiers’ is one she borrows from Camille, 1989: 318.

⁶⁸ Marks, 2012a: 192.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*: 192, 204.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*

could in fact be the *same* object? Norton has suggested this may be the case,⁷¹ and Daw has argued that the missing heads could possibly have accommodated crowns, the description of the Virgin and Child being made from alabaster in the c.1420 inventory ‘presumably an error’ caused by the object being painted and dressed.⁷²

However, there is no clear evidence on the *Sedes sapientiae* for fittings or fastenings for the garment, offerings, or silver plates listed for the Virgin in the inventories. Draping garments and jewelery would not be out of the question, as the decoration of Siena cathedral’s *Madonna del Voto* suggests (Fig.112), but the lack of depth of the relief, and the indented damage to the back of the area where the Virgin’s head would have been, suggesting the head was not in the round, would make any dressing or crowning of the image difficult (Fig.59).

The wider context of the production of images also suggests the possibility of the *Sedes sapientiae* and the alabaster Virgin and Child as being separate objects, perhaps situated to the north and on the altar itself. As noted above, the mid-fourteenth century was the period in which alabaster was becoming an increasingly fashionable medium, and an alabaster Virgin and Child image at York would be a suitably high-status object, with rich temporal and spiritual connotations, to act as a focus for the Marian liturgy both before and after its installation in de Thoresby’s Lady Chapel.⁷³

An equally high-status donor for the York Virgin and Child, either lay or ecclesiastical, is not recorded in the chantry inventories, but remains a possibility. An obvious candidate would be Archbishop de Thoresby, especially in light of his noted devotion to the Virgin, and his experience as bishop of Worcester (1350-52), where the image of the Virgin above the high altar in the Benedictine priory, attested to in evidence from the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, was most likely already *in situ* and exerting a considerable devotional pull.⁷⁴ Thoresby was certainly keen to foster better devotion in the laity through texts, most notably the *Lay Folk’s Catechism*: it is possible that he was equally keen to foster further

⁷¹ As cited from Pers. comm. in Daw, 2011: 34 and reiterated to the author, Pers. comm., May, 2013.

⁷² Daw, 2011: 34.

⁷³ Ramsay, 1991: 36, 29.

⁷⁴ Brown, 2003: 164; Waterton, 1879: 252.

devotion to the Virgin in the Minster through a new image.⁷⁵ Alternatively, William de la Zouche may have donated the image towards the end of his archiepiscopate, as evidence from September 1351 notes that he introduced a new service in honour of the Virgin.⁷⁶

The garments, crowns, silver plates, and especially the *ex-votos* both on the image and bequeathed to it, beg the question of whether the Virgin and Child was a cult or miracle-working image. For Trexler, garments and other ornaments were central in constructing and retaining the miraculous image's power, not only helping to distinguish it from other images, but at once proving its power and encouraging further adornment.⁷⁷ For Marks, such adornment of a Marian image and its placement in an architecturally distinct Lady Chapel at parish level could render it part of 'a substratum occupying the no-man's-land between cult-image proper and popular devotional image' without further evidence for pilgrimage or miracles associated with it.⁷⁸ Within a definition such as the latter, the Minster image might too be considered part of this 'twilight zone',⁷⁹ but Trexler's interpretation leaves room for us to consider whether the institution was intentionally cultivating the image as already, or potentially, of miraculous status. The offerings in the wills of Karr and Carre, and the absence of any request for pilgrimage to the image in the long list of destinations in the will of Willam Eccop, which includes those images of the Virgin relatively close to York, at Doncaster, Scarborough, and Lincoln, suggest that the Minster Virgin and Child was perhaps only of local importance.⁸⁰ Moreover, it was perhaps regarded as of secondary or supplementary importance in the context of the presence of the shrines of St William and, in especially close proximity to it within the interior from 1405 onwards, the tomb of Archbishop Scrope.

⁷⁵ Simmons and Nolloth: 1901. Hughes, 1988: 143-155, esp. 149-154.

⁷⁶ Dixon and Raine, 1863: 44; Brown, 2003: 164.

⁷⁷ Trexler, 2004: 18; 21. For a study of adornment of the Virgin in the continental context, see Verdi Webster, 2004.

⁷⁸ Marks, 2004: 200-01. For more on Marian cult images, see Kingsford, 1917; Woodruff, 1926; Maniura, 2004 and 2011, and on pilgrimage more widely, Collinson, 1990; Coleman, 1995 and the essays in Coleman and Elsner, 1995. See also Goodich, 2007 for a discussion of the medieval development of the concept of the miracle.

⁷⁹ Marks, 2004: 200.

⁸⁰ *TE III*: 199-201, as mentioned in Marks, 2004: 187. Another Marian image in York was associated with a miracle: see Galbraith, 1927: 106-107 for the Anonimale's account of the miraculous recovery of a girl drowned in the River Ouse at York, who was brought before an image of the Virgin at St Mary's Abbey, prayed over, and on waking from her drowned state credited 'une dame' (the Virgin) for helping and comforting her when she was in the water.

Vincent Gillespie has offered important evidence, hitherto undiscussed from an art-historical perspective, for a potential addition to the York Lady Chapel image complex, which we can suggest by c.1400 may have incorporated images in different media including the *Sedes sapientiae* and the alabaster Virgin and Child, as well as the ‘*tabula alba picta*’ of the Conronation. This offers further scope to consider the relationship between images in different media.⁸¹ A text, in a manuscript of scientific and devotional texts and tables, now in Corpus Christi College, Oxford, and ‘probably’ dating from the second quarter of the fifteenth century, describes five depictions of the Virgin said to be on ‘þe tabyll at our lady auter in þe cathedrall kyrke of yorke’.⁸² As Gillespie notes, in Middle English, it sets out how the Virgin is ‘ymagened in v manner of wysys’: each is described in turn, and the text includes two metaphorical terms for her in relation to each depiction.⁸³ Under each Middle English section are three Latin distiches ‘which gloss and comment’ on the iconography, and in each case the Latin is said to be ‘vndyr her fete’, and therefore forming part of the table.⁸⁴ It is not clear from the texts if the metaphorical terms are supposed to be understood as being written on the table or not.⁸⁵

The unusual iconography is worth setting out in full. The first section describes her holding the ‘tabelis offe moyeses’, with the burning bush and a ‘figure off þe worlde’ under her feet; she is described as ‘*Rubus Moisi*’ and ‘*Domina Mundi*’. The second describes her as holding a lily in one hand and a ‘brange of rosys’ in the other, with a golden gate, ‘sparryd’ (closed) under her feet and ‘a heuen full of *angelis*’; she is ‘*Porta Clausa*’ and ‘*Regina Cely*’. The third shows her with a shield in her arm, with the moon and the ‘arke offe the holde testament’ under her feet; she is described as ‘*Dey Genetryx et Arca Testamenti*’. The fourth shows her holding the ‘wande of aron florischyng and beryng almundys’, with depictions of a temple and ‘many virgynys’ under her feet; she is described as ‘*Templum Salamonys et Virgo Virginum*’. The last states that in one

⁸¹ Gillespie, 1997: 206.

⁸² Oxford, Corpus Christi College, MS 132. Gillespie, 1997: 206. All quotations from this text are taken from Gillespie’s transcription, which has been given here unaltered. See Gillespie, 1997: 228-29.

⁸³ *Ibid.*: 206

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*; 228.

hand she holds a ‘sprynkll’ (a bundle, bunch, or sprinkler for holy water⁸⁶), and in the other a cross, with the tree of life and ‘helle’ under her feet; she is described as ‘Ymparatryx Ynfery et *Lignum Vitae*’.⁸⁷ Two additional sentences are also pertinent in the interpretation of the table: under the fourth section is the sentence ‘Or ellis geue our lady yn here hande yn þys place a stone and þat ys most conuenyent to þys verse’, and at the end of the text ‘Þys ys þe consayte offe þe tabyll, aftyr þe consayte of sum pepyll, and so Amen’.⁸⁸ The former, as Gillespie notes, invites the reader to substitute the fourth Virgin with a different attribute, and the latter’s use of ‘consayte’, especially in the second instance, could suggest either a summary, or a plan of a treatise.⁸⁹ However, importantly, and unmentioned by Gillespie, ‘consayte’ can also mean ‘a work of art’.⁹⁰

Several factors lead Gillespie to suggest a provenance of, and potential audience for, the manuscript among the Minster clergy.⁹¹ However, the lack of corroborating evidence for the table in the Minster archives, the context of the descriptions as part of a sequence of two similar texts describing ‘some memorable and striking visual referent supported by Latin scriptural or patristic quotations’, the unusual verbal and visual presentation of the Virgin, and the cryptic use of semantics about the possible incomplete state of the table, lead him to conclude that it may have been intended to be executed as an artefact, but not completed, or may in fact never have been intended to be one at all; the text may have served as a vehicle for visual meditation on the Virgin, imagined in a familiar historical context through the use of mnemonic.⁹²

Evidence from elsewhere gives more weight to the idea that this was an actual object, or one that intended but never executed. A row of five images of the Virgin, with the epithets ‘*Domina Mundi*’, ‘*Regina Celi*’, ‘*Mater Christi*’, ‘*Mater Ecclesie*’ and ‘*Imperatrix Inferni*’, is recorded in a sketch of the c.1470 East Window of Holy Trinity, Goodramgate, York, by Henry Johnson, c.1670

⁸⁶ *MED*, Part S.13: ‘srenkil(le’, a and b.

⁸⁷ Gillespie, 1997: 207.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*: 229.

⁸⁹ Gillespie, 1997: 223. See *MED*, Part C.4: ‘conceit(e’, 4b and c.

⁹⁰ *MED*, Part C.4: ‘conceit(e’, 4d.

⁹¹ Gillespie, 1997: 208-09.

⁹² *Ibid.*: esp. 212.

(Fig.113).⁹³ Three of these images survive, now moved to other parts of the church and with insertions from other figures, the lower two rows of the east window having been filled with brick c.1729.⁹⁴ The iconographical and textual similarities are particularly striking, reading left to right. In the first light, as in the text, the Virgin is '*Domina Mundi*'; in the second light, she is holding what can be discerned as a lily branch, and is '*Regina Celi*', as in the text; in the central light, she departs iconographically and textually from the Minster *tabula* by being styled '*Mater Christi*'; in the fourth light, she is carrying a rod in her left hand and a sprig of flowers in her right, possibly suggestive of Aaron's rod; in the fifth she is described in the text and the window as '*Imperatrix Infermi*', and the balled cross she holds may be related to the cross she is described as holding in the text.

How then, might the text be interpreted within the context of the Minster? Its location of images of the Virgin within the specific local context of the Minster's Lady Chapel is startling in itself. However, of particular interest is the fact that the text is suggestive of a meditative equivalent of the use of spaces in a cathedral as a 'memory landscape': Crossley has discussed this in relation to the treatise on the art of memory by Laurent Fries (b.1480), who employed a sequence of sites in Strasbourg cathedral as mnemonic 'pigeon-holes'.⁹⁵ Citing the wider popularity of *tabulae* in York Minster and other cathedrals and parishes, Gillespie regards the Lady Chapel as a potentially 'satisfactory' context for the *tabula* of the Virgin, if it were a real object: he imagines it 'on an altar', but does not go into further detail.⁹⁶ Two possible positions can be proposed within the chapel: in the reredos, or below it, where it would act as a retable.⁹⁷ It may even be possible that it was conceived as this and later scrapped in favour of the *Arma Christi* iconography on the east wall noted by Browne.

Not considered by Gillespie, but of paramount importance in thinking about the text and possible existence of the *tabula* from an art-historical perspective, is that on the basis of the palaeographic dating of the manuscript to the second quarter of the fifteenth century, it was written as little as seventeen

⁹³ Sheppard Routh, 1986: 117. I am immensely grateful to Amanda Daw for bringing this article to my attention: she will be investigating this window and its iconographical scheme further in relation to the parish of Holy Trinity and its inhabitants in her doctoral thesis.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*: 113-14.

⁹⁵ Crossley, 2010: 240.

⁹⁶ Gillespie, 1997: 202-03.

⁹⁷ My thanks to Amanda Daw for pointing out the latter possibility.

years after the glazing of the east window, which stands directly above the altar of the Virgin in the Lady Chapel. Norton has noted that the window is conspicuous in its lack of an image of the Virgin anywhere within its iconographical programme.⁹⁸ However, the unusual combination of ‘images, attributes, and titles’ as described in the text,⁹⁹ is rendered less so in the context of the east window’s own highly schematically and iconographically inventive visual sweep of the heavenly hierarchy, the Old Testament and the story of Revelation. Indeed, the two are highly complementary, giving further weight to the idea that rather than a merely textual construction this may have been intended as an actual object.

The characterisation of the Virgin in the text as ‘*Domina Mundi*’, ‘*Regina Cely*’, ‘*Ymparatrix Ynferney*’, and ‘*Lignum Vitae*’ as well as the images of her standing on, variously, the world, a gate of gold, the tree of life, and hell, are particularly suggestive of her dominion in heaven, hell, and on earth, and would be especially fitting in light of the East Window’s iconographical sweep of creation. Moreover, her intercessory power would be particularly emphasised in relation to the three central panels on the second row from the bottom of the window, which depict the Last Judgement in the form of the Son of Man, the saved and the damned (Figs. 114, 115, 116).¹⁰⁰ This would be even more apparent if the *tabula* was conceived as, or actually placed, in a retable position, and thus directly below the panels. Although departing from the more usual iconographical position of the Virgin as intercessor in the context of the Last Judgement, to Christ’s right-hand side (Figs. 94, 104), it would surely retain the necessary intercessory connotations.¹⁰¹ The text’s use of the image of the woman standing on the sun and the moon, from Revelations 12:1, in the second distich written under the third ‘maner’ in which the Virgin is depicted, as ‘*Dey Genetryx*’ and ‘*Arca Testamenti*’, with the moon and the ark of the Old Testament under her feet,¹⁰² would, in this context, potentially be in the centre of the *tabula* (if the five images were in row, as the Holy Trinity scheme suggests) creating a strong visual

⁹⁸ Norton, 2005: 170.

⁹⁹ Gillespie, 1997: 211-12; fn. 17.

¹⁰⁰ On the Virgin in the role of Empress of Hell, and within this her personification the woman of the Apocalypse, see Oakes, 2008: 167-97, esp. 190-97.

¹⁰¹ Oakes, 2008: 66-82.

¹⁰² ‘*Et signum grande <mulier> circumdata sole/Sub pedibus luna cuius sunt signa beate/Virginis et matris que sunt a virgine visa*’. Gillespie, 1997: 229.

and textual connection between the *tabula*, the altar below, and the iconographical scheme of the Apocalypse in the window.

The cumulative evidence for images in the Lady Chapel at York suggest it was the site of at least one particularly revered image of the Virgin and Child with a cult-like or particularly revered status, and one where there was an accumulation of images of the Virgin, potentially coloured by an eschatological theme after the installation of the East Window. The presence of the de Thoresby and Percy chantry, the *ex-votos*, and the presence of the vernacular as well as Latin in the enigmatic *tabula* description, also suggest it was a space of lay *and* clerical devotion to the Virgin, with veneration of the same images by both.

The Galilee Chapel Marian images and their layout suggest a different situation at Durham. Firstly, the likely presence of an earlier sculpted image to that of Our Lady of Pity, as suggested by Park, means that the north central aisle altar recess was the site of *successive* images of the Virgin. Although we are dealing with incomplete evidence, the change is one that appears to have focused on iconography rather than material, in contrast to the introduction of the alabaster Virgin and Child at York. The introduction of an image of Our Lady of Pity, with its wide appeal to the laity, especially women, is therefore suggestive of the space being used particularly by this audience, and of the community as being aware of the devotional potential of this iconography.

The c.1300 Coronation wall painting above the altar recess expanded the number and range of Marian images in the Galilee. As Park has noted, its likely function was to act as a 'label' for the altar below.¹⁰³ Yet it would also have enabled devotional associations to be made between it and the images below. Importantly, considering its dating, it would likely have been above first a *Sedes Sapientiae* and then, from perhaps the late fourteenth century, Our Lady of Pity. However, within these two iconographies an emphasis on the earthly Virgin and her incarnated Son, at once complementing and contrasting with the heavenly Virgin and her resurrected Son, would be retained.

The lowering of the roof during Langley's renovations of the Galilee, rendering the top half of the Coronation wall painting obscure, as well as the installation of a Marian altar in the central aisle, are indicative of the relative

¹⁰³ Park, 1990: 28, fn. 13.

importance attached to the wall painting and also perhaps suggestive of a transfer of institutional importance from the north central aisle altar to Langley's chantry. Yet the lack of detailed description of this chapel and its Marian imagery in the *Rites*, especially in contrast to the description of Our Lady of Pity's altar (see pp.81-82), is perhaps indicative of a retention of the latter's devotional importance within the Galilee even after Langley's alterations.

In further contrast to York, there is no evidence for a particularly revered, cult-like image of the Virgin in the Galilee which was the recipient of *ex-votos*, or which was the focus of special veneration on feast days like Our Lady of Boulton. The presence of the shrine of Bede in the Galilee from 1370 may have been a factor in the lack of offerings to any image in the Galilee, but it is noticeable that Beatrice de Dyttmeshale still made her offering to the distant and physically inaccessible St Cuthbert, rather than to a potentially closer image of the Virgin, in the 1180s.

Consideration of these spaces specifically stated as being associated with the Virgin, and where there were multiple images of her, both accumulated and successive through time, lead us to consider further those images which can be characterized as liminal in their spatial position, though not necessarily so in relation to devotion.

6.iv. *Threshold Virgins*

Mary's body, identities, and story are all imbued with the idea of the threshold. It was *through* her God became incarnate, whilst she maintained her virginity. Exegetical texts, litanies, and other devotions characterised her as a threshold, using epithets such as '*Porta Paradisi*', '*Porta Coeli*', and, as in the description of the *tabula* discussed above, '*Porta Clausa*', in particular reference to her perpetual virginity. Furthermore, she crossed the threshold between earth and heaven in a unique way through her bodily assumption.¹⁰⁴

At York, the Virgin and Child on the trumeau of the doorway into the Chapter House, the mutilated statue of the Virgin and Child at the former entrance to the chapel of St Mary and All Angels, and the Assumption roof boss (c.1450,

¹⁰⁴ These metaphors are discussed in detail in Katz, 2009: 198 and 2011: 75. On the idea of the bodily assumption and its twelfth-century dissemination, see Mayr-Harting, 2004: esp. 104-05, and for a more recent discussion of the development of the theology and iconography of the bodily assumption, see Schmitt, 2006.

Fig.117) above the door of the choir screen, all suggest the prevalence of the Virgin's association with the threshold within the space of the cathedral. The evidence from Part One shows that a number of other images of the Virgin were placed at or near points of entrance and/or exit to different parts of the interior at both York and Durham. The potential fruitfulness of an exploration of the significance of these threshold images is clear thanks to several recent studies concentrating on the French cathedral context, particularly in relation to portal sculpture, and more widely, theoretical concern with the idea of liminality.¹⁰⁵

An outline of the major points of these recent studies in the French context is helpful. Fabienne Joubert has pointed out the relationship between the idea of the portal, the iconography of the sculpture there, and the function of a portal or the space beyond it.¹⁰⁶ Stephen Murray has highlighted the capacity of images of the Virgin to act as the pathway to salvation in text and portal sculpture, and to work on several levels, as the Virgin herself, *Ecclesia*, and, where she is the patronal saint, as the 'church' itself.¹⁰⁷ Importantly, in relation to the the Virgin and Child sculpture on the trumeau of the south portal at Amiens (Fig.118), Murray has pointed out the capacity of a threshold image to act as a focus of devotion *sui generis*. There, in the evening, when a lantern, fixed on a rope from the vousoirs above, was lit, locals would see the Virgin 'gradually...detach herself from the surrounding narratives, standing as an isolated icon'.¹⁰⁸ This suggests that we should be alert to the idea that the thresholds at which some images stood could dissolve in light of the way it was presented or viewed.

Paul Crossley has explored portal sculpture at Chartres specifically as preparation for the imagery, objects, and ritual to be found inside, and particularly their capacity to act as starting points for various 'pathways' which can be constructed through the interior's sacred topography by iconographically related images in various media.¹⁰⁹ Crossley's emphasis on interior images as potentially guiding the viewer to and from Chartres' most holy objects by means of iconographical repetition, 'like a musical variation', or of 'extended iconographical narrative', is one that can be employed in considering the

¹⁰⁵ Turner, 1967; 1969; 1974, and Turner and Turner, 1978; Bynum, 1992a; Gertsman and Stevenson, 2012.

¹⁰⁶ Joubert, 2008: 75; 78-87, esp. 85-86

¹⁰⁷ Murray, 2004: 17-25; 33-47, esp. 19-20; 45-7.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*: 46.

¹⁰⁹ Crossley, 2010: 216.

threshold images of the Virgin at York and Durham, their relationships to the cathedrals' other images of the Virgin, and other elements of their sacred topographies.¹¹⁰

Similarly, Claudine Lautier has drawn attention to the relationship between the iconographies and locations of images of the Virgin and Child in the stained glass at Chartres, especially within the east end, and the images of Notre-Dame-Sous-Terre and the reliquary of the *Sancta Camisa*. Importantly, she identifies the Virgin and Child in left lancet of window 113a (Fig.119), above the junction between the north transept and the north ambulatory, as depicting Notre-Dame-Sous-Terre, and therefore 'almost directly above' the crypt where the statue was housed.¹¹¹ This, she argues, acted 'to recall' the statue, which was accessible to pilgrims. However, she also suggests that the stained glass depictions of the Virgin and Child, and especially the window of the Virgin's life in the south choir ambulatory, which was opposite the reliquary in the third bay of the choir (28b, Fig.120), acted to 'evoke' the *Sancta Camisa* for the majority of pilgrims to whom the reliquary was physically, and usually visibly, inaccessible.¹¹² This alerts us to the possibility that images of the Virgin could work to signpost other accessible images and objects of devotion, but also act as substitutes for those that were inaccessible.

Both York and Durham lack extensive iconographical programmes of portal sculpture, and unlike Wells, whose early thirteenth-century west façade was populated with figurative sculpture and retained in later centuries, the early fourteenth-century west façade at York, despite its large number of pedestals and niches, was not decorated to a similar level as that which it replaced, built under Roger Pont l'Evêque, and whose iconography, from the available evidence, does not appear to have had a Marian theme.¹¹³ Nor did either institution have a Marian relic or image of wide renown, though as we have seen, the Lady Chapel alabaster Virgin and Child probably had local importance, and Our Lady of Boulton had particularly novel value within the realm of the spectacle of feast days at Durham.

¹¹⁰ Crossley, 2010: 219; 223.

¹¹¹ Lautier, 2009: 195.

¹¹² Due to the habitual use of curtains and tapestries in the choir, and the covering of the reliquary when these were not in use during penitential seasons. Lautier, 2009: 195; 189; 185-86.

¹¹³ Brown, 2003: 87; 118-22. Oosterwijk and Norton, 1990: 22-24. As the latter point out, some of the figures from Roger's façade were reused on its replacement, though these were from a scheme probably comprising Old Testament figures, apostles, and ecclesiastics.

However, the evidence we do have, plus the methodologies employed within the French context, provide scope to explore some of the Marian images from Part One which were located at thresholds both individually and in relation to other Marian images considered earlier in this chapter.

The most theologically resonant ‘threshold’ image of the Virgin at Durham, that of Our Lady of Boulton, with its literal interpretation of Mary as a door,¹¹⁴ was notably central in its association with the middle chapel of the south transept. The enigmatic image of Our Lady of Howgell, for which we have no description in the *Rites*, can perhaps be characterised as potentially more of a threshold image, being associated with the chapel to the north, and bordering the entrance to the south choir ambulatory. More evidence is available for the image of St Mary in Bethlehem, the Geysen, described specifically at a physical point of entrance and exit, ‘at the door of the Galilee’, in the Sacrists’ account rolls (see pp.82-83).

The questions remain as to when the Geysen image was installed, and the impetus behind it. The iconography was present in the secular cathedral context in the first half of the fourteenth century, as indicated by evidence of its presence in Old St Paul’s by 1325, and Salisbury by 1341, but the evidence from the Durham sacrists’ rolls dates from, at the earliest, 1483-84. In addition, Marks has noted that surviving examples and documentary evidence combined show a concentration ‘in the southern half of the country’.¹¹⁵ The Durham evidence is therefore significant in terms of expanding the geographical range of the iconography, but could also be indicative of a chronological lag in its arrival in the north, and in a male Benedictine institution.

In relation to this, it is worth considering the appeal of the iconography. Marks has noted that it could be resonant for both men and women, lay and clerical. The St Paul’s image was stipulated as part of the imagery of Canon Roger Waltham’s chantry chapel, and the 1498 will of John Gunthorpe, Dean of Wells, requested burial before the Geysen image at Wells,¹¹⁶ whereas the Salisbury image is noted in particular relation to pregnant women; there is also evidence for its presence in the female Benedictine establishment at Elstow in

¹¹⁴ Katz, 2009: 198.

¹¹⁵ Marks, 2004: 144.

¹¹⁶ *Ibid.*: 143-44.

Bedfordshire.¹¹⁷ Durham therefore appears to be the only male monastic institution in England known to have possessed one.

This striking point suggests the community's provision of an image that could have particular devotional value to lay women and lay men in an area that could be accessed by both. Moreover, within the context of the installation of Our Lady of Boulton from c.1380 onwards, it suggests the community's desire to install images articulating the Virgin's motherhood in different registers, one rooted in the biblical, one in the theological, both appropriate to their primary audiences and locations. However, it is notable that lay men and, in relation to liturgical services, members of the community, would have had access to both images, and therefore able to enjoy the resonances of both. Any particular devotional attachment to the image on the part of the laity does not, however, translate into the image's offertory box receipts, whose takings reach a high point of only 5s 4d. in 1484-85. This is in contrast to the much more significant amounts at the offertory box of St Saviour at the door of the Galilee, which received 36s 10d. in the same year, also its highest extant recorded taking (see Appendix 1). However, considering their potential close spatial proximity, it is conceivable that some of the takings for St Saviour were perhaps intended for St Mary in Bethlehem, or represent combined offerings for both images.

Further consideration of the Geysen image in relation to other images, including St Saviour, is helpful in order to tease out their devotional resonances. A mid to late fourteenth-century date, or even early fifteenth-century date, for its installation would render the image of the Geysen part of the replacement and expansion of images of the Virgin in the Galilee and further east in the building. This would have included installation of the Neville Screen's alabaster Virgin, as well as Our Lady of Boulton, but also most probably the image of Our Lady of Pity in the central north altar recess of the Galilee, and at the altar of Our Lady of Pity in the nave. Depending upon circulation around the western nave and Galilee, it can thus be interpreted as potentially acting as a signposting image to the Galilee, and acting as the first in a series of images within that space which would have invited meditation, perhaps sequential, on the figures of both the Virgin and Christ, and their symbiotic relationship, within the story of salvation:

¹¹⁷ Marks, 2004: 143-44; Ayers and Sampson, 2000: 55, esp. fn.116 (for Salisbury).

at Christ's birth, in the form of the Geysen, after his death, in the form of Our Lady of Pity (here it is important to remember also that the wall painting of the south arcade of the north central aisle depicted the Crucifixion), and finally, before Langley's alterations, in heaven, in the form of the Coronation wall painting above the north central aisle altar recess. Within this context, the lack of information regarding the Marian imagery at Langley's chantry chapel is particularly frustrating, as it leaves open the question of whether the 'heavenly' presentation of the Virgin found in the wall painting was echoed in some way once the wall painting was obscured by the modification of the roof.

Conversely, the image of St Mary in Bethlehem may have acted as an introductory image to the interior of the nave from the Galilee. Here too it may have invited a sequential meditative response in light of the proximity of the image of St Saviour, and, further east, Our Lady of Pity. Indeed, it may be that the images in the north-west aisle of the nave may have lead the viewer, and possibly the pilgrim, eastwards along this route, perhaps in preparation for moving eastwards to the crossing, though this would only be possible for men. In light of the difference in registers between the Geysen and Our Lady of Boulton noted above, for those lay men visiting St Cuthbert's shrine on days when it was accessible, and when Our Lady of Boulton was opened to reveal the Trinity, the image of the Geysen would also have acted as an appropriately familiar and earthly prelude to the institutionally important images of the Virgin at the high altar and the shrine, as well as the more theologically nuanced and heavenly representation of the Virgin's motherhood east of the rood screen.

The image of St Mary of Bethlehem can thus be characterised as a kind of 'visual pivot' between multiple images and spaces at Durham, but also as an object of veneration in its own right. A similar flexibility is suggested by the image of the Virgin of the Red Ark at York Minster, and, like St Mary of Bethlehem, the financial evidence associated with it merits particular discussion in relation to its location, meanings, and audiences. Evidence for this image, as noted in Part One, indicates it was most likely situated against the south-west side of the south-east crossing pier, and thus at the important threshold between the crossing and the entrance to the east end, particularly the south choir ambulatory. It was *in situ* from at least 1443/4, and possibly from 1415-16, indicated by the reference to the repair of the chest next to 'the image of Blessed Mary in the

nave', a wording which might conceivably pertain to an image in the crossing (see p.112). Reference to the Red Ark or Chest dates from at least 1432-33, and earlier references to offerings '*de truncis*' date from 1405-06, and perhaps also include this object (see p.114). This begs the question of whether the image and chest were always a pair, or whether the image was introduced later than the chest in order to encourage donations, but this remains unanswerable without further evidence.

The association of an image of the Virgin specifically with offerings to the fabric fund, and therefore the building itself, is interesting for several reasons. The pairing was also present at Beverley Minster: the will of William Bird, 'schipman', in 1398, includes a bequest to the 'image of the blessed Mary above the red chest' of a piece of his best silk velvet.¹¹⁸ There is no indication here of the image and chest's location at Beverley, or whether its donations were channelled specifically into the fabric fund there. Waterton suggests that 'it would almost seem as if the Chapter of York had taken the idea of the Red Ark from Beverley'.¹¹⁹ Certainly the dates for the image and chest fit chronologically with such a reading, but only just, and it is possible that the association of the two at York was in place earlier, but unrecorded. It seems reasonable to suggest that Beverley may have borrowed the combination from the mother church of the archdiocese.

However, there is evidence that this was not necessarily a local association. Offerings 'at the red chest' are recorded in the surviving fabric accounts at Exeter Cathedral on a regular basis from 1286 and into the fourteenth century, giving the red chest and its association with a cathedral fabric fund a much earlier and geographically different provenance.¹²⁰ It is not associated with a particular image in the fabric accounts, but Orme has noted that collection boxes were situated at images of the Virgin in the north porch of the nave and on the south side of the south choir aisle entrance, the latter tantalisingly similar to the location of the Virgin of the Red Ark at York in relation to the cruciform plan, although the former is also (more loosely) similar to the position of the Virgin of

¹¹⁸ '*Iego ymagini beatae Mariae supra rubeam arcam in ecclesia predicta* [that of Beverley Minster]... *unam peciam velorum de serico meam optimam*', *TE* 1: 240; Waterton, 1870: 267.

¹¹⁹ Waterton, 1870: 267.

¹²⁰ Erskine, 1981 and 1983: 1, 52, 62, 73, 100, 113, 125, 136, 146, 155, 164, 234, 243, 252. The presence of this chest is also noted in Oakes, 2003: 57.

the Red Ark in relation to the main lay entrance to the cathedral (Plans 9-11, P).¹²¹ The porch was where Chancellor John Orum was buried: in his will of 1436 he bequeathed £40 for the singing of the antiphon every day at his grave, and Orme notes that it was probably directed to the statue of the Virgin there.¹²² This suggests a liturgical function for the statue that may have been both a response to, and enhancement of, its popularity as a site of donations to the fabric fund. At Salisbury too, offerings to a Marian image, specifically the Geysen, were funneled into the fabric fund by order of the Chapter in 1336, further suggesting the appeal of this iconography, but its location is not recorded, nor the form of its collection box.¹²³

The pairing of an image of the Virgin with a chest for offerings to the fabric at York, but also elsewhere, is likely to have been motivated not only by the Virgin's unsurpassed intercessory powers, but also by connotations of her as *Ecclesia*. As Murray's study of the Amiens sermon and its figurative and argumentative correspondences with the cathedral's portal sculpture has demonstrated, understanding of the Virgin as personifying the Church was not confined to learned clerical culture.¹²⁴ Placement of the chest with the image, whichever chronological way around this happened, would have therefore been an apposite way to garner more money for the fabric fund, and emphasise that the fund was for this purpose. However, more specific reasoning can be suggested. The association of the Virgin with the building itself would be apt at Salisbury, where she was the dedicatee, and, if the Virgin had a quasi-patronal status at York, there too the pairing would have extra significance. At York, the placement of both at or near the south-east crossing pier would be highly pertinent in relation to the fabric in light of the collapse of the central tower and its bells in the first decade of the fifteenth century, affecting the south and west of the tower and wreaking damage 'particularly to the northern end of the south transept's west arcade'.¹²⁵ This necessitated a great deal of funding, and was aided in the form of a papal indulgence issued in December 1407 and an indulgence granted by

¹²¹ Orme, 1986: 26.

¹²² Orme, 2009: 56-57.

¹²³ Ayers & Sampson, 2000: 55.

¹²⁴ Murray, 2004. For the Virgin as personifying *Ecclesia*, see Schiller, 1968-91: IV, 84-106.

¹²⁵ Brown, 2003 dates this to 1407, though see Gough, 2014, who has convincingly argued for a date of 1405 based on more extensive investigation of the related evidence.

Archbishop Bowet (1407-23) in 1408.¹²⁶ The chapter's redirection of two-tenths of dignities and prebends to the fabric in 1408 and the appropriation of funds from Archbishop Scrope's tomb to the fund in 1409 demonstrates the scope of financial need, and an increase in fabric fund offerings would surely have been sought.¹²⁷

Evidence for offerings being given to the Red Ark from clerics who had been convicted before the Court of the Dean and Chapter suggests that the image of the Virgin there may well have been identified imaginatively, if not necessarily directly through a specific iconographical representation, with her role not just as intercessor, but specifically as the Virgin of Mercy.¹²⁸ The evidence from the will of Robert Esyngwald for his request for burial before the image reinforces this legal link to the image, as his profession was Procurator General of the Court of York (see p.110). This burial request, and the evidence from the c.1500 inventory for the *caput* of St Everilda and the book of the Gospels being located 'at the red chest' suggest that the image and chest were part of a wider complex of devotional objects located at the south-east crossing pillar which acted as a focus of devotion in its own right. However, they were also in close proximity to the south-east entrance to the choir ambulatory. This invites us to consider, in light of the work of Crossley and Lautier, how the Virgin of the Red Ark may have related to the images in the east end of the Minster.

The evidence from Beverley and the reference for the York offerings at the chest of 'Mary in the nave' suggests that the image may have been in place in the first decade of the fifteenth century, either at the crossing pier or perhaps more likely at this date, considering the construction work related to the central tower nearby. Within this locational and chronological context, it may have acted as a substitute for images of the Virgin which were formerly accessible in the crypt and later displayed at the altar of the Virgin in the Lady Chapel. Though evidence points to the Lady Chapel being functional by the time of Thoresby's death in 1373, and clearly accessible to a degree in the early 1400s, as records of devotion to Archbishop Scrope's tomb in the adjoining St Stephen's chapel suggest, the east end of the Minster remained 'a huge building site', in the words of

¹²⁶ Brown, 2003: 195-96

¹²⁷ *Ibid.* Unfortunately the extant rolls do not cover 1407 or the following eight years, proscribing verification of this theory.

¹²⁸ Oakes, 2008: 101-128.

Christopher Norton, with the Lady Chapel far from complete, in the first decade of the century.¹²⁹ Indeed, the display of institutionally, symbolically, and financially significant images such as the alabaster Virgin and Child is difficult to imagine in the context of the east window being under scaffolding until at least 1408-09.¹³⁰

The work on the new east end was completed in the 1420s, and most probably from the first direct reference to the Red Ark Virgin in 1443, if not before, it may well have acted as a preparatory or ‘signposting’ image to the Lady Chapel and its images, accessible to the faithful via the choir aisles. Any connotations of the Virgin of the Red Ark as the Virgin of Mercy, either imaginative or iconographical, or both, would be particularly apt in this context in light of the argument advanced above regarding the relationship between the east window iconography and the Marian imagery associated with the altar there. The image’s ‘histories’ would certainly have provided a possible iconographical narrative in which the devotionally significant Lady Chapel alabaster Virgin and Child might be viewed. Thinking back to the iconographical scheme of the Brekke altarpiece’s tabernacle, which shows the Visitation, Nativity, Adoration, and Presentation in the Temple (Fig.68), the Virgin of the Red Ark may too have concentrated on episodes surrounding the birth and infancy of Christ, and therefore Mary’s earthly motherhood, providing a sublunary narrative which would complement the more eschatologically framed Virgin and Child in the Lady Chapel.

Although the offerings of Carre and Karr suggest that members of the laity could have a strong affinity with this Lady Chapel Virgin and Child, and access to Scrope’s tomb may have been through the Lady Chapel, the Red Ark Virgin would perhaps be more readily physically accessible as a devotional destination in its own right even after work finished, especially as the Lady Chapel was enclosed by a screen from c.1409, and gates were positioned to the western sides of the eastern transepts, easily rendering the chapel or wider east end inaccessible if desired by the clergy (Plan 15).¹³¹ Moreover, its position at the south-east crossing pier would allow members of the laity who simply did not want to

¹²⁹ Norton, 2007: 141, 172-73.

¹³⁰ Raine, 1879-94: II, 309; Norton, 2007: 172-73; 178.

¹³¹ Norton, 2007: 178.

venture far into the interior in order to venerate the Virgin ready access to her image from the south transept entrance.

The image of the Virgin and its tabernacle installed above the parclose screen of St Stephen's chapel in 1419-20 can also be explored in relation to the idea of signposting and referencing. The chapel's dedication to St Stephen means that, unlike the Coronation wall painting at Durham, or the wall painting of St Faith at Westminster Abbey, and unlike Joubert's characterisation of threshold images, the image's function was not one of 'labelling' the dedication or function of the space beyond through the identity of the figure. The possible donation of the image of the Virgin listed in Henry, 3rd Lord Scrope of Masham's will, and the images of the Annunciation and Assumption displaying Scrope arms listed in the c.1500 inventory, suggests a particular affinity with the Virgin on the part of the Scropes of Masham. However, there is no reference to the Scropes financing this image, and its installation appears to have been solely financed by the chapter.

Within this context, the parclose Virgin can, like the Red Ark's Virgin, be interpreted as functioning as a signposting image to the Lady Chapel and its images. This would be particularly salient in light of probable routes of circulation from the chapter house and north transept and down the north choir ambulatory to the east end of the Minster. However, we can also suggest that its relationship with the Lady Chapel, its images, and St Stephen's chapel was more complex. Archbishop Scrope's tomb was on the south side of the chapel, and therefore on the threshold of the Lady Chapel and its images, including the especially venerated Virgin and Child (Plans 9-11). The parclose Virgin may therefore have functioned as a legitimizing visual force in relation to the veneration at Scrope's tomb. This would be especially fitting considering, as Norton has demonstrated, the Minster authorities' encouragement of 'a *de facto* cult...while making sure that they should not be seen to be doing so in any formal documents' in the years after his death.¹³²

This potential for a close relationship between the parclose Virgin and the Lady Chapel images, particularly the alabaster Virgin and Child, allows us to consider the requests for burial in front of the former in a wider Marian context,

¹³² Norton, 2007: 180.

as potentially ‘mirroring’ the more prestigious burial location of Archbishop de Thoresby and his predecessors in front of the altar of the Virgin and its image(s) in the Lady Chapel. Certainly within this, we cannot discount the possibility of the testators’ requests as indicative of an affinity with the parclose Virgin in particular, and the relationship of the parclose Virgin to the location of Archbishop Scrope’s tomb may have conferred its own prestige. Nor should the logistics of space be forgotten. Burial plots within the chapel were confined to the family and those plots immediately in front of the west side of the screen to the north were also already taken up by Scrope burials by the time of the date of the earliest will that can be linked to the image, drawn up in 1479 (p.104; see Plan 17). However, the potential for this image to act as a more accessible alternative for veneration in life or death should not be discounted.

One further ‘threshold’ image of the Virgin at York is relevant in relation to these discussions of the Virgin of the Red Ark and the parclose Virgin. This is the enigmatic Virgin ‘at the north choir door’ in the fabric account of 1518-19, which may have been in one of the niches of the screen-arch, as noted in Part One (see p.120). Its position, particularly in light of the parclose Virgin, suggests a signposting function, leading first to the parclose Virgin and potentially to the Lady Chapel images. Yet in combination with the Virgin of the Red Ark, and the roof boss of the Assumption above the main entrance to the choir, it can also be interpreted as a physically distinct yet symbolically united complex of images of the Virgin, emphasising the major threshold between the crossing and the choir. Without knowledge of the iconographies of the Virgin of the Red Ark or the Virgin at the north choir door, it is difficult to suggest how they may have invited interrelated devotion, though the painting of both using the same colours, as recorded in the 1518-19 fabric account, suggests that they may have invited the viewer to make visual connections between them.

6.v. *Conclusion*

This analysis of evidence for images of the Virgin has drawn attention to their distribution, variety, and character throughout both interiors. Its consideration of images in spaces dedicated to her, or particularly associated with her, and liminal spaces in other parts of the interiors of both institutions, has shown varying patterns of accumulation, replacement, and retention of images. At York, both the

high altar and Lady Chapel were particular *loci* for the accumulation of images of the Virgin. The evidence suggests a range of marian images of various iconographies were employed in addition to the principal image to the south of the high altar, both on a regular basis and potentially on particular marian feast-days. Importantly, this has demonstrated the capacity for portable images to modify the visual emphasis of the high altar, and contrasts with the evidence from Durham, which pertains only to the principal image of the Virgin, and suggests that there it was the surrounding material culture which modified the image.

Consideration of images within the Lady Chapels of both institutions - in York's case, designated as such from its building, at Durham, potentially more organically acquiring the function - has demonstrated contrasting patterns of accumulation and successive images of the Virgin respectively. Here, the links between architectural change and the replacement of images have been suggested as being particularly pronounced, especially in relation to the alabaster Virgin and Child at York and the Coronation wall painting at Durham, yet it can also be detected in relation to the high altar image and the Neville Screen at Durham.

The possible presence of the *tabula* of images of the Virgin within the Lady Chapel at York, and its relationship with the iconography of the East Window, potentially modifies our understanding of this area of the Minster significantly, and has drawn further attention to the ways in which images in different media could create image complexes. Discussion of images of the Virgin at threshold locations has highlighted their capacity to create dialogue between the images in different architectural and liturgical spaces within both interiors, as well as being *foci* for devotion *sui generis*, especially when other images were not accessible. Here, we can suggest a connective and/or substitutive function similar to that of the *Triumphkeuze* outlined in the previous chapter.

The provision of images of the Virgin with particular appeal to the laity, and especially women, has been suggested in relation to the images within the west end of the nave and the Galilee Chapel at Durham. In particular, that of St Mary in Bethlehem was contrasted with the more theological portrayal of the Virgin's motherhood, Our Lady of Boulton, and its position in the south transept, where its primary audience would have been the community itself.

This prevalence and varied nature of images of the Virgin at both institutions raises the issue of the distribution, character, and audiences for images of other saints, to which we shall now turn.

CHAPTER SEVEN

IMAGES OF THE SAINTS

7.i. *Introduction*

The importance of the cult of the saints in English parochial life has been emphasised by Eamon Duffy,¹ and Richard Marks has dealt in detail with the proliferation and significance of saints' images within this context. The latter's *foci* have been the patronal image and its relationship to parishioners and clergy, especially in relation to the rituals of the liturgical year, and the spiritual dynamic between parishioners and images of other saints, particularly those who offered intercessory 'specialisms' which intersected with the lived experiences of parishioners.² In this context, images meant that the 'efficacy of a saint was spread far from his or her cult centre or relics', and could reside in the *locus* of the parish.³

The evidence set out in Part One demonstrated the variety of images of saints at both York and Durham, from contemporary royalty (St Louis at Durham, and, at both institutions, Henry VI), to apostles such as John the Baptist, as well as other saints who were staples of the parochial context, including Christopher, Anthony, and Sitha.⁴ However, particularly significant in terms of quantity and detail at both institutions is the evidence related to images of patronal saints, and to figural reliquaries of saints, especially head reliquaries. This chapter will therefore explore both in turn. Examination of images of patronal saints allows us to consider their role and significance within the cathedral context in light of Marks' analysis of their role within the parish context. This analysis is also pertinent due to the presence of significant bodily remains of saints at both institutions, a factor which also contrasts with the parochial context. Durham possessed significant remains of two of its patronal saints, Cuthbert and Oswald,

¹ Duffy, 1992: 155-60.

² Marks, 2003, and 2004: 64-85; 85-120.

³ *Ibid.*: 86.

⁴ *Ibid.*: 100-105.

but also those of Bede. The bodies of St William and the ‘unofficial’ saint Richard Scrope, both archbishops, were present at York Minster.

The multiplicity of images of patronal saints in other media is also significant. The methodologies of Crossley and Lautier outlined previously invite us to consider the relationship between three-dimensional images of patronal saints and their depiction in different media, especially stained glass, throughout the sacred topographies of both institutions, and how this in turn might relate to the saints’ shrines also present.

Exploration of head reliquaries affords further exploration of the relationship between relics and images in the form of a category of object which could, as our sources have demonstrated, be thought of as either or both. Importantly, they were not usually found in the parochial context, but nor were they present in every cathedral church or great abbey, therefore their presence at Durham and York is especially worthy of investigation. Furthermore, their portability also invites a more sustained consideration of the relationship between fixed and moveable images discussed in earlier chapters.

This chapter broadly complements the previous two chapters’ organizational principle of location, here using the high altar as the touchstone for both discussions. Images of patronal saints were most notably located on or in the vicinity of the high altar. In addition, despite the differences in location of the head reliquaries within the sacred topographies of both institutions, the sources suggest that nearly all of them were located either in areas east of the high altar, or within the choir. These oppositional locational factors, beyond and before the *locus* for the communities’ collective worship, therefore invite comparative analysis. The placement of Everilda’s *caput* at the Red Ark represents an anomaly in being placed west of the choir screen, but the head-relic itself is described in the c.1275-1300 inventory as residing at a feretory behind the high altar. This movement is particularly interesting, and will be explored in detail.

7.ii. *Patronal Images*

Part One set out evidence for images of saints other than the Virgin associated with, or likely to have been associated with, the high altar at York, in the form of saints Peter, Paul, and John the Baptist. Part One also set out evidence from the *Rites* for images of saints Cuthbert and Oswald associated with the high altar at

Durham. As in the case of images of the Virgin at the high altar at both institutions, most of these references date from the fifteenth century or later, except that in the c.1300 York *Statutes* relating to St Peter. In particular, images of saints Peter, Paul, and John the Baptist designated for the high altar formed part of the bequest of images to York Minster in the 1415 will of Henry, 3rd Lord Scrope, and the presence of images of both saints in the c.1500 inventory suggests they may have been donated to the Minster despite the confiscation of Henry's goods after his execution. Two other references relating to textiles, in the fabric rolls and the c.1500 inventory respectively, suggest the presence of an image of St Peter '*in choro*' at York. Additionally, the c.1500 inventory lists an image of St Peter with a relic in his hand, whose usual location is not stated. Unlike these scattered references at York, the sole piece of evidence for images of saints associated with the high altar at Durham, of St Cuthbert and St Oswald, is the *Rites*' description of the high altar and Neville Screen.

The presence of an image of the Virgin specifically located at the south side of the high altar at York suggests that an image of St Peter – probably that referred to in the c.1300 *Statutes* - was likely to have been placed to the north, following the usual arrangement outlined by Marks for images of the Virgin and the patronal saint in the parochial context (see p.187). As previously noted, the Scrope bequest of images of the Virgin and saints Peter, Paul, and John the Baptist to the high altar may have formed an image complex additional to the customary north and south images (see pp. 187-88).

Before discussing images of St Peter in relation to his patronal status, some explanation is necessary as to why images of St John the Baptist and St Paul might have been deemed particularly apt for the high altar by Henry Scrope. There was an altar dedicated to St John the Baptist in the Minster, which was located '*ex parte boreali chori in novo opere*' ('in the north part of the choir in the new work') according to a late fourteenth-century charter.⁵ Scrope's bequest of this image, which once belonged to his father, to the high altar may therefore have been motivated by the desire to have a particularly revered family image displayed on the most prestigious altar possible, in a similar manner to that argued for by Norton in relation to the images of the Virgin with Scrope arms (see

⁵ Raine, 1859: 290; Page, 1974: III, 226.

p.189). Additional meanings can be suggested for the image of St Paul. We know from Alcuin that Bishop Aelberht dedicated and embellished an altar of some significance to St Paul, ‘*nimum quem doctor amabat*’ (‘the teacher whom he loved greatly’), in the eighth-century Minster: this was specifically located where Edwin had been baptised.⁶ However, the lack of any evidence for an altar dedicated to St Paul in the late medieval cathedral suggests that in the intervening centuries and rebuilding programmes the altar of St Paul may well have become transferred to, or subsumed under, another dedication, the most likely being the high altar of St Peter. Paul was also intrinsically linked with St Peter throughout the Church through their shared feast day of 29th June, marking their translation to the catacombs of the Via Appia, which can be traced back as early as the middle of the third century.⁷ Their intertwined and complimentary characters and *vitae* were well-known from their entries in the *Legenda Aurea*, and, as Kessler has explored in relation to the Italian artistic context, this extra-biblical theme of *concordia fratrum* has a long iconographical history stretching back to at least the fifth century (Fig.121).⁸ The donation of an image of St Paul by Scrope therefore fits in with this close association of the two figures.

A more personal and immediate reasoning behind the donations is that both saints were decapitated martyrs, as Henry’s uncle, Archbishop Richard Scrope, was styled,⁹ and therefore enabled the high altar to have some associative connotations with the archbishop without displaying his image directly in the early years of his politically sensitive cult.¹⁰ This would perhaps also be an especially important desire in light of the probable presence of the head reliquary of St William on the high altar, noted in Part One (see p.102), whose feast day, 8th June, was also the day on which Scrope died.¹¹ Inadvertently, the donation of the images of John the Baptist and Paul would also later lend themselves to

⁶ Godman, 1982: lines 1490-1506.

⁷ Duchesne, 1889: 265-66.

⁸ Ellis, 1900: IV, 12-27 (for Peter); 27-46 (for Paul). The entry for Peter includes details of the vision of Dionysius, of both saints entering the Heavenly Jerusalem hand in hand (24); the entry for Paul explains their status relative to one another thus: ‘In some place it is said that Paul is less than Peter, otherwhile more, and sometimes equal and like, for in dignity he is less, in preaching greater, and in holiness they be equal’ (29). Kessler, 2002: 109-123, esp. 114-118.

⁹ I am grateful to Professor Norton for this suggestion.

¹⁰ Norton, 2007: 172-77.

¹¹ *Ibid.*: 203-04.

commemoration of Henry Scrope himself, considering that he too was beheaded like his uncle.

The evidence for the making of a tabernacle for an image of St Peter and the embellishment of both in the 1480s is suggestive of the desire to add honour and prestige to what was most probably the north-side patronal image in a similar fashion to that common in the parochial context.¹² It is notable that there is no comparable evidence for a new tabernacle and embellishment of the image of the Virgin on the south side of the altar at this time. Este's bequest of 20 marks for the gilding of this image of the Virgin in 1493 suggests that work may have turned to her only after that of the image of St Peter, a point which in some sense runs counter to the relative importance of the two saints suggested by the procession of an image of the Virgin to the high altar. Also notable is that the making of the tabernacle and embellishment of St Peter occurred *after* the consecration of the Minster in 1472, and after the installation of the new shrine for (at least some of) St William's relics behind the high altar, which has also been dated to the early 1470s.¹³ Whether work on the image should therefore be interpreted as the perhaps delayed culmination of the refitting of the high altar, begun in the second decade of the fifteenth century, a culmination of the dedication itself, or as a singular act, is open to question. In this context, the redecoration of the extant image, rather than the purchase of a new one, especially when so great a sum was clearly available to be spent on the enterprise, is highly suggestive of its institutional significance and, quite possibly as an object of some age, its use as a marker of continuity between the old east end of Roger de Pont l'Évêque and the new east end, much like that which was proposed for the *Sedes sapientiae* (see p.195).

A newly embellished and housed image of Peter '*in choro*' would accord the saint a prominent part in the overall visual scheme of the late fifteenth-century east end of the Minster, along with the high altar rood and the glazing scheme. Specifically, the image of Peter would have complemented the 'Petrine theme' of the choir clerestory windows and the depiction in each of a pope, to which Norton has drawn attention.¹⁴ Significantly, although Peter is shown in the tracery lights

¹² Marks, 2004: 240-43.

¹³ Brown, 2003: 236-39; Wilson, 1977; Norton, 2007: 203.

¹⁴ Norton, 2005: 172.

of these windows (N10 and N9 (Fig.122)), with representations also in S11, S9, and S8, the last two of which are eighteenth-century restorations; see Plan 13), he is not amongst the main-light figures, perhaps precisely because of his prominent presence at the high altar.¹⁵

In contrast, the materiality of the images of Cuthbert and Oswald at the high altar at Durham fittingly lent them a visual complementarity with the image of the Virgin, indicative of their shared patronal status. The colour, lustre, and material expense of the alabaster and gilding of these images, especially when set within the context of the Neville Screen canopies, suggests they were to be deliberately evocative of the 'heavenly bodies' of the saints. As Bynum has demonstrated, by the fourteenth century the holy, glorified body was emphatically understood and articulated in terms of the materiality of the heavenly Jerusalem, with its shining jewels and gold.¹⁶ The accompanying 'faire images' on the screen, also gilded and presumably in the smaller niches, would have surely added to the effect, creating an imposing heavenly vision.¹⁷

This presentation of the glorified bodies of Cuthbert and Oswald is particularly interesting in light of their place to the west of the shrine of St Cuthbert, in which bodily remains of both saints were located. It suggests that these two images had a function additional not only to patronal images within the parochial context, but also to images of patronal saints at the high altar at other cathedral institutions where the patronal saint(s) was not one whose principal relics were housed at the institution, such as York. At Durham, they can be interpreted as acting in a similar way to that of the *Triumphkreuz* as Jung has characterised it: an image of what is present 'beyond the barrier' (the barrier in this case being the Neville Screen) which in fact acts to unify the space. Jung has emphasised that the *Triumphkreuz* invites imaginative connections between the sculpture, the historical body of Christ, and the Eucharist.¹⁸ At Durham, we can suggest that the images of Cuthbert and Oswald invited imaginative connections between the images, presenting the saints in their post-Judgement, glorified, heavenly guise, and the historical bodies of the saints in the form of their bones

¹⁵ Norton, 2005:172. On the clerestory scheme see Harrison, 1922.

¹⁶ Bynum, 1995: 200-225; 318-29; see also Bynum, 2011: 70-71, within a wider discussion of materiality. On whiteness and lustre, see also Woolgar, 2006: 162-63.

¹⁷ *Rites*: 7.

¹⁸ Jung, 2000: 634.

enshrined beyond the screen, drawing attention to their intercessory powers (their souls already being in heaven) and therefore inviting petition.¹⁹ This function would be especially important considering the use of the doors in the Neville Screen to access the shrine from the high altar, as the images can therefore be suggested as inviting a preparatory encounter with the two saints before pilgrims arrived at the shrine and the bones of the saints themselves.

Within this context of the flexibility in function and heavenly appearance of the Neville Screen patronal images, it is apposite that we explore the images of each of the patronal saints listed as the first three items present in the reliquary cupboards in the shrine area according to the 1383 *Liber de Reliquiis*. In contrast to the Neville Screen images, these would be visible usually only on feast days when the cupboards were open (see p.174). Considering the tendency towards the retention of institutionally important images we have noted at York and elsewhere, combined with their listing as the first three items in the *Liber*, it is not unreasonable to suggest that these may have been the patronal images associated with the high altar before the installation of those described in the *Rites*' account of the Neville Screen. Here, the 1383 date of the *Liber* should be borne in mind. It was compiled just after the installation of the Screen, and therefore the movement of these images from the high altar to the shrine area around this time is a distinct possibility, the *Liber* recording the images' new positions.

Unlike the *Rites*' description of the Neville Screen images, the *Liber* descriptions suggest that the images of at least saints Cuthbert and Oswald were discrete in terms of date and form, and therefore indicative of a possible accretion of images. As noted in Part One, the image of St Cuthbert appears from the text of the *Liber* to have been a donation of Bishop William Walcher, or believed to be so. In light of his affinity with the monastic life and the figure of St Cuthbert, highlighted by Ridyard, this is not implausible.²⁰ Evidence from elsewhere in England, both before and after the Conquest, and significantly well before the c.1189 date for the patronal image of the Virgin in Salisbury, also bolsters this argument, and moreover suggests that a location in the vicinity of the high altar for the image both within the pre-1093 cathedral and the post-1093 cathedral is

¹⁹ In relation to the eschatological chronology of the reunification of saints' souls and their bodies, see Bynum, 1992: 257.

²⁰ Ridyard, 1987: 197-98.

possible. Firstly, the *Liber Eliensis* notes that Abbot Brihtnoth (d.991) donated four statues of virgins, made of wood, gold and silver, and gems, which were displayed in pairs either side of the high altar: they were probably large, as Dodwell notes, due to their stated visual impact and William I's devastation of their precious metal covering, suggesting they could not be moved themselves.²¹ Their identities, though not stated, are likely to have been Etheldreda, Sexburgh, Withburgh and Ermenilda, whose tomb-shrines were in the Romanesque east end according to the *Liber Eliensis*, and likely to have been in a similar position beforehand.²² Secondly, according to Gervase, images of saints Aelphege (c.953-1012) and Dunstan (909-988), '*vero patroni ecclesie*', were present on a beam above the high altar at Christ Church, Canterbury, alongside '*multum sanctorum reliquiis*': their tombs were to the north and south of the high altar respectively, probably from c.1130.²³ The positions of the images in both of these instances are specifically not on the high altar itself, suggesting earlier precedents for the arrangements at both Durham and York, and displaying a following of the dictum of Leo IV (847-855), who, in a homily, advised priests that *capsae* and relics of the saints could be legitimately placed on the altar, with only the Gospels and a pyx for the Host also allowed to reside there.²⁴

In relation to the image of St Oswald, singular amongst the three as an image-reliquary, the identification of the rib-bone in the chest suggests that the relic was perhaps exposed or visible through crystal, an opening compartment, or a grille. Boehm dates the increasing popularity of such openings to the early thirteenth century in relation to the reliquaries of the Massif Central, as part of a geographically wider trend towards the display of relics in reliquaries that allowed the relic itself to be seen (Fig.123),²⁵ and so an early to mid-thirteenth-century date for the St Oswald image at Durham is possible. The rib is not recorded in either the twelfth or early-fourteenth century inventories of relics from the cathedral, suggesting that the image was perhaps made to incorporate a newly-

²¹ Dodwell, 1982: 214-15; '*Fecit namque beatarum virginium imagines, easque auro et argento gemmisque pretiosissime textuit, et iuxta altare maius duas a dextris, et duas a sinistris stratuit. Spectaculum populo multum praebebant in magnitudine gloriae templi Domini, quae in deditione magni Willelmi regis excrustatae, et quaeque meliora et maiora ecclesiae ornamenta ablata, solum nuda ligna hactenus valent intueri*', *L-B I*, 1524: 411-12.

²² Fairweather, 2005: 353-54. See also Draper, 1979: 14-15; Fernie, 1979: 6.

²³ Stubbs, 1879-80: I, 5; 13.

²⁴ *PL*: 115, col. 677.

²⁵ Boehm, 1990: 100-101; on the wider trend see also Bynum, 1992b: 271; Bynum, 1995: 202-03.

acquired relic sometime between the compiling of these inventories.²⁶ As Thacker and Rollason have demonstrated, Oswald's relics were diffused throughout the country during the Anglo-Saxon and later medieval periods,²⁷ and the making of the reliquary-image therefore suggests a desire on behalf of the community at Durham both to extend their possession of his relics and promote Oswald's patronal status in potent form. The *Liber's* description of the rib-bone being in the chest suggests the image-reliquary was likely to have been a half-length figure, such as that of St Baudine from Saint-Nectaire, Puy-de-Dôme (first half of the twelfth century; Fig.124). Such a form would lend itself particularly to 'fleshing out' the corporeal context of the (possibly rather paltry) rib-bone, and to emphasise the institution's possession of Oswald's head.²⁸

Further evidence for the reliquary-image's particular institutional importance is suggested by the *Rites'* description of the processions on the feasts of the Ascension, Whitsun, and Trinity Sunday, which notes that a 'picture' of St Oswald, 'sylver and gilt', was carried by the monks on the feast of the Ascension, and 'ye Image of Sancte Oswald' on the other two feast days.²⁹ As Rollason has noted, this is likely to have been the same as that described in the *Liber*.³⁰ Its portability is further suggestive of the object being a half-length figure. In both descriptions of the processions, the *Rites* describes the object as being one of a number of 'Relickes' processed, including 'St Cuthbert's banner, St Bede's shrine, and 'St Margaretts Crosse': the banner and cross were both in the reliquary cupboards as well.³¹ This suggests its singularity in relation to other images in the reliquary cupboards, perhaps due primarily to its reliquary function. However, in light of the argument advanced above, it can be suggested that this prestige may also have stemmed partly from a former patronal function of the image-reliquary.

These considerations of the material aspects of the images at York and Durham to an extent bear out the idea of the patronal image giving an institution

²⁶ Battiscombe (ed.) and Anon., 1956: 113-114; *Scriptores Tres*: ccccxvi-vii.

²⁷ Thacker, 1995, and Rollason, 1995, esp. 168-69.

²⁸ Falk, 1991-93: cat. no. 7. See also cat. no. 5 (St Theofredus), cat. no. 6 (St Cesarius), cat. no. 50 (St Bernard of Monjou). Belting, 1994: 299-301 (on 'fleshing out').

²⁹ *Rites*: 105-06.

³⁰ Rollason, 1995: 177, n. 65.

³¹ *Rites*: 105-06; *Account Rolls* II: 426; Thomas, 1974: 337-339.

its 'sacred identity', as Marks has put it,³² but suggest the complexity inherent in considering such a function within the cathedral context, and individual institutions. In contrast to the parochial context, at Durham, the institution's sacred identity appears to have been cultivated through both images and relics, which acted in a mutually reinforcing fashion, embodied in the reliquary-image of St Oswald. The presence of images of the patronal saints of Cuthbert and Oswald in the Neville Screen suggests that in their immediate setting, west of the shrine, they acted to mark the *locus* of the cult. This is in contrast to the idea of an image acting to 'transplant' a cult into an institution and extend it from its *locus*, which Marks has suggested was the case for images in the parish context.³³ This latter function can be identified as at work more in relation to the image of the Virgin at the high altar at Durham.

The situation is also more complex when we consider the images of Oswald and Cuthbert in relation to the chronology of Durham and its community. As Rollason notes, the Durham monks saw themselves as a transplantation and continuity of the original community at Lindisfarne, which Oswald had founded and where Cuthbert had been bishop, and where the relics originally lay.³⁴ The images may therefore have acted as powerful advertisements of the then current *locus* of the cults of both saints, but at the same time provided a potent visual reminder of the community's origins. As Rollason points out, Oswald was regarded by the monks 'as quite simply the founder' of the community, along with Aidan: the beginning of Symeon's *Libellus* credits Oswald as being not only the driving force behind the institution's 'status and its divine religion', but also characterising it, and the shrine of Cuthbert, as existing under his 'perpetual guardianship'.³⁵ This is also a telling statement regarding the relative status of the two saints in the twelfth century, and goes some way towards explaining the later display of the reliquary-image and significant processional use of it described in, respectively, the 1383 *Liber* and the *Rites*.

This importance of St Oswald, demonstrated through text, material, and sacred performance, also suggests we should be careful in suggesting a later medieval 'subordination' of Oswald's cult to that of Cuthbert's. Victoria Tudor

³² Marks, 2004: 78.

³³ *Ibid.*: 78, 92. On the idea of '*locus*', see 92-95.

³⁴ Rollason, 1995: 174-75.

³⁵ *Libellus*: i.1; Rollason, 1995: 174.

has characterised the relationship in this light on the basis of Reginald of Durham's late twelfth-century life of St Oswald and its emphasis on historical rather than contemporary episodes linked to his intercession, as well as the emergence in the early fourteenth-century of the iconography of St Cuthbert holding Oswald's head.³⁶ However, this late twelfth-century interest in his historical miracles also suggests a desire to promote Oswald more vociferously: it certainly fits in with the pattern of the promotion of Anglo-Saxon saints after the Conquest.³⁷ Furthermore, it is notable that recent discussion of the depiction of St Oswald in the glass at Durham, as recorded in the c.1603 description, has calculated a ratio of 12:5 of portrayals of Oswald on his own in comparison to those in which his head appears as Cuthbert's 'attribute', as Rollason terms it.³⁸ But even this iconography can be seen as part of the renewal of interest in Oswald. It would certainly have drawn attention to the burial of the head with Cuthbert, and Durham as an important *locus* of his cult. This is particularly important when we take into account the increasing importance of the sacred head, and of head reliquaries, at this time, which we will explore in the next section.

At York, at least two relics of St Peter were amongst its collection, one in the *Triumphkreuz*, and the other in the hand of the image of St Peter listed in the c.1500 inventory (see p.124). The habitual location of the latter is not stated, but it may have been used at the high altar on feast days of St Peter, as has been proposed for the images potentially given by Henry, Lord Scrope (see p.187-88). Notably, it is not specified as being used in the same way as the image of the Virgin taken to the high altar each day, and it appears to have been a new addition to the inventory c.1510. The image of St Peter in the patronal position to the north of the high altar can therefore be confidently suggested as separate from this image.

Here, minus any reliquary function, the patronal image of St Peter may have been more suggestive of the desire to extend the *locus* of the saint's cult to the institution. The apostolic status and character of St Peter is important in relation to this, as it implies that the image functioned not only to extend the *locus*

³⁶ Tudor, 1995: 193-94 (for the *Vita* see Arnold, 1882-85: I: 326-85).

³⁷ Ridyard, 1987 and 1988.

³⁸ Stancliffe & Cambridge, 1995: 9; Rollason, 1995: 177.

of the cult, Rome, to York, but also the apostolic and hierarchical power embodied in Peter to the Minster, and in turn, to its hierarchy. However, within the context of the east end's decorative scheme, the image of St Peter also suggests that we think of it not necessarily in relation to embodying the Local Church in contrast to the image of the Virgin embodying the Church Universal, as Marks has posited for the patronal saint in the parochial context.³⁹ Rather, in a kind of visual metonymy, the image of Peter can also be understood as embodying the Church Universal - just as much as the image of the Virgin at the high altar may have had connotations of the Local Church, as we suggested in the previous chapter (see p.187). Indeed, within the context of the Minster, and especially the East Window's eschatological theme, it may be more appropriate to consider them as personifying their heavenly roles as gatekeeper and intercessor *par excellence*. Here it is apposite to remember that Anglo-Saxon representations of Judgement usually included the Virgin and St Peter, as the New Minster *Liber Vitae* shows (Fig.94).⁴⁰

The apostolic and hierarchical power embodied by the image of Peter suggests a further nuance to the role of the patronal image in the cathedral context. Marks has acknowledged 'the special relationship that existed between the medieval parish clergy and their patronal saints', but has not expanded on its character.⁴¹ At York and Durham, we do not have direct evidence in the form of bequests or requests to the patronal images suggesting such special relationships. However, we should not discount the idea of Peter acting as an exemplar for members of the secular clergy and Cuthbert for those who had undertaken monastic vows, and therefore as being considered particularly potent intercessors, in light of the shared vocations of the communities and their patronal saints at each institution.⁴² These shared vocations would be constantly reiterated by the presence of the high altar patronal images of each saint at York and Durham respectively. The community at Durham certainly desired to claim Cuthbert as

³⁹ Marks, 2004: 77.

⁴⁰ On this theme, see Oakes, 2008: 66-71.

⁴¹ Marks, 2004: 78 and 64.

⁴² On Peter's role in relation to Anglo-Saxon clergy, see Cubitt, 2004.

one of their own, and emphasised his monastic vocation, as Alan Piper has noted: Symeon refers to him as '*plane monachus*' ('wholly a monk') in the *Libellus*.⁴³

Yet both Cuthbert and Peter would also have potentially provided touchstones for episcopal and archepiscopal leadership, a point of which Symeon was perhaps only too well aware. In relation to this, we should remember that the *cathedra* of both the bishop at Durham and archbishop at York would have been in the vicinity of the high altar patronal images. The *cathedra* at Durham was on the south side of the choir and above bishop Hatfield's tomb (Plans 2-5, no.8), and that at York on the south side and immediately to the west of the entrance to the choir from the north choir ambulatory (Plans 8-11; no.11).⁴⁴ This arrangement suggests that there was most likely a sight line between the *cathedra* and the images at both institutions.

Baschet has pointed out the oversimplification inherent in considering the church building as a simple image of the power of the institution of the Church, suggesting instead that it should be understood as an expression of *Ecclesia*, encompassing the building, the entire Christian community, and the clerical institution.⁴⁵ At institutions such as Exeter and St Augustine's Abbey, Bristol, the presence of collection boxes associated with patronal images, or, in the case of Norwich cathedral priory, associated with the high altar,⁴⁶ to some extent reinforces the idea that patronal saints were 'not so much exemplary as...helpers and intercessors in everyday life' for the laity, a characterisation Marks has applied to images of the saints in general, but especially 'male [saints]...mostly dressed in the robes and trappings of high office in Church and State', whose lives were amongst those 'inimitable' for the laity'.⁴⁷ However, patronal images can also be seen as similarly multi-faceted as the Church itself, as Baschet has characterized it. They could act as visual reminders of their vocations for the clergy and communities, and therefore potentially as particularly apt intercessors. Yet in turn, for the laity, as well as being 'helpers and intercessors', they could

⁴³ Piper, 1989: 439; *Libellus*: i.3. Peter was not absent from Durham: for instance, he was one of the twelve apostles on one of the long sides of St Cuthbert's coffin. For an exploration of this iconography in its Anglo-Saxon context, see Higgett, 1989.

⁴⁴ *Rites*: 19, for a description of the *cathedra* at Durham.

⁴⁵ Baschet, 2011: 184.

⁴⁶ Orme, 1986: 29; Luxford, 2011a: 243. For Norwich see Shinnars, 1987-89: 135-36.

⁴⁷ Marks, 2004: 91.

also act as visual reminders of the ‘sacerdotal mediation’ which Baschet reminds us was the paradigm on which the institution of the Church was built.⁴⁸

A similar role as an exemplar can also be suggested for St Oswald at Durham, yet in this case specifically in relation to royal and noble patronage and protection of the community. The *Rites*’ description of the kings and queens of England and Scotland whose gilded ‘pictures’ were placed in ‘theire seuerall roomes’ on the choir screen and who are noted as ‘deuout and godly founders and benefactors’, functioned ‘to incite and prouoke their posteritie to the like religious endeauours in their seuerall successions’.⁴⁹ In light of the promotion of Oswald as the guardian of the community at Lindisfarne (see p.226), it was perhaps deliberate that the gilded figures of the kings and queens would have echoed the gilding of the Neville Screen figure of St Oswald, therefore materially allying them with their royal predecessor and the community’s first patron.

Marks has also suggested that the patronal image functioned as ‘social glue’, as in the parochial context.⁵⁰ However, the larger *theatrum sacrum* of these cathedral churches enabled the presence of more than one image of the patronal saint(s) in different sizes and media not only at and in the vicinity of the high altars, but also throughout their interiors. We can therefore suggest that they also functioned here *visually* as a kind of ‘glue’, reiterating the identity of an institution throughout the building, and, in the case of narrative depictions, expanding upon its origins and explaining its significance. Such a reading is complementary to the way of looking at multiple images of the same figure(s) which we explored in relation to images of the Virgin and their ability to act as ‘signposts’. Moreover, it bears out the flexibility inherent in the reading of images which Crossley especially emphasises.⁵¹

Most obviously this can be suggested in relation to the figures of Cuthbert, Oswald, and the Virgin in the Galilee Chapel and in window sXIX in the Neville chantry chapel in the south aisle of the nave at Durham (see p.155). In addition, the three saints were also the subject of one of the fifteenth century windows in

⁴⁸ Marks, 2004: 91; Baschet, 2011: 184.

⁴⁹ *Rites*: 20. See also Slater, 2014: 100-102 on this scheme as encouraging royal patronage.

⁵⁰ Marks, 2004: 82.

⁵¹ Crossley, 2010: 242.

the vestry, to the south of the south choir aisle (V/sII; Plan 12).⁵² This was a liturgically important location: as well as its quotidian use, the *Rites* states that there was an altar there used by the Bishop only when he was going to consecrate a priest or bestow any holy orders.⁵³ It is therefore particularly significant in relation to the exemplary role of Cuthbert discussed above, but also in relation to its potential role as a preparatory image of the Neville Screen arrangement. This preparatory function would also be at work in relation to the images of Cuthbert and Oswald which were within the scheme of kings and bishops said to be on the choir screen before the scheme of kings and queens (Fig.12), particularly within the context of liturgical processions.

At York, the image of St Peter in the west nave, probably on the interior trumeau of the west door, would also have had liturgical significance in the context of processions which encompassed the west door. Here, it would have acted as a visual reminder of the identity of the building to those entering and exiting, but also visually allied the extreme west end of the Minster with the east end. The image of St Andrew described as ‘at the west door’ in the fabric accounts from Wells can be interpreted in a similar fashion.⁵⁴ The presence of a collection box at this image, but no entries in the accounts for one at the high altar, suggests that here there may have been more of a divide between laity and clergy in access to, and affinity with, different images of St Andrew at Wells.⁵⁵

The rich evidence for the subject matter of the windows in the choir ambulatories and east end of Durham lend themselves to examination both as functioning as ‘signposting’ and as ‘glue’, considering their proximity to Cuthbert’s shrine.⁵⁶ In particular, the two ‘high lights’ of the central window of the Nine Altars (window I, Plan 12) depicted St Cuthbert, dressed in his Mass vestments and holding the head of St Oswald, and St Bede, in a ‘blew [black]’ habit, while the lower lights showed St Cuthbert ‘vpon his mothers bedd, at his natiuity...St Oswald...blowing his horne, & the picture of St Cuthbt [sic] appearing to ye said saint Oswald’.⁵⁷ As Haselock and O’Connor have noted, an

⁵² See Haselock and O’Connor, 1980: 115. The vestry was added in the 1290s and destroyed in the post-medieval period. See Cambridge, 1992: 54.

⁵³ *Rites*: 19.

⁵⁴ Colchester, 1983: 9, 16, 21, 28, 35.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*

⁵⁶ Haselock and O’Connor, 1980: 111-13.

⁵⁷ *Rites*, 118-19.

Annunciation scene was above these figures in the tracery: they suggest this ‘reflected the primary dedication of the church to the Blessed Virgin’.⁵⁸ Yet with the images of St Cuthbert holding Oswald’s head, and the figure of Bede there too, the window as a whole also presents a modification of the high altar arrangement of images, one that emphasised the bodily remains of those saints whose relics were all once in the feretory area, Bede’s being in a separate shrine from that of Cuthbert and Oswald before its transfer to the Galilee in 1370, as reported in the *Rites*.⁵⁹

This multiplicity of images of the patronal saints in various media at Durham, especially the presence of the reliquary-image of St Oswald, invites consideration of the other figural reliquaries at both institutions, most notably the head reliquaries. Of particular pertinence is the relationship between these objects and images of the patronal saints.

7.iii. *Head Relics and Head Reliquaries*

Part One set out evidence from Durham’s 1383 *Liber de Reliquiis* for four ‘heads’ in the relic cupboards at St Cuthbert’s feretory: that of St Aidan, described as decorated in gilded copper and precious stones; the ‘*caput et ossa*’ of one of the Eleven Thousand Virgins (hereafter referred to in this chapter as St Ursula’s Companion⁶⁰); and those of St Ceowulf, and of St Boisil, recorded together yet under one entry and described as ‘in a feretory decorated with silver and gold’ (see p.61). The index of the inventory records the *capita* of Ceowulf and St Ursula’s Companion, but merely the ‘*ossa*’ of St Boisil all under ‘C’, and the *capita* of St Aidan and of St Boisil only under ‘A’ and ‘B’ respectively. Part One also set out evidence from York from the Chamberlain’s accounts and the c.1500 inventory for a *caput* of St William, which was likely to have been at the high altar by at least this date, and for the *caput* of St Everilda at the Red Ark (see p. 102; 114). To this we can add the potential presence in the Minster of a head

⁵⁸ Haselock and O’Connor, 1980: 111.

⁵⁹ *Rites*: 46.

⁶⁰ This appellation of ‘St Ursula’s Companion’ is somewhat anachronistic. As Montgomery has noted, it was only in the sixteenth century and later that the cult became widely known as that of ‘St Ursula and her Companions’, as opposed to the collective title of the ‘Eleven Thousand Virgins’, thus bringing a new emphasis upon the individual figure of St Ursula as the leader of the martyrs. Its use here is to differentiate the saint from the Virgin Mary. Montgomery, 2010: 165; 20-21.

reliquary of Archbishop Scrope. Norton has noted that Isabel Bruce's 1477 bequest of a diamond ring '*capiti Ricardi Scrope*', does not specify its location, and has speculated that it might not necessarily be tied to the convent at Clementhorpe, near to his execution site, where she wished to be buried, as has usually been understood.⁶¹ However, the c.1500 inventory makes no reference to such a reliquary, as it does for St William, and there are no other bequests in our sources to it, suggesting this must remain within the realm of speculation.

The study of body-part reliquaries, and head reliquaries in particular, has proliferated in the last twenty-five years.⁶² Boehm and Montgomery have provided, respectively, a study of the form and functions of head reliquaries from the Massif Central region of France, and a wide-ranging consideration of the use and perception of reliquary busts in the late medieval period, though Montgomery's focus is on continental textual sources and surviving examples.⁶³ Montgomery has also highlighted the particular capacity of reliquaries depicting the head, and most importantly the *face*, of a saint as being able to facilitate devotion, thanks to 'the saint's ability to link heaven and earth', through their materiality, and their form, which ensured they had 'eyes to see the needs and actions of the faithful, ears to hear their prayers, and a mouth to forward them to Heaven'.⁶⁴

Wider scholarship has emphasized the importance of the head, and particularly its status as '*pars pro toto* par excellence' in medieval political, medical, and theological discourses.⁶⁵ Two recent exhibitions, '*Il Volto di Cristo*', at the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, and '*Set in Stone: The Face in Medieval Sculpture*' at the Metropolitan Museum, New York, provide wider, yet

⁶¹ Norton, 2007: 209; *TE* III: 231-32; see also Hughes, 1988: 307.

⁶² For a review of the continental literature, see Montgomery, 1996: 5-32 and Boehm, 1997. In particular, see Birgitta Falk's discussion of the emergence of heads, busts, and half-figures, including a catalogue of all known examples in central and western Europe from the ninth to the fourteenth centuries: Falk, 1991-93 (those from York and Durham are listed on pages 105-106, but not discussed). Also important are the essays by Hahn, Head, Montgomery, and Shortell, as well as Boehm's review and Bynum and Gerson's introduction, comprising the 1997 volume of *Gesta*, dedicated to exploring body-part reliquaries.

⁶³ Boehm, 1990. Montgomery, 1996.

⁶⁴ Montgomery, 1996: 2; 54; Cornelison and Montgomery, 2006: 2.

⁶⁵ Ross, 1967: 61-126; Boehm, 1990: 33-45; in relation to iconoclasm and punishment, see Graves, 2008, esp. 41-44. Recently, the essays within Santing, Baert, and Traninger, 2013 (quotation here at page 2), especially Esther Cohen's contribution, on the meaning of the head in the high middle ages at 59-76.

specifically art-historical, contexts for our exploration.⁶⁶ As the title of the former indicates, it should be borne in mind in relation to head reliquaries that the head, and specifically the *face*, of Christ was also a focus of devotion throughout the late medieval period. As Wolf has noted, a face-to-face encounter with Christ in the next world was the goal of the medieval Christian's life.⁶⁷ The popularity of devotion to the head of John the Baptist throughout the period should be remembered here too.⁶⁸

Thus far, analysis of head reliquaries in the English cathedral context has been limited and focused on the common practice of the enclosure of the head of a cathedral's principal saint (whose relics the institution possessed and promoted) in a separate shrine to that of the body.⁶⁹ The more extensive evidence from Durham and York allows us to explore head reliquaries of individuals who were not necessarily the patronal and/or principal saints of each institution, but also to consider them in relation to these patronal and principal saints.

The ambiguity within the descriptions and indexing of the heads at Durham and York demand close examination in order to elucidate the exact nature of the objects which were recorded. This is especially necessary in light of Hahn's emphasis on the frequency with which body-part reliquaries did not necessarily contain the body-part depicted, and discussion by Montgomery concerning the indeterminate terminology used to refer to these objects in continental medieval sources.⁷⁰ The term '*caput*' or '*capud*' and its vernacular equivalents were used to refer variously to a skull or other head relic, or the reliquary itself, 'whether in the form of heads, busts, or half-figures'.⁷¹ The only discussion thus far of the Durham *capita*, by R.N. Bailey, concentrates on the question of whether Durham was the custodian of Oswald's head throughout the medieval period, and lacks awareness of these possible nuances in the

⁶⁶ Morello and Wolf, 2000; Little, 2006, and within this, Boehm, 2006.

⁶⁷ Morello and Wolf, 2000: 19. For more consideration of devotion to images of Christ's face, see the essays in Kessler and Wolf, 1998, especially that by Wolf.

⁶⁸ On the role of images of John the Baptist's head, see most recently Baert, 2013, and Kapustka, 2013. For surviving alabaster reliefs of the head of John the Baptist, see *Gothic*, cat. no. 219, and *Wonder*, cat. nos. 7-8.

⁶⁹ Nilson, 1998: 54-56, and Crook, 2011: 218-220. Venables, 1893, provides an analysis of the head shrine of St Hugh of Lincoln.

⁷⁰ Hahn, 1997: 20; Montgomery, 1996: 246-49.

⁷¹ Montgomery, 1996: 246-47. See also Falk, 1991-93: 99-100.

terminology. It is therefore even more pressing to clarify, as far as possible, the nature of these *capita*.⁷²

Rather than indicating, as Bailey assumes, that the 1383 evidence for the ‘*caput*’ of Aidan can be equated with a skull which earlier had been in St Cuthbert’s coffin and had the potential to be mistaken for Oswald’s, the inventory leaves room to suggest that the object was a head reliquary containing fragments of a skull or another part of a skeleton.⁷³ As Bailey himself points out, there is a lack of reference to a head of St Aidan in a twelfth-century inventory of Durham relics, dated to no later than the middle of the century,⁷⁴ with reference only to ‘*ossa*’.⁷⁵ An inventory of relics dated to the early fourteenth century also records only the ‘*ossa*’ of St Aidan amongst its list of those relics found with St Cuthbert’s body on the day of his translation.⁷⁶ It is also notable that both inventories *do* specify that amongst the relics found with St Cuthbert was the ‘*caput*’ of Ceowulf, suggesting that when distinguishable as a head or skull, the relic was noted as such.⁷⁷

The description of the ‘*caput et ossa*’ of St Ursula’s Companion in the 1383 *Liber* might also indicate a head reliquary containing undistinguishable bones. The twelfth-century and early fourteenth-century inventories of relics record the ‘*ossa*’ of St Ursula’s Companion as being, like those of St Aidan, amongst the variety of relics found with the body of St Cuthbert on the day of his translation, rather than any ‘*caput*’ (i.e. actual skull). Therefore whilst Bailey is probably correct that this *caput* did not come into contact with Oswald’s skull, and whilst reliquary busts of the Eleven Thousand Virgins on the continent frequently did hold whole skulls, it is likely that this contact did not occur at Durham because the *caput* was a reliquary for the *ossa*, not a skull itself, as Bailey assumes, and therefore was never in the coffin.⁷⁸

⁷² Bailey, 1995.

⁷³ ‘*ossa sancti Aidani*’. *Scriptores Tres*: ccccxxvii.

⁷⁴ Battiscombe, 1956: 113.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*

⁷⁶ ‘*Inventa sunt quoque cum corpore ipsius sancti Patris, die translacione ejusdem, ossa sancti Aidani...*’. *Scriptores Tres*: ccccxxvi-ccccxxvii.

⁷⁷ ‘*Caput Ceowulfi regis et postea monachi in Lindisfarnensi ecclesia*’. *Ibid*: ccccxxvii. St Oswald’s head is also defined as such, with its location: ‘*Caput Oswaldi Regis et Martis, quod locatum est in scrinio cum corpore Cuthberti*’, *Ibid*: ccccxxvi.

⁷⁸ ‘*Ossa sanctorum virginum xi millium colonie*’, Battiscombe, 1956: 114. Montgomery, 2010: 29-30.

The assertion that the bones belonged to one of the Eleven Thousand Virgins needs clarification in light of the chronology of the cult of relics attached to the legend. Cuthbert's translation was in 1104, and the excavations north of Cologne which revealed thousands of graves of Roman origin, and identified immediately as the graves of the Eleven Thousand Virgins, began only in 1106.⁷⁹ As Montgomery has noted, wide dissemination of the relics began almost immediately and continued until a papal bull was issued in 1393 forbidding their further exportation.⁸⁰ However, relics of the Eleven Thousand Virgins were in circulation on the continent as early as the tenth and eleventh centuries, fuelled by their use as gifts between monastic institutions, and were to be found at another Benedictine institution in England, Glastonbury, before 1171.⁸¹ The Durham *ossa* therefore may have been acquired by Alfred of Westou, whom we know from Symeon travelled extensively between institutions and was responsible for depositing relics of a number of Northumbrian saints in Cuthbert's coffin, most spectacularly those of Bede.⁸²

The actual head of Ceowulf is noted by Symeon as being moved to Durham long after his death along with relics of 'many other saints'⁸³ and Bailey posits that it was one of Alfred's acquisitions.⁸⁴ St Boisil's relics are described by Symeon as being translated by Alfred from Melrose to Durham, where they were installed in a shrine 'near to Cuthbert's body, just as they are preserved to this day', though there is no mention of a separate head reliquary or shrine for the head, nor, as Bailey has noted, is there a head listed separately in the twelfth-century inventory; examination of the early fourteenth-century inventory reveals the same.⁸⁵

The fluidity with which the 1383 *Liber* classifies both images and reliquaries as relics is matched by the fluidity of the York c.1500 inventory's classification of images, which includes the *caput* of St Everilda. Both speak to

⁷⁹ Montgomery, 2010: 20.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*: 27-28.

⁸¹ Tervarent, 1931, I: 39-43 and 44.

⁸² *Libellus*: iii.7. For discussion of Alfred's activities and the reporting of them by Symeon, and later Reginald of Durham, see Crook, 2011: 98-102.

⁸³ *Libellus*: i.15.

⁸⁴ Bailey, 1995: 204. Battiscombe, 1956: 113; *Scriptores Tres*: ccccxxvii.

⁸⁵ 'iuxta illius corpus {Cuthberti} in altero scrinio decenter sicut hactenus habentur condidit', (translation by Rollason). *Libellus*: iii.7. Bailey, 1995: 205, n. 43. 'Corpus et vestimenta sancti boisili', Battiscombe, 1956: 113.

the ability of relics and reliquaries to become conflated, even, as Hahn notes, the container's ability to supercede the contained when the latter was made from the heavenly materials of gold and jewels,⁸⁶ as well as images' ability to acquire a relic, or relic-like, status over time. Yet this classification of the *caput* of Everilda as an image, as well as Hahn's observation, also challenge modern scholarly tendency to discuss reliquary heads separately from images without a reliquary function. Similarly, the 1536 inventory from Salisbury Cathedral includes, under its section headed '*Imagines*', entries for images of the Trinity, the Virgin, St Osmund, the Virgin and Child, but also 'a head of silver' containing relics of St Catharine, and an arm of 'St Thomas a Becket, in a casket, and some other holy relics'.⁸⁷ These inventories suggest that administratively, and perhaps devotionally, three-dimensional representations of the saints, whether having a reliquary function or not, were thought of, and potentially used, in more similar ways than has hitherto been acknowledged, united by their material allusion to the 'glory of the transfigured body'.⁸⁸

In contrast to the evidence relating to St Ursula's Companion, the evidence from the c.1300 inventory at York indicates that the whole skull of St Everilda, 'wrapped in a linen cloth' in the feretory behind the high altar, was taken out of the feretory and enclosed in a head reliquary, although there remains a possibility that it enclosed only a fragment of the skull, and/or some or all of the *ossa* and/or garments which were in the feretory at St James' altar in the c.1300 inventory, and which are not mentioned in any later sources.

Can we suggest a more precise date for the making of the *caput* of St Everilda, and when the relics at Durham were enclosed? Examination of the wider chronology of head reliquaries and consideration of the idea of the saint's head is necessary before attempting to answer this question, allowing us to contextualise the objects not only chronologically, but imaginatively, especially in relation to the tension between part and whole with regard to saints' bodies and relics explored by Bynum and Hahn.⁸⁹ The earliest documented head reliquary on the continent, of St Maurice, is no longer extant, and dated from the late ninth-

⁸⁶ Hahn, 1997: 28, following Bynum, 1995: 211-12.

⁸⁷ Wordsworth, 1901: 160.

⁸⁸ Schmitt, 2002: 287.

⁸⁹ Bynum, 1992: 268-97; 1995: 201-14; 318-29; Hahn, 1997: 28.

century (Fig.125) and was commissioned by Boson, king of Burgundy (d.887).⁹⁰ Boehm has convincingly argued for the Massif Central region as being the *locus* for the origin and early development of the form, and Montgomery has concisely summarised its rise in popularity and proliferation on the continent, which, though steadily rising throughout the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, he suggests became particularly noticeable in the fourteenth century, and continued until the Reformation.⁹¹

The incomplete nature of the evidence, especially the lack of extant head reliquaries, makes it more difficult to assess whether this was the pattern in England. As Falk has noted, the head of St Justus is recorded in the *Annales Monasterii de Wintonia* as a gift from King Aethelstan, in 924, though no decoration of it is described and it may or may not have been a reliquary.⁹² A head reliquary of St Justus of Beauvais is, however, noted amongst the gifts of Bishop Henry of Blois (d.1171), abbot of Glastonbury, to Winchester Cathedral: it is described as ‘*bene ornatum in auro et lapidibus pretiosis*’ (‘beautifully adorned in gold and precious stones’) and, in an example of the kind of inexact similitude between reliquary and relic pointed out by Hahn, it is said to contain relics of one of the Innocents.⁹³

Although several early English saints’ cults focused on figures who were beheaded as martyrs, such as St Alban and St Oswald, intactness of head and body in death were emphasised in the literatures associated with two of the most popular saints’ cults of the late eleventh and most of the twelfth centuries in England, those of the beheaded martyr St Edmund at Bury, whose miraculously reattached head is central to his sacred identity, and St Etheldreda at Ely.⁹⁴ the cults of both have been identified as the main ‘rivals’ to that of St Cuthbert during this period.⁹⁵ In contrast,

⁹⁰ Boehm, 1990: 47-48.

⁹¹ *Ibid.*: 49-51; Montgomery, 1996: 87-95.

⁹² Luard, 1865: II, 10; Falk, 1991-93: cat. no.22.

⁹³ ‘*Capud s. Iusti martyris...et in eodem sunt reliqui unius Innocentis*’. *L-B* II: 669 (4765).

⁹⁴ Ridyard, 1988: 176-210 (on that of St Etheldreda and her relatives) and 211-33 (on that of St Edmund). See also Blanton, 2007: 31-56 (on St Etheldreda); Gransden, 1995 and Bale, 2009 (on St Edmund), and especially Greenway & Sayers, 1989: 100-101 for Jocelin of Brakelond’s description of the opening of Edmund’s shrine in 1198 and his comments about the head’s intactness.

⁹⁵ St Edmund’s popularity is particularly suggested by Reginald of Durham, recounting miracles from 1083 and 1172, in which two pilgrims respectively drew lots between saints Cuthbert, Edmund, and Etheldreda, and Cuthbert, Edmund, and Thomas Becket. For the miracles, see Raine, 1835: XIX (37-41), CV (260-61). On the relationship between these cults, and particularly the latter miracle as evidence of the ascendancy of St Thomas’ cult, see also Ward, 1982: 105-06 and more extensively Tudor, 1989.

the mode of the death of St Thomas Becket in 1170 can be suggested as bringing renewed attention, and more importantly, sacred prestige, to the idea of the severed head.⁹⁶ The subsequent separate enclosure of his head relics can also be suggested as potentially providing an imaginative context for the enclosure of the *capita* at Durham and York, though the increasing continental popularity of the head-reliquary must surely also have played its part. The rebuilding of major shrines during the period 1270-1350, which Coldstream has examined in detail, should also not be forgotten as providing opportunities for the separate enclosure of *capita*.⁹⁷

The chronology and nature of the head reliquary of St Thomas is uncertain. Most literature on the cult accepts that one was set up in the Corona Chapel, most likely enclosing the crown of Becket's head: Nilson has asserted that it is the earliest example of a head 'or part thereof' of a saint whose main shrine also resides at the same institution.⁹⁸ However, as Stanley notes, the earliest reference to a '*corona sancti Thome*', in which gold, silver, and precious stones at a cost of £115 12s. are listed as being bought for it, occurs only in 1314: we do not know whether this marks the final stages of its initial manufacture, or a sumptuous redecoration of an extant reliquary.⁹⁹

At this time head reliquaries of other saints were also present at Christ Church, Canterbury, though the extent to which their making and display can be linked to the ascendancy of Becket's cult is unclear. According to the 1315 inventory of relics at Christ Church, the heads of saints Furseus and Austroberta were displayed in the relic cupboard on the north side of the choir.¹⁰⁰ They had previously been enclosed, respectively, in a crypt altar in the Anglo-Saxon cathedral, and in the altar of the Virgin in the Anglo-Saxon cathedral's eastern Lady Chapel, though there is no indication of how they were enclosed at these locations, when they were enclosed in their current reliquaries, or moved to the relic cupboard at the high altar.¹⁰¹ The reliquary cupboard also contained the head of St Blaise, whose body was first translated to Canterbury by Archbishop Plegemund (d. 914).¹⁰² All are stated as being '*in capite argenteo et deaurato*',

⁹⁶ See Coehn, 2013 on this in relation to wider currents of thought about the head at this time.

⁹⁷ Coldstream, 1976.

⁹⁸ Stanley, 1904: 206-07; Nilson, 1998: 54; see also Tatton-Brown, 2002: 96; 106, and Binski, 2004: 11.

⁹⁹ Stanley, 1904: 206-07.

¹⁰⁰ Legg & Hope, 1902: 80.

¹⁰¹ Willis, 1845: 11-12.

¹⁰² Legg & Hope, 1902: 80.

with those of Fursus and Austroberta additionally described as ‘*amaliato*’.¹⁰³ The heads themselves are listed separately to the reliquary-heads which contained them, for example ‘*Caput sancti Blasi in capite argenteo et deaurato*’: this is again suggestive of the variation in recording of these objects at individual institutions.¹⁰⁴ The inventory also suggests that, as in the case of St Oswald’s head, not all the heads deposited at Christ Church were placed in reliquaries and displayed. The inventory does not mention the head of St Swithun, enclosed in an altar by Archbishop Aelphege, for example.¹⁰⁵ This indicates that we should pay particular attention to which saints’ heads were enclosed and displayed, and why, a topic that we will return to below.

The Christ Church evidence therefore suggests a possible fourteenth century date for the making of the *caput* of St Everilda, and this would fit the chronology of the increasing popularity of head reliquaries on the continent outlined above. However, we can suggest a more immediate context, and therefore perhaps a more accurate date, by considering architectural change in the Minster. It is not unreasonable to speculate that the rebuilding of the choir in the late fourteenth century, and especially the suspension of services there in 1394, provides an apposite context into which we might fit the manufacture of the *caput*, due to the probability that the feretory behind the high altar described in the c.1275-1300 inventory as holding the head of Everilda would have had to have been moved due to the building work.

Local as well as national and international contexts need to be considered in relation to the Durham *capita* too. It is noticeable that the twelfth-century and the early fourteenth-century inventories of relics from Durham do not mention any reliquaries in connection with the relics found in Cuthbert’s coffin. Whilst the latter inventory does read partly as a copy of the former, and therefore cannot necessarily be relied upon in dating any change, it also includes a large number of other relics described as being kept in ivory caskets and crystal phials, and these are not included in the earlier inventory. They are described as ‘*extra feretrum sancti Cuthberti conservatis*’, suggesting that if the relics from the coffin were enclosed in individual reliquaries by the time this inventory was compiled, they

¹⁰³ Legg and Hope, 1902: 80.

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*

¹⁰⁵ Willis, 1845: 11.

would have been described thus.¹⁰⁶ A loose *terminus post quem* of the mid-twelfth century can therefore be proposed for the Durham *capita*, but an early fourteenth-century date is also possible.

Regulations concerning reliquaries do not necessarily help us in proposing a more precise date for the making of the *capita*. For example, Boehm rightly notes that the ruling of Lateran IV in 1215 stating that relics should not be displayed except within a reliquary is suggestive that the practice of the direct display of the relic itself was common.¹⁰⁷ The process of the enclosure of the relics at Durham may have been piecemeal. However, as proposed above for York, it may have been prompted by architectural change, in this case the new shrine base for St Cuthbert and the erection of the Neville Screen in the late fourteenth century. This would have necessitated considerable disruption to the high altar and feretory area, as we have discussed above in relation to the possible movement and replacement of the patronal status of the images of St Cuthbert, the Virgin, and St Oswald. Indeed, the purpose of the 1383 *Liber* may partly have been to record these new reliquaries; if not this, it may be proposed at least to record the new locations of extant reliquaries in light of the recent works.

Accounts of the translation of St Cuthbert in 1104 help to explain how and why the Durham *ossa* came to be enclosed in separate reliquaries. The anonymous twelfth-century account of the translation of Cuthbert specifies that the head of Oswald was inside the coffin, as were the bones of Aidan (again, *ossa* rather than specifically his head).¹⁰⁸ The bones of several successors of Cuthbert, as well as those of Bede, were all contained in a ‘small linen bag’; furthermore, the coffin also contained the bones of ‘very many relics of other Saints’, so many that it was difficult to move Cuthbert’s body within the coffin, and so the body was removed while the relics were collected.¹⁰⁹ Only Oswald’s head was replaced in its position ‘by the head of the glorious archbishop’, the rest being placed into caskets which were processed behind Cuthbert’s body during the translation ceremony.¹¹⁰

¹⁰⁶ *Scriptores Tres*: ccccxxvii-ccccxxx.

¹⁰⁷ Boehm, 1990: 100.

¹⁰⁸ Raine and Mynors, 1956: 102.

¹⁰⁹ *Ibid.*

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*: 106.

This movement, which functioned to expand the institution's number of accessible relics, and the details of the processional gesture, not only further indicate that the *capita* are of a later date, but are suggestive of the relics' relative status to Cuthbert. The deliberate replacement of Oswald's head in the coffin, rather than its removal and any subsequent translation and enclosure into a head reliquary, is suggestive of the two saints' close affinity in the eyes of the monks. Furthermore, it is indicative of the relative sanctity of Oswald's head in relation to the other saints' relics, an affinity and sanctity which, as we have seen in the previous section, manifested itself in the reliquary-image of St Oswald and its procession, as well as the iconography of St Cuthbert holding St Oswald's head.

While he is silent on the status of St Oswald's head, Reginald of Durham's account of the same events makes clear the relative sanctity of the other relics in relation to St Cuthbert, again perhaps indicating Oswald's particular affinity with Cuthbert precisely through this exception. He states that 'the precious relics deposited beside him gave proof of the signs of great holiness still abiding in St Cuthbert'.¹¹¹ However, despite this 'enhancing' function, according to Reginald these relics were in a putrefied state, their 'reduction to ash' resulting in dampness in the coffin, and he goes on to contrast their state to that of St Cuthbert's incorrupt body. Indeed, they are characterised as damaging Cuthbert's resting place: 'that part of the tomb where some portion of the relics of the saints had rested was seen to be foul and dirty and somewhat damp...they cleansed the coffin from this hurtful defilement', placing the relics 'separately elsewhere'.¹¹² In this case, although we do not know which bones specifically were those which caused the 'defilement', the enclosure of the relics into the head reliquaries listed in the 1383 *Liber* may be seen as an especially restorative act, considering that, as both Montgomery and Bynum have elucidated, body part reliquaries deny the process of putrefaction by 'reconstructing the saint in a non-decomposed state'.¹¹³ In this context, their placement in the relic cupboard at the shrine may also be interpreted as restoring their 'correct' status in relation to the sanctity of St Cuthbert.

It is notable that neither the heads, nor any of the other relics in the cupboards, are described individually in the description of the feretory in the

¹¹¹ Raine and Mynors, 1956: 107.

¹¹² Pace, 1956: 108-09.

¹¹³ Montgomery, 1996: 260; Bynum, 1995: 209, and 2011: 185-86.

Rites. This is somewhat surprising considering the *Rites*' delight in describing objects made from precious materials and/or with intricate designs, such as the shrine cover (see pp.182-83). It may be that these individual objects were no longer *in situ*. However, it could also indicate continuity in the perception of the relics and reliquaries seen in the accounts of Cuthbert's translation outlined above. As noted in the previous section, collectively the contents of the cupboards are described in the *Rites* as 'all the holy reliques...that was ofered to that holy man St Cuthbert'.¹¹⁴ This suggests that despite the relics' separation from Cuthbert's coffin, and their enclosure in separate reliquaries (an action that Hahn has characterised as giving relics their 'proper identification and a cultural matrix'),¹¹⁵ their location meant that they were still perceived to be intrinsically linked with, and even relative to, the relics of St Cuthbert. This link between the *capita* and St Cuthbert would be further emphasised by the opening of the 'almeryes' occurring at the same time as when the shrine cover was drawn up in a grand gesture of *ostentatio*.¹¹⁶

The opening of the relic cupboards also invites us to consider the material and symbolic relationship between the head reliquaries, and how they might relate to the other objects in the cupboards and their potential audiences. In contrast to the gilded copper and precious stones of the *caput* of St Aidan, that of St Ursula's Companion is not described in any detail, and this leaves open to question their provenance, and whether they had any material similitude. The continental context allows us to make some suggestions. The *caput* of St Ursula's Companion may have been imported from Cologne, where most of those of the Eleven Thousand Virgins were produced, but a more local provenance should not be entirely discounted.¹¹⁷ Montgomery has highlighted the iconographic coherency in surviving reliquary busts of the Eleven Thousand Virgins, which were often displayed together, and the way in which this fed into the cult's 'emphasis on corporeal and corporate unity'.¹¹⁸ This, he has emphasised, can be seen even

¹¹⁴ *Rites*: 5.

¹¹⁵ Hahn, 1997: 28.

¹¹⁶ *Rites*: 5.

¹¹⁷ Montgomery, 2010: 62.

¹¹⁸ *Ibid.*: 68-71

where a small number of head reliquaries have been produced on a local level, such as the four extant thirteenth-century examples from the Limousin.¹¹⁹

At Durham, therefore, the *caput* of St Ursula's Companion may well have been iconographically distinct, giving it a strong individual identity both in relation to that of St Aidan and St Oswald within the wider reliquary collection. Potentially easily identifiable as one of St Ursula's Companions in light of reliquaries elsewhere, it would have had particular resonance for pilgrims visiting the feretory, considering that the Eleven Thousand Virgins were thought to have been martyred on their return from Rome.¹²⁰ Yet, as Montgomery has suggested, the cult's 'collective unity' and 'subsuming of individual identity' would also speak to a monastic audience, meaning it would have resonance for both pilgrims and the community in its location at the feretory.¹²¹ More specifically, as well as the images of the Virgin present in the reliquary cupboards, the *caput* would have provided a complementary female *exemplum* of holy virginity for the community.¹²² Indeed, it is perhaps the holy virginity of St Ursula's Companion, complementary to that of St Cuthbert, which was a factor in the depositing of the relics in St Cuthbert's coffin. This, and the subsequent presence of the *caput* at the feretory, adds further nuance to the idea of St Cuthbert's alleged misogyny: clearly, there could be some kind of exception to the rule.

While the thread of holy virginity might have been used to draw associations between the distinct head reliquaries of St Ursula's Companion and St Aidan, as well as the reliquary-image of St Oswald and the images of St Cuthbert and the Virgin in the reliquary cupboards, the possibility of an iconographical and material similarity between the two head reliquaries of St Ursula's Companion and St Aidan should also not be discounted. This can be substantiated by examination of other reliquaries and reliquary displays which emphasise complementarity. We have already noted the similarity in materials used to describe the head reliquaries of Furseus, Austroberta, and Blaise at Christ Church; the detail that those of both Furseus and Austroberta were enamelled may have distinguished them from that of Blaise, but given the two a similitude. The display of reliquaries, books, crosses, and angels in Thomas of Elmham's drawing

¹¹⁹ *Ibid.*; O'Neill (ed.), 1995: cat. nos. 153 (a and b), 154, 157.

¹²⁰ Ellis (ed.), 1900, VI: 62-68; Montgomery, 2010: 16-17.

¹²¹ Montgomery, 2010: 29.

¹²² *Ibid.*: 93-94.

of the high altar at St Augustine's, Canterbury, is particularly notable for its symmetry (Fig.93). The display of relics depicted in the Litlington Missal initial for the Feast of the Relics (Fig.126) is also suggestive of a similar desire, with the arm reliquaries (probably of saints Bartholomew and Thomas the Apostle), flanking the 'lantern' (probably holding a relic of vestments of St Peter), and a head reliquary (probably of Edward the Confessor), with the 'cup' relic of the Holy Blood, donated by Henry III, in the centre.¹²³ However, continental evidence provides a more intricate example. Instructions dating from c.1500 for the display of reliquaries on the high altar at Basel cathedral on seven high feast days¹²⁴ shows that the head reliquaries of saints Eustache and Pantalus and saints Thecla and Ursula were placed on opposite sides of the Golden Frontal, the centrepiece of the display (Fig.127; see also Figs.69-71), so that saints Ursula and Pantalus were to the north and Eustache and Thecla to the south.¹²⁵ The relics were displayed minus the centrepiece of the Golden Frontal on other days.¹²⁶ Chapuis has noted that as well as acting as 'pendants' to one another, as in the case of the reliquary statuettes of St John the Baptist and St Christopher, and the arm reliquaries of saints Valentine and Walpert, all of which were also in the display, the desire to create symmetry appears to have governed the arrangement, and indeed the commissioning of the reliquaries themselves.¹²⁷ More specifically, we can suggest that the head reliquaries created two groups of *martyrs* to the north and south of the altar. The northern group is particularly interesting, as it includes saints central to the legend of the Eleven Thousand Virgins, Pantalus being the bishop of Basel who led the group of pilgrims to Rome. Importantly, as Montgomery has noted, the making and display of his *caput*, particularly with that of St Ursula, lent the episcopal office at Basel both legitimacy and a saintly 'heir'.¹²⁸ This enhanced the status of the institution and suggested that its

¹²³ Tudor-Craig, 1998: 108-109. The 'lantern' and 'cup' are so described in the 1520 inventory of the relics. As Tudor-Craig notes, there are no head relics of sainted kings listed, and she therefore suggests that this head came from one of the gilt effigies around the shrine, or from an effigy under the canopy of the shrine (109). For the inventory, see Westlake, 1923: II, 499-501 (Appendix 4).

¹²⁴ These feasts were Christmas, Easter Sunday, Pentecost, Corpus Christi, St Henrich's Day, the Ascension, and All Saints'. Chapuis, 2001: 20. See also Burckhardt, 1933: 15-16 and 353-358, including the schematic lists on 355 and 356, the latter for high feast days.

¹²⁵ Chapuis, 2001: 20.

¹²⁶ *Ibid.* and Burckhardt, 1933: 356.

¹²⁷ Chapuis, 2001: 20 and Burckhardt, 1933: 15-16 and 353-54.

¹²⁸ Montgomery, 2010: 143-49.

corporate identity was intrinsically linked with the company of the Eleven Thousand Virgins, under the protection of Ursula and Pantalus.¹²⁹ This is similar to the legitimizing and enhancing function that we have suggested previously in relation to the image-reliquary of St Oswald, and the Durham community who saw him as their guardian.

A similar use of the display of head reliquaries as tools to help define corporate identity has been suggested by Ellen M. Shortell in relation to those at St Quentin, Picardy. These were first displayed on altars in the nave in 1228, and moved to behind the high altar by 1257 after the translation of the saints' bodies due to the building of the new choir, a sequence which bolsters the argument for a link between architectural change and the making of the reliquaries at York and Durham.¹³⁰ In light of this, and Montgomery's analysis of the role of the head reliquaries at Basel, the making and display of the *caput* of Aidan at Durham can be suggested as functioning, with the image of Cuthbert and the reliquary-image of St Oswald, to form part of an image complex amongst the contents of the reliquary cupboards which served to highlight further the 'community genealogy', its origins at Lindisfarne, and the nexus of relationships between the figures. A similar concern is suggested by the Cosin manuscript's description of the statues of bishops and kings on the choir screen, the latter of whom are specifically described in relation to their Cuthbertine links, and the representations of the wider genealogy of the Benedictine order said in Wessington's treatise to be at the altar of St Jerome and Benedict, which included saints associated with the Durham community, including Cuthbert, Aidan, Boisil, and Eata (see, respectively, Appendix 2 and p.71).

Although we have no evidence for the exact location of the head of St Everilda and the arrangement of the devotional complex 'at the Red Ark' in the crossing of York Minster, we can suggest that the head was secured in some way, perhaps inside the tabernacle in which the image of the Virgin stood, and thus also perhaps not necessarily always visible, but in a position that made it easily accessible to the laity. Unlike Durham, at York there is no evidence for a display of several head reliquaries together, or as part of a wider display of reliquaries. The recording of textiles for the *caput* of St William specifically in relation to the

¹²⁹ Montgomery, 2010: 143-49.

¹³⁰ Shortell, 1997: 43.

high altar in the c.1500 inventory suggests that it was perhaps permanently located there, the textiles being used for the procession of the *caput*, or that it was moved there on certain liturgical occasions for the purpose of *ostentatio*.¹³¹ Similar textiles are not noted for Everilda. Whilst textiles were used to hold relics in procession, as the illustration of the translation of the relics of St Hedwig (1353; Fig.128), including her statuette of the Virgin and Child, demonstrates,¹³² other pictures of translation and ostentation indicate that the reliquary or relic itself could be held directly (Figs.129, 130), giving us no easy answer as to the intricacies with which the *capita* of saints William and Everilda were handled and/or moved at York.

The high altar location for the *caput* of St William, whether permanent or periodical, meant that it was at least on occasion in the vicinity of the St William window in the north-east transept overlooking the high altar (n7; Plan 13). The location of this window is, on an architectural scale, in a position akin to that of the patronal image, and the presence of both William's head and an image of St Peter at the high altar would surely invite visual resonances between the two. The north side position of the head reliquary of St Pantalus at Basel is also suggestive of the idea of a local saint being displayed on the north side of the altar. This potential link between William and Peter can be explored further by turning to evidence from the Continent. Boehm has observed that 28 out of 37 extant or documented head reliquaries from the Massif Central and nearby regions represent 'either the founder of the monastery, the principal apostle of the region, or the saint with whom the church was sufficiently associated that it bore its name'.¹³³ In relation to the synod convened by Arnaud, bishop of Rodez some time between 1004 and 1012, where head reliquaries of saints Foy, Marius, Amantius, and an image of the Virgin were brought, she notes that the patron saints acted as emblems of the communities and 'a kind of reference to a local 'apostolic succession', since [s]he was often the founder of the community'.¹³⁴

This idea of reference to local apostolic succession is one that we can suggest was perhaps at work at York, with the placement of the head of St William in proximity to an image of St Peter, further linking the Minster to the

¹³¹ Boehm, 1990: 77; 98; Montgomery, 1996: 119-63.

¹³² *Treasures of Heaven*, cat. no. 191.

¹³³ Boehm, 1990: 83.

¹³⁴ *Ibid.*: 92.

wider institute of the Church, and feeding into the theme of the decorative scheme of the east end. A high altar location for the head of St William also has implications in light of the evidence for the shrine of the saint behind the high altar.¹³⁵ The head of the saint whose relics lay hidden in the shrine was potentially visible in front of it, given that the shrine was likely partially visible through and above the high altar screen. Thus the head reliquary may have acted in part, as argued for the images of Cuthbert and Oswald at Durham above, to connect the two spaces.

In contrast to the numerous bequests to, and *ex-votos* surrounding, the shrines of St William, including his *caput*, and the tomb of archbishop Scrope,¹³⁶ it is notable that we have no evidence for direct bequests to or *ex-votos* for Everilda's head, or indeed to the feretory holding her bones. Nor do we have any indication as to whether the feretory holding bones from her body survived into the later medieval period. Furthermore, there is no evidence for an altar dedicated to her at any time. Monetary donations may have been made *in situ* in honour of the *caput*, as they may have been made in honour of the Virgin, but if there were, they appear to have been subsumed under the total amount given at the Red Ark, ostensibly for the fabric fund. Norton has highlighted the offerings made at several locations in the Minster by a York chaplain and a vicar choral, in 1452 and 1470 respectively, in response to charges of fornication: both were to give 3s. 4d. to St William's *caput* and also to Archbishop Scrope's tomb; the chaplain the same amount again to the fabric, the vicar choral the same amount to the red chest, and at the tomb of St William.¹³⁷ In Norton's opinion the offering to the red chest was 'probably for the fabric', as in the case of the chaplain.¹³⁸ However, could it be that the placement of the head of St Everilda and the image of the Virgin there was also a factor in this location's importance as well? Offerings to two models of chastity in response to charges of fornication would make sense.

Our inability to unpick the image complex of the Virgin and St Everilda financially is perhaps indicative of how the image complex was interpreted visually, as working symbiotically, and in this the objects provide a contrast to the relationship between the relics of St Cuthbert and the head reliquaries displayed at

¹³⁵ Brown, 2003: 236-37.

¹³⁶ Raine, 1859: 224-26.

¹³⁷ Norton, 2007: 205.

¹³⁸ *Ibid.*

Durham. John Blair has drawn attention to the growth in Anglo-Saxon England of the cult of local saints in minsters dedicated to universal saints, and the acknowledged ability of local saints to petition universal saints.¹³⁹ Such a relationship can be suggested in relation to the placement of the head of Everilda and the Virgin, and a wider significance for the combination can also be suggested in light of its position within the Minster, at the entrance to the south choir ambulatory. Here, Everilda's Anglo-Saxon and local character, and the Virgin's status as universal saint, may have functioned as a complement, or even provided an introduction to, the visual emphasis of east end of the Minster, which, as we have demonstrated in detail in light of Norton's argument, concentrated on the institution in relation to the local and universal Church.

Evidence for Everilda's presence in the east end glazing itself can also be suggested. It is not unreasonable that she should be identified as one of the three abbesses pictured in Row A of the east window, the bottom row of the tracery (lights A13; A17 and A18; Fig.131), representing 'A Cloud of Witnesses' (Hebrews 12:1), according to French's classification.¹⁴⁰ Whilst French leaves them unidentified, as they have no distinguishing attributes, Gent's 1762 *History* of the east window identifies the three abbesses as saints Hilda, Osyth, and Ermenilda, but no reasoning is given for these choices.¹⁴¹ Based on our knowledge of the Minster, its history, and its relics, we can suggest as alternative identifications Hilda, Everilda, and Etheldreda. All had connections to St Wilfred, including Everilda who, as noted in Part One, was given land by him to found her convent (see p.114);¹⁴² clothes belonging to Etheldreda are recorded as in a red feretory behind the high altar, and further relics of her, of an unidentified nature, are recorded as in the altar ('*In altare*') of St James, therefore the same altar where the feretory holding Everilda's body and garments was located.¹⁴³ All three appear together in the litanies in two important books of hours from fifteenth-century York, the Bolton Hours and the Pavement Hours.¹⁴⁴

¹³⁹ Blair, 2002a: 448-49.

¹⁴⁰ French, 1995: 42-44.

¹⁴¹ Gent, 1762: 67-68.

¹⁴² On Hilda and Etheldreda's connections to Wilfred, see respectively Eddius Stephanus' *Life of Wilfred* (Colgrave, 1927: Ch. X, 20-22), and *HE*: iv.19.

¹⁴³ Raine, 1859: 151; 153.

¹⁴⁴ YMLA, MS Add. 2, fol. 91r; YMLA MS XVI.K.6, fol. 39v.

These abbesses appear as part of the bottom row within the tracery head of the south arch of the window, along with seven other female saints; the central and north arches contain ten ecclesiastics and ten male saints respectively, as Norton has noted (Fig.132).¹⁴⁵ The possible figure of Everilda, undistinguishable from her fellow abbesses, thus works here in a similar fashion to reliquary busts of the Eleven Thousand Virgins displayed together, suggesting a complementary corporate body. However, the window's design also places her as part of a wider and more diverse corporate body of female saints, who were pictured within an even wider corporate body of the 'host of the saved', comprising figures from the Old and New Testaments.¹⁴⁶ This interplay between individual and corporate body is made more pronounced by the window's construction. The 'fragmentation' of the individual figures afforded by the mullions also builds them into a whole company, while keeping each figure distinct, giving a very different effect from the construction and design of the slightly earlier east window at Gloucester, where the architecture in the glass, and the bands of coloured glass, serve to unite the figures (Fig.133).¹⁴⁷ The place of Everilda in the east window at York can therefore be contrasted with the location of the reliquary bust of St Ursula's Companion at Durham, there acting as a representative of the corporate body of the Eleven Thousand Virgins,¹⁴⁸ yet also acting as one of several *exempla* of holy virginity, and more widely part of the corporate body of saints who were once interred with St Cuthbert.

Although the documentary and physical evidence for Everilda's presence in the Minster is therefore slim, and chronologically far apart, it is both materially and locationally significant, in particular the making and display of the *caput*. This invites us to consider her importance to the Minster over time, and her status in relation the cults of other saints present in the building, those of St William and later Archbishop Scrope. Everilda is named in Hugh Candidus' *List of Saints' Resting Places*, compiled c.1155, in which he describes her location as '*in Euoruwic*'.¹⁴⁹ She is the only saint listed in connection with York, and the wording of other entries in the list indicates that when no institution is named, the

¹⁴⁵ Norton, 2005: 176.

¹⁴⁶ *Ibid.*: 177.

¹⁴⁷ On this window see Kerr, 1985.

¹⁴⁸ Montgomery, 2010: 88.

¹⁴⁹ Butler, 1987: 94; 102.

principal institution of the town or city should be inferred as the resting place. This suggests both that Everilda was a not insignificant figure at this time, known beyond the local area, and also that her relics were likely to have been in the Minster around the time of, and quite possibly well before, the death of St William in 1154. In light of Hugh Candidus' list, Blair has suggested that '[relics of the saint] were at some point' translated from Nether Poppleton, near York, where Domesday Book describes three and a half carucates of land owned by a deacon named Oda as that which '*fuit terra S. Eluride*', but provides no evidence in support of this, and seems unaware of the later evidence for her relics' presence in the Minster.¹⁵⁰

However, a late eleventh or early twelfth-century date for a translation from Nether Poppleton, where archaeological evidence suggests there was an Anglo-Saxon monastic complex, and where the extant church includes a twelfth-century chancel arch,¹⁵¹ would be apt in light of local and national ecclesiastical contexts. It would fit the pattern of the wide promotion of Anglo-Saxon saints' cults at this time by Norman bishops and abbots, whom Ridyard has argued employed these figures, often local saints, in order to define their institution and community, as in the case of Bishop Walcher and St Cuthbert.¹⁵² The destruction of the Anglo-Saxon Minster by fire in 1069 would make the presence of the relics of an Anglo-Saxon saint such as Everilda in Thomas of Bayeux's Romanesque building an especially important mark of continuity, perhaps in a similar way to that which was claimed for Cuthbert by Symeon of Durham.¹⁵³ The founding of St Mary's Abbey in York in 1088, and the change from a secular to a monastic rule at Durham in 1083, as well as Cuthbert's translation in 1104,¹⁵⁴ would perhaps have given the Minster impetus to claim a monastic saint of their own. The importance of the cult of Etheldreda at Ely may also have been a factor, serving as a model for the potential popularity of specifically a high-status *female*

¹⁵⁰ Blair, 2002b: 505. See Williams et. al., 1992: fol. 329r for the Domesday reference.

¹⁵¹ Thompson et. al., 2005: esp. 29; Leach and Pevsner, 2009: 599.

¹⁵² Ridyard, 1987: esp. 205.

¹⁵³ Rollason et. al., 1998: 144; Johnson et. al., 1990: Ch. 2, 18.

¹⁵⁴ Ridyard, 1987: 197.

religious, and one connected to St Wilfred, as both Etheldreda and Everilda were.¹⁵⁵

It was perhaps the case that Everilda was considered a suitable but convenient, ‘make-do’ figure in the absence of any attainable relics of Anglo-Saxon ecclesiastical figures, particularly archbishops and bishops, connected to the see. As Christopher Norton has pointed out, by the twelfth-century these figures were all buried elsewhere, but the institution was keen to claim one, as illustrated by the story of the unsuccessful efforts of Thomas II (d.1114) to translate St Eata (d.686), Cuthbert’s predecessor at Lindisfarne, from Hexham.¹⁵⁶ William’s death and subsequent promotion and canonization in 1227, giving the Minster a saintly member of the ecclesiastical hierarchy, and one of particular contemporary relevance in light of the burgeoning cults of Thomas Becket at Canterbury and the established cult of Cuthbert at Durham, perhaps resulted in an eclipse of Everilda’s cult, potentially before it had time to flourish.

Evidence from breviaries and books of hours which contain Everilda in their calendars attest to her continued liturgical commemoration in the period between her possible translation and the appearance of the head reliquary in the c.1500 inventory.¹⁵⁷ The recording of the location of her head and bones in the c.1300 inventory within the York Gospels would also ensure her continued place in the collective imagination of the Minster itself. Her appearance in the calendar of the Percy Hours, dating from the first quarter of the fourteenth century, indicates that knowledge and veneration of her extended beyond the Minster clergy to one of the institution’s most prestigious and generous lay patronal families,¹⁵⁸ but it is notable that the litany does not include Everilda amongst its list of virgin saints.¹⁵⁹

The making and display of the *caput* at the Red Ark, potentially resulting from the movement of the feretory behind the high altar in the late fourteenth-

¹⁵⁵ On the founding of St Mary’s, see Norton, 1994: 257; 260; 280-82 (Appendix 2); Ridyard, 1987: 181-82; See also Blanton, 2007: 131-71 on the presentation of Etheldreda’s cult in the twelfth-century *Liber Eliensis*.

¹⁵⁶ Norton, 2006: 158-59.

¹⁵⁷ YMLA MS Add.68, fol. 291r (Breviary, c.1325-50); MS XVI.O.9, fol. 281r (Breviary, c.1350); MS Add. 383, fol. 287r (Breviary, 1400-1425); MS Add. 70, fol. 161v (Breviary, first half of the fifteenth century). I am grateful to Prof. Nigel Morgan for sharing his list of liturgical books of the York Use, their locations, and probable dates: the dates here are from this list.

¹⁵⁸ London, BL, MS Harley 1260, fol. 4r.

¹⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, fols. 96-99r, with the list of virgins on fol. 99v.

century, may therefore have marked a revivification of Everilda's cult at a time when the Minster was increasingly thinking about its history as an institution,¹⁶⁰ and it is perhaps within this context of renewed interest that we should consider her possible presence in the east window: indeed, the making of the head reliquary and the east window may have been contemporary.

Elsewhere in the fifteenth century a saint 'secondary' to that of the principal saint was given renewed attention through materially focusing on her head: Bishop Grey of Ely (d.1478) is recorded as decorating a head of St Sexburgh with precious metals and gemstones, which Draper has interpreted as suggesting she was accorded a separate head reliquary.¹⁶¹ The potential presence of the *caput* in the Minster from the early fifteenth-century onwards would also have further expanded the range of local saints' relics accessible within the Minster (and given particular focus to the idea of the sacred head) within the chronological context of Archbishop Scrope's death and veneration. It is possible that, unlike the situation at Ely, where any enhancement of Sexburgh's cult would have been likely to enhance veneration of both her and her sister, the veneration of Archbishop Scrope at the same time as a revival of Everilda's cult may have served only to eclipse that of the latter, as once again the Minster found itself with a contemporary episcopal saintly figure. However, considering the politically sensitive nature of Scrope's cult, the possibility that Everilda's head reliquary was intended partly as an alternative sacred head available for veneration should perhaps not be discounted.¹⁶²

The possible presence of the *caput* at the Red Ark in the first half of the fifteenth century and her appearance in liturgical sources, especially both the Bolton Hours and the Pavement Hours, contrasting with the notable lack of *ex-votos* for the *caput* in the c.1500 inventory, raises the issue of how extensive knowledge and veneration of Everilda was beyond the Minster clergy. Margaret Blackburn, whose will requested burial before the image of the Virgin in the south part of the Minster (see p.111), has been suggested as the patron of the Bolton Hours, and so her burial request may have extra significance, as we can

¹⁶⁰ This theme was most recently elucidated by Norton in a paper, 'John Newton and Intellectual Culture in York, c.1400', given at York, 2nd July, 2014.

¹⁶¹ '*decoravit caput Sancte Sexburge cum argento & auro & pretiosis lapidibus ad valorem lxxx librarum*', Wharton, 1691: I, 673; Draper, 1979: 12.

¹⁶² Norton, 2007: 204-05.

potentially link it to the Red Ark's devotional complex. However, the lack of direct reference to Everilda's *caput* leaves open the question of whether it was a factor in the request, or even whether it was *in situ* at the time of the will's composition.¹⁶³

As an Anglo-Saxon abbess, and one who, unlike St Etheldreda, did not have a miracle-cult attached to her relics, Everilda may have had limited appeal in the context of the devotional lives of the laity. The presence of an image of St Sitha in the Bolton Hours has been discussed in relation to her relevance and appeal to lay women, particularly girls, for example.¹⁶⁴ Indeed, the lack of any surviving, identifiable image of Everilda, bar the possible east window representation, leads to the question of how the head reliquary was recognized as that of the saint, and if indeed it was recognized as her by those outwith the Minster community.

The reliquary's potential use within the liturgy on her feast day, and other occasions meriting *ostentatio*, would have given audiences within the Minster, including the laity, specific contexts in which they could identify her, and become better acquainted with, or reminded of, her *vita*.¹⁶⁵ Yet besides these occasions, it may be that the *caput* of Everilda was identified as her at the Red Ark not necessarily primarily through its appearance, but potentially by the presence of an inscription. The inscription on the cornice of the reliquary for what was claimed to be St Oswald's skull at Hildersheim (Fig.134) gives some indication of how this could be incorporated into the object.¹⁶⁶ Another possible mode of identification would be text on a *tabula* somewhere at the Red Ark. The significant amount of text in Latin and English described as being under the images of the Virgin on the *tabula* associated with the Lady Chapel give us a potential precedent for such a conjunction of text and image within the Minster, and the inscriptions said to be under the images of kings and bishops suggests a similarly prominent conjunction at Durham. Indeed, as recent discussions have emphasised, conjunctions of word and image, especially inscriptions, were widely

¹⁶³ Cullum and Goldberg, 2000: 222-25.

¹⁶⁴ *Ibid.*: see Fig.1 on 226, and 236. For more on the Bolton Hours and its readers, see Rees Jones, 2007.

¹⁶⁵ For a comparative case study of identification and *ostentatio*, see Montgomery, 1997.

¹⁶⁶ The inscription reads '*Rex pius Oswaldus sese dedit et sua Christo lictorique caput quod in auro conditur isto*'. Falk, 1991-93: cat. no. 178.

prevalent and of great importance within the interior of the late medieval church.¹⁶⁷

7.iv. *Conclusion*

This analysis has demonstrated the importance and multiplicity of images of patronal saints and of head reliquaries at both institutions, particularly within their eastern arms. In doing so, it has elucidated the complex relationships between images and relics at both locations, and between different saints' cults.

The evidence has highlighted the high altar at York to be a potential *locus* of multiple images of St Peter as well as of the Virgin (suggested in the previous chapter), and has considered the elaborately-housed patronal image within the wider visual theme of the fifteenth-century east end. Unlike institutions such as York, where the patronal saint(s) and principal saint's relic cults were not the same, it was argued that at Durham, the patronal saints' images had an additional function in the context of the Neville Screen, signifying the *locus* of the cult beyond the high altar at the feretory, and thus working in a similar 'anticipatory' way to the *Triumphkreuz* at York and to the threshold Virgins investigated in previous chapters. Furthermore, this chapter also highlighted the capacity for other images of the patronal saints, in various media, to work in dialogue with one another, connecting parts of the interior, and therefore reiterating visually the particular identity of each institution.

The probable redecoration and rehousing of the extant patronal image of St Peter at York in the late fifteenth century was contrasted with the probable movement of the pre-1380s patronal images - suggested as those of the Virgin and saints Cuthbert and Oswald listed in the 1383 *Liber* - and their replacement by new alabaster images when the Neville Screen was installed. However, both cases testify to the desire for the retention of institutionally important images, and suggestive of the kind of transformation of an image to relic, or relic-like, status discussed previously in relation to the York *Sedes sapientiae*.

This chapter placed the making and display of head reliquaries at Durham and York within wider geographical and scholarly contexts, but importantly linked them to the specific architectural changes in the east ends of both

¹⁶⁷ On the relationship between text and image in other contexts, see for instance Murray, 2004, and Marks, 2012c.

institutions. Whilst thinking about these objects in relation to the ideas of parts and wholes, and the individual and the community, it explored the symbiotic relationships between the *capita* and other images and relics at both institutions. It drew attention to the subordinate role of those at Durham to St Cuthbert's relics, but also their potential to complement – materially and imaginatively - the wider complex of images and relics with which they were housed. It suggested that although the *caput* of St Everilda was prominently displayed with the Virgin of the Red Ark at York, her cult may have been eclipsed by those of the archbishops whose relics were in the Minster - St William and the more contemporary Archbishop Scrope.

St Everilda's potential lack of appeal to the laity due to her status as an Anglo-Saxon abbess was also proposed. This contrasts with our discussion of the patronal saints at both institutions, which drew attention to the clerical, monastic, and royal characters of saints Peter, Cuthbert, and Oswald as functioning particularly as exemplars for their images' primary audiences, the clergy and monastic community respectively. However, just as the images of Peter, Cuthbert, and Oswald have been interpreted as important means of visually and materially emphasizing each institution's patrimony, so too can the *caput* of St Everilda, considering her association with St Wilfred.

CONCLUSION

The concentration in previous scholarship on the medieval image, particularly in the medium of three-dimensional sculpture, has largely focused on surviving examples in the continental context, and, in the English context, on those which were found in parish churches, but which for the most part are now no longer extant. Using primarily documentary evidence, this study has built up the topographies of images within the late medieval interiors of two English cathedrals, Durham cathedral priory and York Minster, and it has analysed these images through a close comparative reading. These two cathedral institutions in the north of England complemented and contrasted with one another in several important ways. In ecclesiastical terms, both were situated within the northern province, yet Durham's Benedictine community meant that an ecclesiastical body with a distinct identity and mode of religious life were present there as well as the bishop, in contrast to the secular Dean and Chapter of York Minster and the Archbishop of York. York was a Metropolitan cathedral, to whom Durham's bishop was subordinate, but this subordination had a counterbalance in the secular sphere, where the Bishop of Durham held the important role of *comes palatinus*, presiding over the lands of the bishopric of Durham and the often disputed border between England and Scotland. As we have seen, the two cathedral churches also complemented and contrasted with one another in terms of their architectural and liturgical layouts, and the characters of the cults of the saints whose relics were present within each interior. Notably, the devotional topography of both included the shrines of bishop saints differing in terms of their chronologies and popularity. At Durham, the shrine of the Anglo-Saxon St Cuthbert made Durham one of the major pilgrim destinations in England throughout our period, whilst at York, the shrine of the twelfth-century figure of St William, as well as the tomb of the unofficial early fifteenth-century saint Archbishop Richard Scrope, were more local in their appeal.

This framework of difference has been complemented by a methodology of drawing on physical and documentary sources from other English cathedrals and great abbeys, and from continental cathedrals, for further comparison. In turn, this has elucidated the singularities in the presence, uses, and meanings of images

at both institutions, but also suggested wider patterns, and allowed us to consider the ways in which these manifested themselves in the particular interiors of Durham and York. Throughout, this study has analysed the potential relationships that could be constructed between images and the individuals and communities who worshipped within the interiors (both religious and lay), the associations that could be constructed between images themselves (encompassing those in spatial proximity to each other; those in dialogue across space, and those in dialogue across different media), and between images and other sacred objects, especially the relics interred in the saints' shrines in each cathedral church.

In Part One, Chapters One and Three set out the characters, values, and limitations of the rich textual sources for images at both institutions. The range and depth of these sources are also important in suggesting the kinds of documents useful for the study of images at other institutions, and the abundance of evidence which may be found therein. Chapters Two and Four built up the topographies of images at both institutions. They placed the evidence for images within the spatial contexts of both interiors, sometimes suggesting new or alternative locations, and highlighted the differences in the architectural and liturgical layouts of each institution. The chapters also suggested the iconographies and materials of images where appropriate, and contextualized the objects at Durham and York by recourse to extant images.

Part Two comprised chapters Five to Seven. Here, respectively, images of Christ, of the Virgin, and of the Saints were analysed in a series of case studies. Chapter Five concentrated on images of Christ on the Cross. It widened our understanding of the important role of York's high altar rood within the visual theme of the east end of the fifteenth-century Minster. It also drew attention to the differences in high altar iconographical schemes at Durham and elsewhere, demonstrating this as a *locus* of varying visual emphases chosen by individual institutions. The *Triumphkreuze* were demonstrated as functioning differently at both York and Durham in relation to their different positions, working respectively to connect the spaces before and beyond the choir screen, and to delineate the nave as a distinct space. The chapter highlighted the importance of these roods in the liturgical and devotional lives of the institutions' communities as well as the laity, and drew attention to the similar patterns of patronage of *Triumphkreuze* by archbishops and abbots and the reasons behind them, in

particular that of Roger de Pont l'Évêque's twin commission of a high altar rood and *Triumphkreuz* at York. Discussion of nave images of Christ pointed out the potential for the several Passion-related images in the west end of the nave at Durham to be used in conjunction with one another, and their likely appeal to the laity. It also proposed that the image-niche on the interior of the west wall at York housed an image of Christ in Majesty, therefore adding to the 'sacred spine' of images and shrines connecting the west and east of the building.

Discussion of the monumental Black Rood of Scotland significantly added to our understanding of this and the smaller reliquary cross of the same name, emphasising the historical resonances of the textual descriptions of the circumstances under which they came to Durham. It also drew attention to their imaginative affinity to each other, and with other roods connected to the Battle of Neville's Cross, and suggested this as the starting point for the Neville family's patronage of images within the cathedral priory. The identification of John Neville as the probable patron of Our Lady of Boulton, and discussion of the liturgical use of its interior crucifix, suggested a wider programme of Neville family patronage in the 1370s than has been previously acknowledged.

Chapter Six discussed images of the Virgin. It drew attention to the local and institutional resonances of images in the standard high altar positions, relating those at Durham and York to, respectively, the Virgin and Child incised onto Cuthbert's coffin and the Anglo-Saxon church of St Mary at York. It demonstrated the capacity of the additional images at the high altar to change its visual emphasis, and the textures of response this placement could elicit. Analysis of the images in the spaces known as Lady Chapels within each interior drew attention to them as *loci* wherein image complexes of the Virgin accumulated, and the diversity in iconographies and media of these complexes. At Durham, it related changes to these iconographies over time to those who used the Galilee Chapel. Our discussion of threshold Virgins demonstrated the relationships between images of the Virgin across space within each interior, but also their capacity to act as *foci* for devotion *sui generis*.

Chapter Seven examined images of patronal saints and heads and head reliquaries. It suggested that the presence of the relics of saints Cuthbert and Oswald at the feretory at Durham gave the patronal images the additional function as promoting the *locus* of their cults, unlike images at institutions where no major

relics of the patronal saints lay. It discussed the patronal image of St Peter, and its representation of apostolic and hierarchical power, within the context of the iconographical theme of the local and universal in the Minster's fifteenth-century east end. It also stressed the potential functions at both institutions of saints Peter and Cuthbert as exemplars and particularly potent intercessors for their communities and bishops due to their shared religious vocations. The multiplicity of images of patronal saints was suggested as reiterating its particular institutional identity throughout the interior, but also as connecting the various spaces within the churches. Our discussion of heads and head reliquaries clarified the nature of the *capita* at Durham, and drew attention to the fluidity with which these objects were classified, as images and/or relics, within our sources. It suggested links between the making and/or display of head reliquaries in both interiors with major architectural changes at and around the high altars. The chapter considered the importance of St Everilda at York, the chronology of her translation, and the display of her head reliquary in relation to the cults and relics of St William and Archbishop Scrope. It suggested her potentially limited appeal outside the Minster community despite the prominent display of her reliquary at the Red Ark.

Cumulatively, these case studies have suggested that images at both Durham and York were of great importance in helping to create, to sustain, and to promote the particular local identities of each institution, but also to emphasise their part within the universal Church. They have drawn attention to the close, and sometimes fluid, relationship between images and relics at each institution, and therefore the importance of considering both together within the cathedral context. The evidence from both institutions points to symbiotic yet not necessarily equal relationships between different saints' cults, evident in the modes in which their images and head reliquaries were displayed together. It has also emphasised the close relationship between architectural change and patterns of the replacement and the retention of images, especially within the east ends of both cathedral churches. These patterns suggest that images could act as important markers of continuity, but also that both institutions were keen to adopt new iconographies and materials in dialogue with devotional and architectural innovations.

What points of distinction can we suggest for images within the cathedral context in relation to those in the parochial context and that of the great abbey?

The analysis presented here suggests there was little of distinction in terms of general iconographies or locations, especially in relation to great abbeys such as that at St Albans. Rather, the images at Durham and York had distinct connotations, emphases, and associations due to their specific locations within these particular interiors, and often also due to the particular images and other sacred objects which were in their vicinity. The presence of the only unique iconography in our sources, that of Our Lady of Boulton at Durham, can perhaps be more easily attributed to Durham's monastic status than its cathedral status: as we have noted, the iconography would have particular appeal to a learned monastic audience, and the particular Benedictine affinity to the Virgin suggested by the work of Nigel Morgan would perhaps have heightened this. Yet the complex Marian iconography of the York Lady Chapel *tabula* described in the fifteenth-century treatise analysed by Vincent Gillespie reminds us that a learned, secular religious community could enjoy similarly theologically sophisticated images too. Furthermore, in the case of Our Lady of Boulton, the singular relationship between the community at Durham and the Neville family, and its political as well as its spiritual side, needs to be taken into account too.

Stronger evidence for distinctiveness, at least in relation to the parochial context, is found in our consideration of the materiality of the images at Durham and York, particularly the number of images made from, or decorated in, precious metals, as suggested particularly by the evidence from Durham's *Liber de Reliquiis* and York's c.1500 inventory. The prominent display of image-reliquaries, and especially the head reliquaries investigated in depth in Chapter Seven, is a point of particular distinction in relation to the parish context, where reliquaries were not usually found. However, as the range of our evidence has indicated, this distinctiveness was not the preserve of, or easily attributable to, an institution's cathedral status, being shared by great abbeys too.

Our evidence has also pointed to a similarity in the kind of patronage engaged in by archbishops, bishops and abbots of great abbeys in relation to images, particularly the *Triumphkruez*, and the probable similarities in the motivations for lay patronage of this ubiquitous image in both the parochial and cathedral contexts. As well as Roger de Pont l'Évêque's significant donation to the high altar at York, this study has also underlined the role of prominent nobles, notably John, Lord Neville and Henry, Lord Scrope, as patrons of images at this

most important of liturgical locations at Durham and York respectively. Additionally, John Neville's probable donation of Our Lady of Boulton has been shown as potentially extending his patronage both spatially and liturgically, the latter through the use of the crucifix inside the image on Good Friday.

Consideration of these particular examples has drawn out the differences of the donations and suggested the relative closeness of each family's ties with their respective cathedrals. Neville's comprised the new high altar images c.1380, but Scrope's 1415 images were likely to have been additional to the patronal image and the Virgin to the south of the high altar. Whilst the latter may have been influenced by the former, the difference in function is reflective of the Neville family's singular status at Durham, in contrast to the Scopes, whose status was particularly high in part due to their kinship with Archbishop Richard, but who were also one among a range of aristocratic families with strong ties to the Minster, especially the Percys.¹

By considering the stated and implied audiences for particular images, as well as their locations and iconographies, this study has also demonstrated the range of functions and meanings that might be attached to them. For example, it has expanded our understanding of the resonances of the images in the west end of the nave and Galilee Chapel at Durham in light of these spaces' associations with the laity, especially women. It has also delineated the distinct connotations images could have for different audiences, such as the high altar patronal images of St Cuthbert and St Peter at Durham and York respectively. These images would invite different responses from the bishops and the communities at each institution in relation to their vocations. However, in addition, the image of St Cuthbert, along with that of St Oswald, at Durham might also have a particular resonance for pilgrims before they encountered the shrine beyond the Neville Screen.

There are few points of distinction between images at the northern institutions of Durham and York and cathedral churches further south which can be particularly attributed to their status as 'northern' institutions. Certainly the number and diversity of representations of northern saints can be suggested, though this is also distinct between Durham and York as well. Indeed, this study

¹ See, for instance, the list of stone shields in the nave and choir in Brown, 2003: 278-79.

has widened our knowledge and understanding of the cults of certain northern saints, but also highlighted the nuances of how they were represented at each institution. Notably, it has provided the first analysis of evidence for the cult of St Everilda at York. Whilst can therefore identify an affinity between York and Durham in the promotion of Anglo-Saxon saints of the north, the cult of this abbess in particular underlines York's probable interest in responding to saints' cults further afield, such as that of St Etheldreda at Ely. A similar interest is also suggested in its promotion of St William, who, as we have noted, fit in with the wider pattern of the promotion of twelfth-century bishop-saints throughout England.

Our evidence and analysis of saints' images has also shown that whilst Cuthbert was most likely to have been prominently represented at York, in the niche on the south-east side of the south-west crossing pier, St William does not appear to have been similarly represented at Durham. This prominent image of St Cuthbert at York, importantly on the route from the south transept entrance to St William's tomb in the nave, is perhaps indicative of York promoting its status as mother church of the diocese, a theme which Christopher Norton has already suggested was prominent in the fifteenth-century Minster in relation to the themes of the east window and the presence of windows showing the *vita* of St Cuthbert and St William in the south-east and north-east transepts respectively. However, we see little other evidence for patterns in relation to images at Durham and York. As was noted in Chapter Six (see p.192), Hugh le Puiset's decision to install a Lady Chapel, and most likely a Marian image as well, at Durham might have been influenced by Roger de Pont l'Évêque's new Lady Chapel and probable installation of the extant *Sedes Sapientiae* at York. However, Hugh's probable knowledge of Chartres and the important Marian image there might also have played a large part in this.

These findings point to similarities across ecclesiastical contexts, especially those of cathedrals and great abbeys; indeed, secular and monastic points of distinction may perhaps be more fruitful avenues of further, and wider, enquiry. Yet focus on the cathedral context, and on these two major cathedral churches of the north of England and the northern province, has given scope for consideration of the patronage of bishops, for example, as well as the representation of these institutions' local, northern saints. Furthermore, this

analysis has underlined the benefit of investigating each institution on its own terms due to the particular interaction between its monastic or secular status, cathedral or non-cathedral status, the specifics of its architectural and liturgical layout, its patrons, and the character of its saints' cults.

The importance of this nuanced approach is also suggested by the way in which this thesis has analysed images throughout both interiors not just as individual objects, but as image complexes within particular spaces, or within a particular iconographical category spread out over space and/or time within each interior. By doing so it has demonstrated additional and deeper resonances for the images at Durham and York. In particular, it has examined image complexes consisting of different media, especially those encompassing stained glass, and drawn attention to the importance of moveable images as creating additional image complexes or modifying existing complexes. Whilst not proposing the interiors of these institutions as *Gesamtkunstwerke*, especially as it has noted significant changes over time, this study has demonstrated that the relationships between images in various media and locations meant that there was a considerable degree of integration between images and across spaces at Durham and York.

This study has therefore considerably modified our understanding of the late medieval interiors of these important cathedral churches, and contributed to our understanding of the characters, uses, and meanings of images within ecclesiastical institutions in both English and continental contexts. It also points to the potential fruitfulness of further research. Deeper investigation of the relationship between images and stained glass at both Durham and York is possible thanks to the richness of the extant glass and documentary sources. Further in-depth comparison with one or more cathedrals in the south of England would allow us to suggest further points of similarity and distinction. Christ Church, Canterbury, is potentially the most apposite due to the significant appeal of St Thomas Becket's cult and its munificence of extant stained glass. However, the methodology employed here can also be used to analyse the images within other contexts, for instance that of the royal chapel. The pursuit of such avenues would add further nuance to our understanding of the physical, devotional, and imaginative importance of images within late medieval England.

APPENDIX ONE: TABLES OF COLLECTION BOX
RECEIPTS FROM DURHAM CATHEDRAL PRIORY

TABLE A - Offertory Box Receipts from extant Sacrist's Rolls at Durham 1383-84, 1384, 1458 - 1535-36										
Location	1383-84	1384	1458-59	1465-66	Year	1483-84	1484-85	1486-87	1487-88	1535-36
Holy Cross in the Galilee & Church Door (Combined)	£11 17s. 3d.	78s. 4d.								
Holy Cross in the Galilee	4s. 1d.	6s. 11d.	7s. 14s. 11d.	18d. 21s.	3s. 2d. 7s. 9d.	8s. 1d. 34s. 8d.	6s. 10d. 8s. 10d.	5s. 2d. 6s. 11d.	8s. 5d. 16s. 3d.	3d. 67d.
Tomb of St Bede	4s. 1d.									
Altar of Holy Cross 'vestiti' and offertory box of St Louis (combined)										
Offertory Box of Holy Cross 'vestiti'		2s 6d								
Offertory Box of St Mary of Bethlehem at the door of the Galilee						4s. 5d.	5s. 4d.	2s. 8d.	3s. 1d.	1d.
Offertory Box of King Henry										
Offertory Box of St Salvador at the door of the Galilee						35s. 11d.	36s. 10d.	11s. 9d.	4s. 2d. 15s. 11d.	4d.
Offertory Box of St Sitha										1d.
TABLE B - Offertory Box Receipts of Holy Cross in the Galilee, Tomb of St Bede, and Church Door from extant Sacrist's Rolls, Durham 1348 - 1458-59										
Year	Church Door	Offertory Box in the Galilee ('Holy Cross in the Galilee')	Church Door in Galilee (from 1378-79 'Holy Cross in the Galilee') Combined	Location	Church Door, Offertory Box of Holy Cross in Galilee and Tomb of St Bede Combined	Relics at Church Door on St Cuthbert's Feast Days	All other oblations, including on the two feast of St Cuthbert and at the church door			
1348-49	30s									
1349-50	7 s. 8 d.	27s. 5 d.								
1350-51	20s 5 d.	£9 26s								
1355-56		26s	£9 10s. 5 d.							
1362-63	26s. 8d.	£10 14s 4 d.								
1376-77			£8 25s. 4d.							
1377-78			£10 10s. 10d. 18s.							
1378-79			£10 14d.							
1379-80			£10 10s. 8d. 14s.							
1380-81			£10 8s. 18s.							
1381-82			£9 10s. 14s.							
1382-83			£7 14s. 4d. 10s. 10d.							
1383-84			£11 17s. 3d. 4s. 1d.							
1384			78s. 4d.							
1385-86			£10 2s. 2d.							
1386-87			£8 6s. 2d. 9s. 11d.							
1388-89			£7 5s. 3d. 14s. 6 d.							
1404-05			some figures missing only legible figures are: 1s. 1 d.							
1409		11s. 2 d.				2s. 4d.				
1411-12		£4 3s. 7d.					20s. 11d.			
1414-15		66s. 3d.					22s.			
1420-21 (Damaged roll, only legible amount shown is that in column H)	?	?	?			?	?11s. 7d.			
1439-40		15s. 3d.					8s. 4d.			
1458-59		7s.					16s. 4d.			

In both tables, greyed out cells indicate amount is not listed in roll

APPENDIX 2: INSCRIPTIONS UNDER IMAGES OF
KINGS AND BISHOPS ON THE CHOIR SCREEN AT
DURHAM CATHEDRAL PRIORY

Extracted from *Rites*: 137-143 (transcribed by Fowler from DUL, MS Cosin B.II.2, pp.17-25 (1660), with abbreviations preserved).

‘Scripturae sub Imaginibus Regum Ad ostium Chori Ecclesiae Dunelmensis ex parte Australi. Octo Reges Totius Angliae qui antiquas possessiones et libertates Ecclesiae Sti Cuthberti confirmauerunt et plures de nouo addiderunt. Rex West Saxonum Alured...Rex Edwardus senior filius Aluredi...Rex Ethelstanus filius Edwardi primi...Rex Edmundus frater Ethelstani...Rex Angliae et Danamarchiae Kanutus ad corpus Sti Cuthberti Dunelmum nudis pedibus a Garmundisway venit...Rex Will’mus Conquestor...Rex Will’mus Secundus...Rex Henricus Primus...’

‘Scripturae sub Imaginib{us} Regum ad ostium Chori Eccl’iae Dunelm. ex parte Boreali. Sex Reges Northumbriae a Trenta et Mersee usq; fforth. ubi est mare Scotticum. et Duo Reges Scotiae promotores hujus Eccl’iae Sedis Ep’alis et Coetus Monachalis. Oswaldus Sanctus fundator Eccl’iae et Sedis Ep’alis ac coetus monachalis qui quondam erant in Lindisfarnia nunc sunt in Dunelmo Cujus caput cum corpore Sti Cuthberti requiescit. Rex Oswin...Egfridus Rex Northumbriae...Rex Northumbriae Alfridus...Sactus Ceolwlfius [sic]...Anno nono Regni sui relicta Corona factus est Monachus Lindisfernensis cujus ossa ut sanctae Riliquiae in Eccl’iam hanc sunt translata...Guthredus Rex...Edgarus Rex Scotiae...Dauid Rex Scotiae...’

‘Scripturae sub Imaginibus Pontificum Ad Ostium Chori Ecclesiae Dunelm. ex parte Australi. Stus Cuthbertus Monachus Ep’us Lindisfernensis. nunc partronus Ecclesiae et Ciuitatis ac Libertatis Dunelm. cujus corpus post 418 annos Sepulturae suae incorruptum et flexibile dormienti quam mortuo similis est inuentum et sic vitam intemeratam comendat corporis Incorruptio...Stus Eadbartus...Stus Eadfridus...cujus ossa in Arca cum corpore Sti Cuthberti sunt inuenta, et in hac Ecclesia Dunelm. conseruata...Stus Ethelwoldus...objit cujus

ossa cum Corpore Sti Cuthberti inuenta, et in hac Ecclesia in Scrinio [box] sunt reposita...Walcherus Ep'us sextus hujus loci Dunelmi et de habitu seculari consecratus. Hic Walcherus reperiens in alba Ecclesia, quae erat in Loco ubi nunc est Tumba St Cuthberti in claustro...Will'mus de Sto Karilepho...Randolphus octauos...Corpus Sti Cuthberti de loco in alba Ecclesia, ubi nunc est Tumba in Claustro post annos depositionis ejus 418 Anno gr'ae 1109 incorruptum et flexibile inventum in hanc Ecclesiam ubi nunc transtulit...Hugo de Puteaco...'

'Scripturae sub Imaginibus pontificum ad ostium Chori Eccl'iae Dunelm. ex parte Boreali. St Adanus...Hujus Aidani animam St Cuthbertus ab Angelis in coelum deferri conspexit et ejus caput in ossa in hac Eccl'ia Dunelm. ut sanctae Reliquiae sun seruata...Sanctus ffinanus...Sanctus Eata...Ecgredu...Eardulphus...Cutheardus ...Aldwinus...Edmundus...'

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

<i>Account Rolls I-III</i>	Fowler, J.T. (ed.). <i>Extracts from the Account Rolls of the Abbey of Durham, from the original Mss.</i> Surtees Society 99, 100, 103 (Durham, London and Edinburgh, 1898-1901).
Arch. Reg.	Archbishop's Register
BAA	British Archaeological Association
BIA	Borthwick Institute for Archives
BL	British Library
<i>Chivalry</i>	Alexander, J. and Binski, P. (eds.). <i>Age of Chivalry: Art in Plantagenet England 1200-1400</i> , exh. cat. (London, Royal Academy of Arts, 1987).
CVMA	<i>Corpus Vitrearum Medii Aevi</i>
D/C	Dean and Chapter (York Minster)
DCL	Durham, Cathedral Library
DDCA	Durham, Dean and Chapter Archives
<i>English Romanesque Art</i>	Zarnecki, G. et al. <i>English Romanesque Art 1066-1200</i> , exh. cat. (London, Hayward Gallery, 1984).
<i>Gothic</i>	Marks, R. and Williamson, P. (eds.), <i>Gothic: Art for England 1400-1547</i> , exh. cat. (London, Victoria & Albert Museum, 2003).

- HE* B. Colgrave and R.A.B. Mynors (eds. and trans.). *Bede's Ecclesiastical History of the English People* (Oxford, 1969).
- JBAA* *Journal of the British Archaeological Association*
- Lewis and Short C.T. Lewis and C. Short (eds.). *A Latin Dictionary: founded on Andrews' edition of Freund's Latin dictionary* (Oxford, 1886), online: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3atext%3a1999.04.0059>, Accessed 17th June 2014.
- L-B I-V* Lehmann-Brockhaus, O. *Lateinische Schriftquellen zur Kunst in England, Wales und Scotland vom Jahre 901 bis zum Jahre 1307*, 5 vols. (Munich, 1955-1960).
- LCI I-VIII* E. Kirschbaum, and W. Braunfels (eds.). *Lexicon der Christlichen Ikonographie*. 8 vols. (Freiburg im Breisgau, 1968-76).
- Libellus* Rollason, D. (ed. and trans.). Symeon of Durham, *Libellus de Exordio atque Procursu istius hoc est Dunhelmensis Ecclesie* (Oxford, 2000).
- LP* Duchesne, L. (ed.). *Liber Pontificalis*. 2 vols. (Paris 1886-92).
- MED* Kurath, H. and Sherman, M.K. (eds.). *Middle English Dictionary* (Ann Arbor, c.1952-c.2001).
- Prob. Reg. Probate Register
- ODNB* Matthew, H.C.G. and Harrison, B. (eds.). *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford, 2004).

<http://www.oxforddnb.com>, Accessed 29th July, 2014.

- Rites* J. T. Fowler (ed.), *The Rites of Durham Being a Description or Brief Declaration of all the Ancient Monuments, Rites and Customs Belonging or Being Within the Monastical Church of Durham Before the Suppression*. Surtees Society 107 (Durham, London and Edinburgh, 1903).
- Scriptores Tres* Raine, J. (ed.). *Historiae Dunelmensis Scriptores Tres, Gaufridus de Coldingham, Robertus Graystones, et Willielmus de Chambre*. Surtees Society 9 (Durham, 1839).
- Statutes* Dean and Chapter. *The Statutes etc. of the Cathedral Church of York* (Leeds, 1900).
- Stell* Stell, P. *Transcription of York Minster Library and Archives Fabric Rolls* (Under the Auspices of York Archaeological Trust, 2003a).
- TE I-VI* Raine, J., Raine, J. and Clay, J.W. (eds.). *Testamenta Eboracensia*. Surtees Society 4, 30, 45, 53, 79, 106 (Durham, London and Edinburgh, 1835-1902).
- Torre* YMLA MS L1/7 (James Torre's 'The Antiquities of York Minster Collected out of the Records of the Said Church and Some Other Authorities', 1690-91).
- Treasures of Heaven* Bagnoli, M., Klein, H.A., Griffith Mann, C., and Robinson, J. *Treasures of Heaven. Saints, Relics and Devotion in Medieval Europe* exh. cat. (London, British Museum, 2011).
- YMLA* York Minster Library and Archives

BIBLIOGRAPHY

i.Unpublished Primary Sources

British Library

Harley MS 1260 (The Percy Hours)

Harley MS 5289 (The Durham Missal)

Royal MS 7 A VI (Hymns and Prayers in Latin, Durham Provenance)

Borthwick Institute for Archives

Arch. Reg. 20

Arch. Reg. 27

Prob. Reg. 2

Prob. Reg. 3

Prob. Reg. 5

Prob. Reg. 6

Prob. Reg. 8

Durham Cathedral Library

MS C.III.23 (The Hogg Roll)

MS B.II.35 fols. 192r-198v

MS Hunter 44 (*The Rites of Durham*)

MS Hunter 45 (*The Rites of Durham*)

MS Lawton (*The Rites of Durham*)

B/W Negatives Box 1; no.266, i-viii (Negatives of Eve Baker's restoration work on the Galilee Chapel Paintings)

Durham Cathedral Inventory, Volume 7

Durham University Library

MS Cosin B.II.11, fols. 49r-86v (*The Rites of Durham*)

MS Cosin B.II. 2, pp.13-25 (List of Kings and Bishops on the Choir Screen)

MS Cosin B.III.30

Sacrists' Account Rolls 1318-1536

Feretrar's Account Rolls 1375-1538

York Minster Library and Archives

MS E3/1-44 (Fabric Rolls)

MS L1/7 (James Torre's 'The Antiquities of York Minster Collected out of the Records of the Said Church and Some Other Authorities', 1690-91)

MS L 2 (4) (Prob. Reg. 1)

MS L 2 5(a) (Prob. Reg. 2)

MS M2 (2)d (c.1500 Inventory, with c.1510 revisions)

MS M2 (4)a (Chantry Survey, 1521)

MS M2 (4)g (Miscellaneous Register '1290-1340'; containing c.1360 and c.1364 inventories)

MS Add. 1 (The York Gospels)

MS Add. 2 (The Bolton Hours)

MS Add.68 (Breviary)

MS Add. 70 (Breviary)

MS Add. 383 (Breviary)

MS XVI, K.6 (The Pavement Hours)

MS XVI.O.9 (Breviary)

York Archaeological Trust

Stell, P. *Transcription of York Minster Library and Archives Fabric Rolls* (Under the Auspices of York Archaeological Trust, 2003a).

ii. Published Primary Sources

Battiscombe C.F. (ed.). Anon. 'A Twelfth-Century List of Durham Relics', in

C.F. Battiscombe (ed.), *The Relics of St Cuthbert: Studies by Various Authors* (Oxford, 1956), 112-114.

Anderson, A.O. and Anderson, M.O. (eds. and trans.). *Adomnán's Life of Columba* (London and Edinburgh, 1961).

Arnold, T. (ed.) *Symeonis Monachi Opera Omnia*. 2 vols. Roll Series 75 (London, 1882-85).

Barker, N. (ed.). *The York Gospels* (London, 1986).

Bestul, T. H. (ed.). *A Durham Book of Devotions, edited from London, Society of Antiquaries Ms. 7* (Toronto, 1987).

Campbell, A. (ed. and trans.). *Æthelwulf. De Abbatibus* (Oxford, 1967).

Chapman, F.R. (ed.) *The Sacrist Rolls of Ely*, 2 vols. (Cambridge, 1907).

Clay, J. W. *Testamenta Eboracensia. A Selection of Wills from the Registry at York. Vol. VI*. Surtees Society, 106 (Durham, London and Edinburgh, 1902).

Colchester, L.S. (ed. and trans.) *Wells Cathedral Fabric Accounts 1390-1600* (Wells, 1983).

Colgrave, B. (ed. and trans.). *The Life of Bishop Wilfred by Eddius Stephanus* (Cambridge, 1927).

----- (ed. and trans.). *Two Lives of St Cuthbert* (Cambridge, 1985).

----- and R.A.B. Mynors (eds. and trans.). *Bede's Ecclesiastical History of the English People* (Oxford, 1969).

- Dean and Chapter. *The Statutes etc. of the Cathedral Church of York* (Leeds, 1900).
- Duchesne, L. (ed.) *Liber Pontificalis*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1886-1892).
- Ellis, F.S. (ed.). *The Golden Legend: or lives of the saints. As Englished by William Caxton* (London, 1900). 7 vols.
- Erskine, A. (ed. and trans.). *The Accounts of the Fabric of Exeter Cathedral, 1279-1353*, 2 vols. (Torquay, 1981-1983).
- Fairweather, J. (ed. and trans.). *Liber Eliensis* (Woodbridge, 2005).
- Freeland, J.P. (trans.) and Dutton, M.L.(ed.). *Aelred of Rievaulx: The Historical Works* (Kalamazoo, 2005).
- Fowler, J.T. (ed.). *Extracts from the Account Rolls of the Abbey of Durham, from the original Mss.* 3 vols. Surtees Society, 99, 100, 103 (Durham, London and Edinburgh, 1898-1901).
- . *The Rites of Durham Being a Description or Brief Declaration of all the Ancient Monuments, Rites and Customs Belonging or Being Within the Monastical Church of Durham Before the Suppression.* Surtees Society 107 (Durham, London and Edinburgh, 1903).
- Frere, W. H. *The Use of Sarum*, 2 vols. (Cambridge, 1898, 1901).
- Galbraith, V.H. (ed.). *The Anonimalle Chronicle, 1333-1381* (Manchester, 1927).
- Godman, P. (ed.). *Alcuin. The Bishops, Kings, and Saints of York* (Oxford, 1982).
- Greenway and Sayers (eds. and trans.). *Jocelin of Brakelond. Chronicle of the Abbey of Bury St Edmunds* (Oxford and New York, 1989)

Hanssens, J.M. (ed.). *Amalarii Episcopi Opera Liturgica Omnia*. 3 vols. (Vatican City, 1948-50).

Henderson, W. G. (ed.). *Missale ad usum insignis Ecclesiae Eboracensis*. 2 vols. Surtees Society, 59, 60 (Durham, London, and Edinburgh, 1874).

----- (ed.). *Manuale et processionale ad usum insignis ecclesiae Eboracensis*. Surtees Society 63 (London, Durham and Edinburgh, 1875).

Johnson, C., Brett, M., Brooke, C.N.L., and Winterbottom, M. (eds. and trans.). *Hugh the Chanter. The History of the Church of York* (Oxford, 1990).

Knowles, D. and Brooke, C.N.L (ed. and trans.). *The Monastic Constitutions of Lanfranc* (Oxford, 2002).

Lawley, S. W. (ed.). *Breviarium ad Usum Insignis Ecclesiae Eboracensis*. 2 vols. (Durham, 1880, 1883).

Legg, J.W. and St John Hope, W.H. (eds.). *Inventories of Christchurch Canterbury. With Historical and Topographical Introductions and Illustrative Documents* (Westminster, 1902).

Lehmann-Brockhaus, O. *Lateinische Schriftquellen zur Kunst in England, wales und Scotland vom Jahre 901 bis zum Jahre 1307*, 5 vols. (Munich, 1955-1960).

Love, N. *Speculum Vitae Christi* (London, 1484).

Lloyd, R. (ed.). *An Account of the Altars, Monuments & Tombs Existing A.D. 1428 in Saint Alban's Abbey* (St Albans, 1873).

Luard, H.R. *Annales Monastici*. Rolls Series 36. 5 vols. (London, 1864-69).

Maxwell, H. (ed.). *The Chronicle of Lanercost, 1272-1346* (Glasgow, 1913).

Migne, J. P. (ed.). *Patriologia Latina* (Paris, 1844-65).

Meehan, D. (ed. and trans.). *Adamnan's De Locis Sanctis. Scriptores Latini Hiberniae* vol. III (Dublin, 1958).

Mommsen, T. *Eusebius Werke*. 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1908).

Neale, J.M. and Webb, B. (trans.). Durandus, *The Symbolism of Churches and Ornaments. A Translation of the Rationale Divinorum Officiorum* (London, 1893).

Nichols, J.G. (ed.). *Pilgrimages to Saint Mary of Walsingham and Saint Thomas of Canterbury by Desiderius Erasmus* (London, 1849).

Pace, G. (trans.). *Reginald of Durham, Account of the Translation of St Cuthbert* in C.F. Battiscombe (ed.), *The Relics of St Cuthbert: Studies by Various Authors* (Oxford, 1956), 107-112.

Page, W. (ed.). *The Certificates of the Commissioners Appointed to Survey the Chantries, Guilds, Hospitals, etc. in the County of York. Part II.* Surtees Society 92 (Durham, London & Edinburgh, 1895).

-----, *The Inventories of Church Goods for the Counties of York, Durham and Northumberland.* Surtees Society 97 (Durham, London & Edinburgh, 1897).

Panofsky, E. (ed. and trans.). *Abbot Suger on the Abbey Church of St-Denis and its Art Treasures* (Princeton, 1979).

Raine, J. (ed.). *Reginaldi Monachi Dunelmensis. Libellus de Admirandis Beati Cuthberti Virtutibus Que Novellis Patratae Sunt Temporibus.* Surtees Society 1 (London, 1835).

----- (ed.). *Testamenta Eboracensia or Wills Registered at York Illustrative of the History, Manners, Language, Statistics &c., of the Province of York from the year MCCC downwards*. Surtees Society 4 (London, 1836).

----- (ed.). *Historiae Dunelmensis Scriptores Tres, Gaufridus de Coldingham, Robertus Graystones, et Willielmus de Chambre*. Surtees Society, 9 (Durham, 1839).

----- (ed.). *A description or briefe account of all the ancient monuments, rites and customes belonging or beinge within the monastical church of Durham before the suppression. Written in 1593*. Surtees Society 15 (Durham, London and Edinburgh, 1844).

----- . And Mynors, R.A.B. (eds. and trans.). 'The Anonymous Account of the Translation of St Cuthbert, 29 August 1104', in C.F. Battiscombe (ed.), *The Relics of St Cuthbert: Studies by Various Authors* (Oxford, 1956), 99-107.

Raine, J. (ed.). *Testamenta Eboracensia. A Selection of Wills from the Registry at York. Part II*. Surtees Society, 30 (Durham, London and Edinburgh, 1835).

----- (ed.). *The Fabric Rolls of York Minster*. Surtees Society, 35 (Durham, 1859).

----- (ed.). *Testamenta Eboracensia. A Selection of Wills from the Registry at York. Vol. III*. Surtees Society 45 (Durham, London and Edinburgh, 1865).

----- (ed.). *Testamenta Eboracensia. A Selection of Wills from the Registry at York. Vol. IV*. Surtees Society 53 (Durham, London and Edinburgh, 1868).

----- (ed.). *Historians of the Church of York and its Archbishops*. Rolls Series, 71. 3 vols. (London, 1879-94)

----- (ed.). *Testamenta Eboracensia. A Selection of Wills from the Registry at York. Vol. V.* Surtees Society 79 (Durham, London and Edinburgh, 1884).

Riley, H.T. (ed.). *Gesta Abbatum Monasteri Sancti Albani.* 3 vols. (London, 1867-69)

Rollason, D. (ed. and trans.). *Symeon of Durham. Libellus de Exordio atque Procursu istius hoc est Dunhelmensis Eccleise. Tract on the Origins and Progress of this Church of Durham* (Oxford, 2000).

-----, Gore, D., and Fellows-Jensen, G. (eds.). *Sources for York History to AD 1100* (York, 1998).

Simmons, T.P. and Nolloth, H.E. (eds.). *The Lay Folk's Catechism* (E.E.T.S., London, 1901).

Stell, P. *York Bridgemaster's Accounts* (York, 2003b).

----- . *Probate Inventories of the Diocese of York, 1350-1500* (York, 2006).

Stubbs, W. (ed.). *The Historical Works of Gervase of Canterbury.* 2 vols. Rolls Series, 73 (London, 1879-80)

Sollier, J.B. (ed.). *Martyrologium Usardi Monachi* (Antwerp, 1714).

Wilkinson, J. (ed. and trans.). *Egeria's Travels* (London, 1971).

Williams, A., Palliser, D. M., and Thorn, F.R. (eds.) *The Yorkshire Domesday* (London, 1992).

Wharton, H. *Anglia Sacra* (London, 1691), 2 vols.

Wordsworth, C. (ed.). *Ceremonies and Processions of the Cathedral Church of Salisbury* (Cambridge, 1901).

iii.Secondary Sources (Unpublished and Published)

Alexander, J. and Binski, P. (eds.). *Age of Chivalry: Art in Plantagenet England 1200-1400* exh. cat. (London, Royal Academy of Arts, 1987).

Arnold-Foster, F. *Studies in Church Dedications or England's Patron Saints*, 3 vols. (London, 1899).

Andersson, A. *English Influence in Norwegian and Swedish Figuresculpture in Wood 1220-1270* (Stockholm, 1949).

Aston, M. *Lollards and Reformers: Images and Literacy in Late Medieval Religion* (London, 1984).

-----'. 'Gold and Images' in W.J. Sheils and D. Wood (eds.). *The Church and Wealth*, Studies in Church History 24 (1987), 189-209.

-----'. *England's Iconoclasts, vol. I, Laws Against Images* (Oxford, 1988).

-----'. 'Segregation in Church', in W.J. Sheils and D. Wood (eds.), *Women in the Church*. Studies in Church History 27 (Oxford, 1990), 237-294.

-----'. *Faith and Fire: Popular and Unpopular Religion, 1350-1500* (London, 1993).

Attwater, D. (ed.). *The Penguin Dictionary of Saints* (Harmondsworth, 1965).

Ayers, T. *The Medieval Stained Glass of Wells Cathedral* (Oxford, 2004).

----- (ed.). *The History of British Art 600-1600* (London, 2008).

Ayers, T. and Sampson, G. 'The Middle Ages', in T. Ayers, (ed.), *Salisbury Cathedral: The West Front. A History and Study in Conservation* (Chichester, 2000), 9-82.

Aylmer, G.E. and Cant, R. (eds.). *A History of York Minster* (Oxford, 1977).

Bacci, M. 'Side Altars and "Pro Anima" Chapels in the Medieval Mediterranean: Evidence from Cyprus', in J. E. A. Kroesen and V. M. Schmidt, eds, *The Altar and its Environment 1150-1400*, Studies in the Visual Cultures of the Middle Ages, 4, (Turnhout 2009), 11-30.

Backhouse, J. (ed.). *The Medieval English Cathedral. Papers in honour of Pamela Tudor-Craig*. Proceedings of the 1998 Harlaxton Symposium (Donington, 2003).

Baert, B. 'The Johannesschüssel as Andachtsbild: The Gaze, The Medium and The Senses', in C. Santing, B. Baert, and A. Traninger (eds.). *Disembodied Heads in Medieval and Early Modern Culture* (Leiden and Boston, 2013), 117-160.

Bagnoli, M. 'The Stuff of Heaven. Materials and Craftsmanship in Medieval Reliquaries', in Bagnoli, M., Klein, H.A., Griffith Mann, C., and Robinson, J. *Treasures of Heaven. Saints, Relics and Devotion in Medieval Europe*. exh. cat. (London, British Museum, 2011), 137-47.

-----, Klein, H.A., Griffith Mann, C., and Robinson, J. *Treasures of Heaven. Saints, Relics and Devotion in Medieval Europe*. exh. cat. (London, British Museum, 2011).

Bailey, R. N. 'St Oswald's Heads', in C. Stancliffe and E. Cambridge (eds.), *Oswald: Northumbrian King to European Saint* (Stamford, 1995), 195-209.

Bailey, T. *The Processions of Sarum and the Western Church* (Toronto, 1971).

Bale, A. (ed.). *St Edmund, King and Martyr. Changing Images of a Medieval Saint* (Woodbridge, 2009).

Barber, T. and Boldrick, S. (eds.). *Art Under Attack: Histories of British Iconoclasm* (London, 2013).

Barlow, F. 'Pont L'Évêque, Roger de (c. 1115-1181)', *ODNB* vol. 44 (Oxford, 2004), 832-35.

Bandmann, G. 'Früh- Und Hochmittelalterliche Altarandordnung Als Darstellung', in V.H. Elbern (ed.), *Das erste Jahrtausend: Kultur und Kunst im werdenden Abendland an Rhein un Ruhr*. 2 vols (Düsseldorf: 1962), I, 371-411.

Barron, C. 'The Travelling Saint: Zita of Lucca and England', in P. Horden (ed.), *Freedom of Movement in the Middle Ages: Proceedings of the 2003 Harlaxton Symposium* (Donington, 2007), 186-202.

Barrow, G.W.S. 'The Kings of Scotland and Durham', in D. Rollason, M. Harvey, and M. Prestwich (eds.). *Anglo-Norman Durham 1093-1193* (Woodbridge, 1994), 311-23.

-----'. 'Puiset, Hugh du, earl of Northumberland (c.1125–1195)', *ODNB*, vol. 45 (Oxford, 2004), 526-29.

Barrow, J. 'English Cathedral Communities and Reform in the Late Tenth and Early Eleventh Centuries', in D. Rollason, M. Harvey, and M. Prestwich (eds.). *Anglo-Norman Durham 1093-1193* (Woodbridge, 1994), 25-40.

Bassham, C.J. and Gee, E.A., York Minster. *The Chapter House. Royal Commission on Historical Monuments of England* (London, 1980).

Baschet, J. 'L'image et son Lieu: Quelques Remarques Générales', in C. Voyer and E. Sparhubert (eds.), *L'Image Médiévale* (Turnhout, 2011), 179-204.

Beck, C.H. *The Kunsthistorisches Museum Vienna. The Imperial and Ecclesiastical Treasury* (London, 2009).

Beer, M. *Triumphkreuz des Mittelalters. Ein Betrag zu Typus und Genese im 12. und 13 Jahrhundert* (Regensburg, 2005).

Belting, H. *The Image and Its Public in the Middle Ages: Form and Function of Early Paintings of the Passion* (New Rochelle, New York, 1990).

----- . *Likeness and Presence: A History of the Image Before the Era of Art* (Chicago and London, 1994).

Bergmann, U. (ed.). *Verschwundenes Inventarium der Skulpturenfund im Kölner Domchor*, exh. cat (Schnütgen Museum, Cologne, 1984).

----- . (ed.). *Schnütgen-Museum. Die Holzskulpturen des Mittelalters (1000-1400)* (Cologne, 1989).

Berliner, R. 'Bemerkungen zu einigen Darstellungen des Erlöseres als Schmerzensmann', *Das Münster*, 9 (1956), 97-117.

Biddle, M. *The Tomb of Christ* (Stroud, 1999).

Biernoff, S. *Sight and Embodiment in the Middle Ages* (Hampshire, 2002).

Billings, R.W. *Architectural Illustrations and Description of the Cathedral Church at Durham* (London, 1843).

- Binski, P. 'The Murals in the Nave of St Albans Abbey', in D. Abulafia, M. Franklin, and M. Rubin (eds.). *Church and City 1000-1500: Essays in Honour of Christopher Brooke* (Cambridge, 1992), 249-78.
- . *Westminster Abbey and the Plantagenets: Kingship and the Representation of Power 1200-1400* (New Haven and London, 1995a).
- . 'The 13th-century English altarpiece' in *Norwegian Medieval Altar Frontals and Related Materials, Acta Institutum Romanum Norvegiae*, XI (Rome 1995b), 47-57.
- . 'The English Parish Church and its Art in the Later Middle Ages: A Review of the Problem', *Studies in Iconography*, 20 (1999), 1-25.
- . 'The Crucifixion and the Censorship of Art around 1300', in P. Linehan and J. Nelson (eds.), *The Medieval World* (London 2001), 342-60.
- . *Becket's Crown: Art and Imagination in Gothic England 1170-1300* (New Haven and London, 2004).
- . 'Statues, Retables and Ciboria: The English Gothic Altar in Context, before 1350', in J. E. A. Kroesen and V. M. Schmidt, eds, *The Altar and its Environment 1150-1400*, *Studies in the Visual Cultures of the Middle Ages*, 4, (Turnhout 2009a), 31-46.
- . 'The Year 1300 and the Creation of a New European Architecture, ed. A Gajewski and Z. Opačić' (Review), *JBAA* 162 (2009b), 227-29.
- . 'The Ante-Reliquary Chapel Paintings in Norwich Cathedral: The Holy Blood, St Richard, and All Saints' in J. M. Luxford and M. A. Michael (eds.), *Tributes to Nigel Morgan: Contexts of Medieval Art: Images, Objects and Ideas* (London and New York, 2010), 241-61.

- Binski, P. and Panayotova, S. (eds.). *The Cambridge Illuminations: Ten Centuries of Book Production in the Medieval West* (London, 2005).
- Blair, J. 'A Saint for Every Minster?' in A. Thacker and R. Sharpe (eds.), *Local Saints and Local Churches in the Early Medieval West* (Oxford, 2002a), 455-494.
- '. 'A Hand-list of Anglo-Saxon Saints', in A. Thacker and R. Sharpe (eds.), *Local Saints and Local Churches in the Early Medieval West* (Oxford, 2002b), 495-565.
- Blanton, V. *Signs of Devotion: The Cult of St Æthelthryth in Medieval England, 695-1615* (University Park, Pennsylvania, 2007).
- Blick, S. 'Reconstructing the Shrine of St Thomas Becket, Canterbury Cathedral', *Konsthistorisk tidskrift/Journal of Art History*, 72:4 (2003), 256-286.
- 'Votives, Images, Interaction and Pilgrimage to the Tomb Shrine of St. Thomas Becket, Canterbury Cathedral', in S. Blick and L. Gelfand (eds.). *Push Me, Pull You: Physical and Spatial Interaction in Late Medieval and Renaissance Art*, vol. 2 (Leiden, 2011), 21-58.
- '. and Gelfand, L. (eds.). *Push Me, Pull You: Imaginative, Emotional, Physical and Spatial Interaction in Late Medieval and Renaissance Art*, 2 vols. (Leiden, 2011).
- Blindheim, M. *Main trends of east Norwegian wooden figure sculpture in the second half of the 13th Century* (Oslo, 1952).
- '. et. al. *Norwegian Medieval Altar Frontals and Related Materials, Acta Institutum Romanum Norvegiae*, XI (Rome, 1995).
- '. *Painted Wooden Sculpture in Norway c.1100-1250* (Oslo & Oxford 1998).

- . *Gothic Painted Wooden Sculpture in Norway, 1220-1350* (Oslo, 2004a).
- . 'The Cult of Medieval Wooden Sculptures in Post-Reformation Norway', in S. Kaspersen and U. Haastrup (eds.), *Images of Cult and Devotion: function and reception of Christian images in medieval and post-medieval Europe* (Copenhagen, 2004b), 47-59.
- Boehm, B. D. *Medieval Head Reliquaries of the Massif Central*. 2 vols. (PhD Dissertation, New York University, 1990).
- . 'Body Part Reliquaries: The State of Research', *Gesta* 36:1 (1997), 8-19.
- . 'Reliquary Busts: A Certain Aristocratic Eminence', in C. Little (ed.) *Set in Stone: The Face in Medieval Sculpture*. exh. cat. (New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art, 2006), 168-173.
- Boertjes, K. 'Pilgrim Ampullae of York Minster and the Healing Oil of St William', in S. Blick (ed.), *Beyond Pilgrim Souvenirs and Secular Badges: Essays in Honour of Brian Spencer* (Oxford, 2007), 48-63.
- Boldrick, S. Park, D. and Williamson, P., *Wonder: Painted Sculpture from Medieval England*, exh. cat. (Leeds, Henry Moore Institute, 2002).
- Bond, F. *Dedications and Patron Saints of English Churches. Ecclesiastical Symbolism. Saints and their Emblems* (London, 1914).
- . and Camm, B. *Roodscreens and Roodlofts* (London, 1909).
- Bonner, G. 'St Cuthbert at Chester-le-Street', in G. Bonner, D. Rollason, C. Stancliffe (eds.), *St Cuthbert, His Cult and Community to AD 1200* (Woodbridge, 1989), 387-96.

- Bossy, J. 'The Mass as a Social Institution 1200-1700', *Past and Present*, 100 (1983), 29-61.
- Bowers, R. 'The Lady Chapel and its musicians, c.1210-1559', in J. Crook (ed.), *Winchester Cathedral: Nine Hundred Years. 1093-1993* (Chichester, 1993), 247-56.
- Brieger, 'England's Contribution to the Origin and Development of the Triumphal Cross', *Medieval Studies* 4:3 (1942), 85-96.
- Brown, A.D. *Popular Piety in Late Medieval England: the Diocese of Salisbury 1250-1550* (Oxford and New York, 1995).
- Brown, P. *The Cult of the Saints. Its Rise and Function in Latin Christianity* (Chicago, 1982).
- Brown, S. *Sumptuous and Richly Adorn'd: the Decoration of Salisbury Cathedral* (London, 1999).
- 'Our Magnificent Fabrick': *York Minster An Architectural History c.1220-1500* (Swindon, 2003).
- Browne, J. *The History of the Metropolitan Church of St Peter, York*, 2 vols (London, 1847).
- Brush, K. 'Integration and Segregation among Disciplines? The Historiography of Gothic Sculpture as a Case Study', in V. Raguin, K. Brush, and P. Draper, *Artistic Integration in Gothic Buildings* (Toronto, 1995), 19-40.
- Buran, D. 'The crucifixion in Kežmarok: A little-known masterpiece by Master Paul' in Z. Opačić and A. Timmermann (eds.), *Image, Memory and Devotion. Liber Amicorum Paul Crossley* (Turnhout, 2011), 181-194.

Burton, J. 'The Monastic Revival in Yorkshire: Whitby and St Mary's Abbey, York', in D. Rollason, M. Harvey, and M. Prestwich (eds.). *Anglo-Norman Durham 1093-1193* (Woodbridge, 1994), 41-52.

Butler, L. 'Two Twelfth-Century Lists of Saints' Resting-Places', *Analecta Bollandiana* 105 (1987), 87-103.

Bynum, C. W. 'Women's Stories, Women's Symbols: A Critique of Victor Turner's Theory of Liminality', in C.W. Bynum (ed.), *Fragmentation and Redemption. Essays on Gender and the Human Body in Medieval Religion* (New York, 1992a), 27-52.

-----'. 'Material Continuity, Personal Survival and the Resurrection of the Body: A Scholastic Discussion in its Medieval and Modern Contexts', in C. W. Bynum (ed.), *Fragmentation and Redemption. Essays on Gender and the Human Body in Medieval Religion* (New York, 1992b), 239-97.

-----'. *The Resurrection of the Body in Western Christianity, 200-1336* (New York, 1995).

-----'. *Christian Materiality. An Essay on Religion in Late Medieval Europe* (Cambridge, MA, and London, 2011).

-----'. and Gerson, P. 'Body-Part Reliquaries and Body Parts in the Middle Ages', *Gesta* 36:1 (1997), 3-7.

Cambridge, E. *The Masons and Building Works of Durham Priory, 1339-1539* (PhD Dissertation, University of Durham, 1992).

-----'. 'Why did the Community of St Cuthbert Settle at Chester-le-Street?', in G. Bonner, D. Rollason, C. Stancliffe (eds.), *St Cuthbert, His Cult and Community to AD 1200* (Woodbridge, 1989), 367-86.

- Camille, M. *The Gothic Idol: Ideology and Image Making in Medieval Art* (Cambridge, 1989).
- Carruthers, M. J. *The Book of Memory, A Study of Memory in Medieval Culture* (Cambridge, 1990).
- . *The Craft of Thought: Meditation Rhetoric and the Making of Images 400-1200* (Cambridge, 1998).
- . 'The Concept of *Ductus*, or Journeying through a Work of Art', in M. J. Carruthers (ed.), *Rhetoric Beyond Words: Delight and Persuasion in the Arts of the Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 2010)
- Carter, J. *Plans, Elevations, Sections, and Specimens of the Architecture and Ornaments of Durham Cathedral* (London, 1801).
- Caviness, M. H. 'Artistic Integration in Gothic Buildings: A Post-Modern Construct?', in V. Raguin, K. Brush, and P. Draper, *Artistic Integration in Gothic Buildings* (Toronto, 1995), 249-61.
- Champion, M. 'Personal Piety or Priestly Persuasion: Evidence of Pilgrimage Bequests in the Wills of the Archdeaconry of Sudbury, 1439-1474', *Peregrinations*, III:3 (2012), 66-82.
- Chapuis, J. 'A Treasury in Basel', in T. Husband (ed.) *The Treasury of Basel Cathedral* exh. cat. (New York, Metropolitan Museum, 2001), 11-24.
- Chazelle, C. 'Pictures, Books, and the Illiterate: Pope Gregory I's Letters to Serenus of Marsaille', *Word and Image* 6 (1990), 138-53.
- Cheetham, F. *English Medieval Alabasters* (Oxford, 1984).
- . *Alabaster Images of Medieval England* (Woodbridge, 2003).

------. *Unearthed: Nottingham's Medieval Alabasters* (Nottingham, 2004).

Clapham, A. *English Romanesque Architecture after the Conquest* (Oxford, 1934).

------. 'The York Virgin and its Date', *Archaeological Journal*, 105 (1948), 6-13.

Clark, J.G. *The Benedictines in the Middle Ages* (Woodbridge, 2011).

Clayton, M. *The Cult of the Virgin Mary in Anglo-Saxon England* (Cambridge, 1990).

Cohen, E. 'The Meaning of the Head in High Medieval Culture', in C. Santing, B. Baert, and A. Traninger (eds.). *Disembodied Heads in Medieval and Early Modern Culture* (Leiden and Boston, 2013), 59-76.

Coldstream, N. 'English Decorated Shrine Bases', *JBAA* 129 (1976), 15-34.

------. 'The Lady Chapel at Ely: its place in English Decorated Style', *Reading Medieval Studies* 11 (1985), 1-30.

Coleman, S. *Pilgrimage Past and Present* (London, 1995).

------. and Elsner, J. (eds) *Pilgrimage. Past and Present in the World Religions* (Cambridge, 1995).

Collinson, P. 'Pilgrimage to Walsingham and the Re-Invention of the Middle Ages', in J. Stopford (ed.), *Pilgrimage Explored* (York, 1990), 137-68.

Conryn J.M. and Horie, C.V. 'The Anglo-Saxon Coffin: Further Investigations', in G. Bonner, D. Rollason, C. Stancliffe (eds.), *St Cuthbert, His Cult and Community to AD 1200* (Woodbridge, 1989), 247-56.

- Cornelison, S.J. and Montgomery, S.B. (eds.). *Images, Relics, and Devotional Practices in Medieval and Renaissance Italy*. Medieval & Renaissance Texts & Studies, v.296. (Tempe, Arizona, 2006).
- Cowdrey, H.E.J. 'Stigand (d. 1072)', *ODNB*, vol. 52 (Oxford, 2004), 774-77.
- Cragoe, C.D. 'Belief and Patronage in the English Parish before 1300: Some Evidence from Roods', *Architectural History* 48 (2005), 21-48.
- Crook, J. 'The Architectural Setting of the Cult of St Cuthbert in Durham Cathedral (1093-1200), in D. Rollason, M. Harvey, and M. Prestwich (eds.). *Anglo-Norman Durham 1093-1193* (Woodbridge, 1994), 235-250.
- *English Medieval Shrines* (Woodbridge, 2011).
- Crossley, P. 'The man from inner space: architecture and meditation in the choir of St Laurence in Nuremberg', in G.R. Owen-Crocker and T. Graham (eds.), *Medieval Art. Recent Perspectives. A memorial tribute to C.R. Dodwell* (Manchester and New York, 1998), 165-182.
- 'The Integrated Cathedral: Thoughts on 'Holism' and Gothic Architecture', in E.S. Lane, E.C. Pastan, and Shortell, E.M. (eds.). *The Four Modes of Seeing: Approaches to Medieval Imagery in Honor of Madeline Harrison Caviness* (Aldershot, 2009), 157-173.
- 'Ductus and Memoria: Chartres Cathedral and the Workings of Rhetoric', in M. J.Carruthers (ed.), *Rhetoric Beyond Words: Delight and Persuasion in the Arts of the Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 2010), 214-249.
- Cubitt, K. 'Images of St Peter: The Clergy and the Religious Life in Anglo-Saxon England', in P. Cavill (ed.), *The Christian Tradition in Anglo-Saxon England: Approaches to Current Scholarship and Teaching* (Woodbridge, 2004), 41-54.

- Cullum, P. and Goldberg, P.J.P. 'How Margaret Blackburn Taught Her Daughters: Reading Devotional Instruction in a Book of Hours' in J. Wogan-Browne et. al. (eds.), *Medieval Women: Texts and Contexts in Late Medieval Britain. Essays in Honour of Felicity Riddy* (Turnhout, 2000), 217-236.
- Davidson, C. (ed.). *Index to York Art* (Kalamazoo, 1985).
- Davies, P. 'The Lighting of Pilgrimage Shrines in Renaissance Italy', in Thurnø, E. and Wolf, G. *The Miraculous Image In the Late Middle Ages and Renaissance* (Rome, 2004), 57-80.
- Davis, M. T. 'The Visual Logic of French Rayonnant Architecture', in A Gajewski and Z. Opačić (eds.), *The Year 1300 and the Creation of a New European Architecture* (Turnhout, 2007), 17-28.
- Daw, A. *Aspects of the Humanity of Christ in the Iconography of Fifteenth-Century York* (University of York, MA Dissertation, 2011).
- Dawton, N. 'The York Chapter House: Notes on the Trumeau Virgin and the Iconographic Significance of the Building', in H. Weston and D. Davies (eds.), *Essays in Honour of John White* (London, 1990), 48-54.
- Deacon, R. and Lindley, P. (eds.). *Image and Idol: Medieval Sculpture* (exh. cat., Tate Gallery, London, 2001).
- Dehio, G. *Geschichte der deutschen Kunst*, 4 vols (Leipzig, 1921-1934).
- Dixon, W. H., and Raine, J. *Fasti Eboracenses: Lives of the Archbishops of York* (London, 1863).
- Dobson, R. B. *Durham Priory 1400-1450* (Cambridge, 1973).

-----'. 'The Later Middle Ages, 1215-1500', in G. Aylmer and R. Cant, *A History of York Minster* (Oxford, 1977), 44-110.

-----'. *Church and Society in the Medieval North of England* (London, 1996).

Dodwell, C. R. *Anglo-Saxon Art: A New Perspective* (Manchester, 1982).

Donzet, B., and Siret, C., (eds.), *Les Fastes du Gothique. Le Siècle de Charles V*, exh. cat. (Paris, Galeries nationales du Grand Palais, 1981).

Drake, F. *Eboracum, or The History and Antiquities of the City of York* (Wakefield, 1736; reprinted London, 1978).

Draper, P. 'Bishop Northwood and the Cult of St Ethelreda' in N. Coldstream and P. Draper, (eds.). *Medieval Art and Architecture at Ely Cathedral*, BAA Conference Transactions 2 for the year 1976 (Leeds, 1979), 8-27.

-----'. 'Architecture and Liturgy' in J. Alexander and P. Binski (eds.), *The Age of Chivalry: Art in Plantagenet England, 1200-1400*, exh. cat. (London, Royal Academy of Arts, 1987), 83-91.

-----'. 'Seeing the It Was Done in all the Noble Churches in England', in E. Fernie and P. Crossley (eds.), *Medieval Architecture and Its Intellectual Contexts: Studies in Honour of Peter Kidson* (London, 1990), 137-42

-----'. 'Enclosure and Entrances in Medieval Cathedrals: Access and Security', in J. Brackhouse (ed.), *The Medieval English Cathedral: Papers in Honour of Pamela Tudor-Craig. Harlaxton Medieval Studies X* (Donington, 2003), 76-88.

-----'. *The Formation of English Gothic: Architecture and Identity* (London, 2006).

- Drury, J. L. 'The Monument at Neville's Cross, Co. Durham', in D. Rollason and M. Prestwich (eds.), *The Battle of Neville's Cross 1346* (Stamford, 1998), 78-96.
- Duchesne, L. *Origines du Culte Chrétien. Étude sur la Liturgie Latine avant Charlemagne* (Paris, 1889).
- Duffy, E. 'Devotion to the Crucifix and Related Images in England on the Eve of the Reformation' in B. Scribner (ed.), *Bilder und Bildersturm im Spätmittelalter un in der Frühen Neuzeit* (Wisebaden, 1990), 21-36.
- , *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England 1400-1580* (New Haven and London, 1992).
- Dugdale, W. and Caley, J., Ellis, H., Bandinel, B. (eds.). *Monasticon Anglicanum: A History of the Abbies and other Monasteries, Hospitals, Friaries, and Cathedral and Collegiate Churches, with their Dependencies, in England and Wales* (London, 1817-30). 6 vols.
- Duggan, L.G. 'Was Art Really 'the book of the illiterate'?', *Word and Image* 5 (1989), 227-51.
- Dupeux, C. (ed.) et. al. *Iconoclasme. Vie et mort de l'image médiévale*, exh. cat. (Berne, Musée d'histoire and Strasbourg, Musée de L'Oeuvre Notre-Dame, 2001).
- Durrand, J., Laffitte, M-P, and Giovannoni, D. (eds.), *Le Trésor de la Sainte-Chapelle*, exh. cat. (Paris, Musée du Louvre, 2001).
- Edwards, K. *The English Secular Cathedrals in the Middle Ages: a constitutional study with special reference to the fourteenth century* (Manchester, 1967).
- Eire, C. *War Against the Idols: The Reformation of Worship from Erasmus to Calvin* (Cambridge, 1986).

- Eliade, M. *The Sacred and the Profane. The Nature of Religion* (New York, 1959).
- Erlande-Brandenberg, A. *The Cathedral: the Social and Architectural Dynamics of Construction* (Cambridge, 1989).
- Edwards, J. G. et. al. (The Royal Commission on Ancient and Historical Monuments in Wales and Monmouthshire). *An Inventory of the Ancient Monuments in Caernarvonshire: II, Central*. (London, 1960).
- Falk, B. 'Zur Entstehung und Entwicklung der metallenen Kopf-, Büsten-, und Halbfigurenreliquiare im Mittelalter', *Aachener Kunstblätter* 59 (1991-93), 99-238.
- Farmer, D. H. (ed.). *Oxford Dictionary of Saints* (Oxford, 2004).
- Fernie, E. 'Observations on the Norman Plan of Ely Cathedral', in N. Coldstream and P. Draper (eds.), *Medieval Art and Architecture at Ely Cathedral*, BAA Conference Transactions 2 for the year 1976 (Leeds, 1979), 1-7.
- '. 'The Spiral Piers of Durham Cathedral', in in N. Coldstream and P. Draper (eds.), *Medieval Art and Architecture at Durham Cathedral*. BAA Conference Transactions 3 for the Year 1977 (Leeds, 1980), 49-58.
- '. 'The Architectural Influence of Durham Cathedral', in D. Rollason, M. Harvey, and M. Prestwich (eds.). *Anglo-Norman Durham 1093-1193* (Woodbridge, 1994), 269-282.
- Ferrari, M. C. 'Il Volto Santo di Lucca', in G. Morello and G. Wolf, (eds.), *Il Volto di Cristo*, exh. cat. (Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Rome, 2000), 253-62.

- Fisher, A.E. 'Cross Altar and Crucifix in Ottonian Cologne - Past Narrative, Present Ritual, Future Resurrection', in E. Thunø and S. Kaspersen (eds.), *Decorating the Lord's Table. On the Dynamics Between Image and Altar in the Middle Ages* (Copenhagen, 2006), 43-62.
- Flannigan, C. C. 'The Moving Subject: Medieval Liturgical Processions in Semiotic and Cultural Perspective', in K. Ashley and W. Hüsken (eds.), *Moving Subjects. Processional Performance in the Middle Ages and Renaissance* (Atlanta, 2001).
- Flavingy, L. and Jablonski-Chauveau, C. *D'Angleterre en Normandie. Sculptures d'albâtre du Moyen Age* (Rouen and Evreux, exh. cat., 1998).
- Forgeard, L. *L'Age d'Or del la Vièrge et L'Enfant. Le XIVe siècle en Seine-et-Marne* (Paris, 1995).
- Forsyth, I. H. *The Throne of Wisdom. Wood Sculptures of the Madonna in Romanesque France* (Princeton, 1972).
- Forsyth, W.H. *The Pietà in French Late Gothic Sculpture. Regional Variations* (New York, 1995).
- Franklin, M. 'The Cathedral as Parish Church: the Case of Southern England', in M. Franklin and M. Rubin (eds.), *Church and City 1000-1500. Essays In Honour of Christopher Brooke* (Cambridge, 1992), 173-98.
- Franks, G. 'The Pilgrim's Gaze in the Age Before Icons' in R.S. Nelson and N. Bryson (eds.), *Visuality Before and Beyond the Renaissance: Seeing as Others Saw* (Cambridge, 2000), 98-115.
- Franks, J. 'St Zita, St Sythe and St Osyth', *Nottingham Medieval Studies*, 36 (1992), 148-50.

- Fraser, C. M. 'Beaumont, Louis de (d. 1333)', *ODNB*, vol. 4 (Oxford, 2004), 671-73.
- Freedburg, D. *The Power of Images: Studies in the History of Theory and Response* (Chicago, 1989).
- French, K. 'The Seat Under Our Lady: Gender and Seating in the Late Medieval Parish Church' in V. Chieffo Raguin and S. Stanbury (eds.) *Women's Space: Patronage, Place, and Gender in the Medieval Church* (Albany, NY, 2005), 141-160.
- French, T. *The Great East Window. Corpus Vitrearum Medii Aevi Great Britain - Summary Catalogue 2* (Stroud, 1995).
- , *The St William Window. Corpus Vitrearum Medii Aevi Great Britain - Summary Catalogue 5* (Oxford, 1999).
- and O'Connor, D. *York Minster. A Catalogue of Stained Glass. Fascicule 1: The West Windows of the Nave* (Oxford, 1987).
- Gameson, R. (ed.), *Manuscript Treasures of Durham Cathedral* (London, 2010).
- Gaposchkin, M.C. *The Making of Saint Louis: Kingship, Sanctity, and Crusade in the Later Middle Ages* (Ithaca and London, 2010).
- Geary, P. J. *Furta Sacra. Thefts of Relics in the Central Middle Ages* (Princeton, 1978).
- Gee, E. 'The Topography of Altars, Chantries and Shrines in York Minster', *The Antiquaries Journal*, 64 (1984), 337-50.
- Gem, R. 'Towards an Iconography of Anglo-Saxon Architecture', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 46 (1983), 1-18.

-----‘Architecture of the Anglo-Saxon Church, 735 to 870: From Archbishop Ecgberht to Archbishop Ceolnoth’, *JBAA* 146 (1993), 29-66.

Gent, T. *The Most Delectable, Scriptural and Pious History of the Famous and Magnificent Great Eastern Window (According to Beautiful Portraits) in St Peter’s Cathedral, York...*(York, 1762).

Gerrard, D. M. *The Military Activities of Bishops, Abbots and Other Clergy in England c.900-1200* (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Glasgow, 2011).
<http://theses.gla.ac.uk/2671/> Accessed 11th September 2013.

Gertsman, E. ‘The Pilgrim’s Progress: Devotional Journey Through the Holy Womb’, in S. Blick and L. Gelfand (eds.). *Push Me, Pull You: Physical and Spatial Interaction in Late Medieval and Renaissance Art*, vol. 2, (Leiden, 2011), 231-259.

----- and Stevenson, J. (eds.). *Thresholds of Medieval Visual Culture. Liminal Spaces* (Woodbridge, 2012).

Gilchrist, R. *Norwich Cathedral Close: the Evolution of the English Cathedral Landscape* (Woodbridge, 2005).

Giles, K. ‘Seeing and Believing: visibility and space in pre-modern England’, *World Archaeology* 39:1 (2007), 105-121.

Gill, M. *Late Medieval Wall Painting in England (c.1330-c.1530)*, (PhD Dissertation, Courtauld Institute of Art, 2002).

Gillespie, V. ‘Medieval Hypertext: Image and Text from York Minster’, in P.R. Robinson and R. Zim (eds.), *Of the Making of Books: Medieval Manuscripts, their Scribes and Readers: Essays presented to M.B. Parkes* (Aldershot, 1997), 206-229.

- Goodich, M. *Miracles and Wonders. The Development of the Concept of Miracle, 1150-1350* (Aldershot, 2007).
- Gough, J. 'The Fall of the Central Tower', *The Friends of York Minster Annual Report*, 85 (2014) 61-71.
- Graef, H. *Mary. A History of Doctrine and Devotion* (London, 1985).
- Gransden, A. 'Abbo of Fleury's *Passio Sancti Eadmundi*', *Revue Bénédictine* 105 (1-2; 1995), 20-78.
- Graves, C.P. 'Social Space in the English Medieval Parish Church', *Economy and Society* 18:3(1989): 297-322.
- '. 'Sensing and Believing: exploring worlds of difference in pre-modern England: a contribution to the debate opened by Kate Giles', *World Archaeology* 39: 4 (2007), 515-531.
- '. 'From an Archaeology of Iconoclasm to an Anthropology of the Body: Images, Punishment, and Personhood in England, 1500-1660', *Current Anthropology* 49:1 (2008), 35-57.
- Greatrex, J. 'Marian Studies and Devotion in the Benedictine Cathedral Priors of in Later Medieval England' in R.N. Swanson (ed.), *The Church and Mary. Studies in Church History* 39 (2004), 157-167.
- Guillot de Suduiraut, S. (ed.) *Sculptures allemandes de la fin du Moyen Âge dans les collections publiques françaises 1400-1530*, exh. cat. (Paris, 1991).
- Hahn, C. 'The Voices of the Saints: Speaking Reliquaries', *Gesta* 36:1 (1997), 20-31.
- '. 'The Spectacle of the Charismatic Body: Patrons, Artists, and Body-Part Reliquaries', in Bagnoli, M., Klein, H.A., Griffith Mann, C., and

Robinson, J. *Treasures of Heaven. Saints, Relics and Devotion in Medieval Europe* (London, 2011), 163-172.

Hall, M. 'The Tramezzo in Santa Croce, Florence, Reconstructed', *The Art Bulletin* 56:3 (1974), 325-41.

Halsey, R. 'The Galilee Chapel', in N. Coldstream and P. Draper (eds.), *Medieval Art and Architecture at Durham Cathedral*. BAA Conference Transactions 3 for the Year 1977 (Leeds, 1980), 59-78.

Hamburger, J.F. *Nuns As Artists: The Visual Culture of a Medieval Convent* (Berkeley and London, 1997).

----- . *The Visual and The Visionary: Art and Female Spirituality in Late Medieval Germany* (New York, 1998).

Hamilton, S. and Spicer, A. *Defining the Holy: Sacred Space in Medieval and Early Modern Europe* (Aldershot, 2005).

----- . 'Defining the Holy. The Delineation of Sacred Space', in S. Hamilton and A. Spicer (eds.), *Defining the Holy: Sacred Space in Medieval and Early Modern Europe* (Aldershot, 2005), 1-23.

Hampton, I. *Neville Family Patronage at Durham Cathedral, 1346-1446: 'cheryshing and kepyng in of the love of my lords Westmerland & Nevyll'* (M.A. Dissertation, University of York, 2011).

Harper, J. *The Forms and Orders of the Western Liturgy from the Tenth to the Eighteenth Centuries: A Historical Introduction for Students and Musicians* (Oxford, 1991).

Harrison, F. 'The West Choir Clerestory Windows in York Minster', *Yorkshire Archaeological Journal* 26 (1922), 353-73.

- Harrison, S.A. 'Observations on the Architecture of the Galilee Chapel', in D. Rollason, M. Harvey and M. Prestwich (eds.), *Anglo-Norman Durham 1093-1193* (Woodbridge, 1994), 213-34.
- Harvey, M. *Lay Religious Life in Late Medieval Durham* (Woodbridge, 2006).
- Haselock, J. and O'Connor, D.E. 'The Medieval Stained Glass of Durham Cathedral', in N. Coldstream and P. Draper (eds.), *Medieval Art and Architecture at Durham Cathedral*. BAA Conference Transactions 3 for the Year 1977 (Leeds, 1980), 105-129.
- Haussherr, R. 'Triumphkreuzgruppen der Stauferzeit', in R. Haussherr and Väterlein (eds.), *Die Zeit der Staufer: Geschichte-Kunst-Kultur*, exh. cat.. (Stuttgart, Württembergisches Landesmuseum, 1977-1979) 131-68.
- Hawkes, J. 'Columban Virgins: Iconic Images of the Virgin and Child in Insular Sculpture', in C. Bourke (ed.), *Studies in the Cult of St Columba* (Dublin, 1997), 107-135.
- Hayes, D. M. *Body and Sacred Place in Medieval Europe, 1100-1389* (New York, 2003).
- Head, T. 'Art and Artifice in Ottonian Trier', *Gesta* 36:1 (1997), 65-82.
- Hearn, M.F. and Willis, L. 'The Iconography of the Lady Chapel at Salisbury Cathedral', in L. Keen and L. Cocke (eds.), *Medieval Art and Architecture at Salisbury Cathedral*. BAA Conference Transactions 17 for the year 1991 (Leeds, 1996), 40-45.
- Heard, K. "'Such stuff as dreams are made on': Textiles and the Medieval Chantry', *JBAA* 164 (2011), 157-68.
- Heslop, T.A. 'English Origins of the Coronation of the Virgin', *Burlington Magazine* 147, 1233 (2005), 790-97.

- Higgett, J. 'The Iconography of St Peter in Anglo-Saxon England, and St Cuthbert's Coffin', in G. Bonner, D. Rollason, and C. Stancliffe (eds.), *St Cuthbert, His Cult and Community to AD 1200* (Woodbridge, 1989), 267-86.
- Hill, R.M.T. 'From 627 until the Early Thirteenth Century', in G. Aylmer and R. Cant, *A History of York Minster* (Oxford, 1977), 1-44.
- Hope, W.H. St John. *English Altars from Illuminated Manuscripts* (London, 1899).
- .'On the great Almyry for relics of late in the Abbey Church of Selby, with notes on some other receptacles for relics', *Archaeologia* 60:2 (1907), 411-22.
- .'On the Quire Screens of English Churches, with special reference to the twelfth-century Quire Screen formerly in the Cathedral Church of Ely', *Archaeologia* 68:2 (1917), 43-110.
- Hourihane, C. *The Processional Cross in Late Medieval England: The 'Dallye Cross'* (London, 2005).
- Hughes, J. *Pastors and Visionaries: Religion and Secular Life in Late Medieval Yorkshire* (Woodbridge, 1988).
- Hunter-Blair, C.H. 'Medieval Seals of the Bishops of Durham', *Archaeologia* 72 (1922), 1-24.
- Husband, T. (ed.). *The Treasury of Basel Cathedral* exh. cat. (New York, Metropolitan Museum, 2001).

- Iacobini, A. 'Est Haec Sacra Principis Aedes: The Vatican Basilica from Innocent III to Gregory IX (1198-1241)', in W. Tronzo (ed.) *St Peter's in the Vatican* (Cambridge, 2005), 48-63.
- Jacobs, L.F. *Early Netherlandish Carved Altarpieces, 1380-1550. Medieval Tastes and Mass Marketing* (Cambridge, 1998).
- James, M.R. *On the Abbey of St Edmund at Bury* (Cambridge, 1895).
- Jay, M. 'That Visual Turn: the advent of visual culture', *Visual Culture* 1:1 (2002), 87-92.
- Jefferies, J. *A Study of Altars and Chantry Endowments in York Minster c.1364* (University of York, MA thesis, 2000).
- Johnson, M. and McIntyre, M. 'Wall Paintings in the Galilee of Durham Cathedral', *Transactions of the Architectural and Archaeological Society of Durham and Northumberland*, 11 (1958-1965), 278-80.
- Johnson, M. 'The North-East Altar in the Galilee of Durham Cathedral', *Transactions of the Architectural and Archaeological Society of Durham and Northumberland*, 11 (1958-1965), 371-90.
- Jolly, Karkov, and Keefer (eds.). *Cross and Culture in Anglo-Saxon England: Studies in Honor of George Hardin Brown* (Morgantown, West Virginia, 2007).
- Jones, W. R. 'Lollards and Images: The Defense of Medieval Art in Later Medieval England', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 34 (1973), 27-50.
- Joubert, F. *La Sculpture Gothique en France: XIIème-XIIIème siècles* (Paris, 2008).

Jung, J. 'Beyond the Barrier: The Unifying Role of the Choir Screen in Gothic Churches', *The Art Bulletin* 82 (2000), 622-57.

-----'. 'Seeing through Screens: The Gothic Choir Enclosure as Frame' in S.E.J. Gerstel (ed.), *Thresholds of the Sacred: architectural, art historical, liturgical, and theological perspectives on religious screens, East and West* (Cambridge, 2006), 185-213.

-----'. 'The Tactile and the Visionary: Notes on the Place of Sculpture in the Medieval Religious Imagination', in C. Hourihane (ed.), *Looking Beyond: Visions, Dreams and Insights in Medieval Art and History* (Princeton, 2010).

-----'. *The Gothic Screen: Space, Sculpture, and Community in the Cathedrals of France and Germany, ca. 1200-1400* (Cambridge, 2013).

Kamerick, K. *Popular Piety and Art in the Late Middle Ages: Image Worship and Idolatry in England 1350-1500* (Houndmills, 2002).

Kammel, F. 'Imago Pro Domo. Private religiöse Bilder und ihre Benutzung im Spätmittelalter', in F. Kammel (ed.), *Spiegel der Seligkeit: Privates Bild und Frömmigkeit im Spätmittelalter* (exh. cat. Germanisches Nationalmuseum, Nürnberg, 2000), 10-33.

Karkov, Keefer, and Jolly (eds.). *The Place of the Cross in Anglo-Saxon England* (Woodbridge, 2006).

Karrenbrock, R. (ed.). *Die Holtzskulpturen des Mittelalters II, 1. 1400 bis 1540. Teil I: Köln, Westfalen, Norddeutschland* (Köln, 2001).

Kapustka, M. 'Chasing the Caput. Head Images of John the Baptist in a Political Conflict', in C. Santing, B. Baert, and A. Traninger (eds.). *Disembodied Heads in Medieval and Early Modern Culture* (Leiden and Boston, 2013), 161-190.

Katz, M. 'Behind closed doors: Distributed bodies, hidden interiors, and corporeal erasure in Vierge ouvrante sculpture', *Res: Anthropology and Aesthetics* 55/56 (2009), 194-221.

-----'. 'Marian Motion: Opening the Body of the Vierge Ouvrante' in N. Zchomelidse. and G. Freni (eds.), *Meaning in Motion: The Semantics of Movement in Medieval Art* (Princeton, 2011), 63-91.

Kauffmann, C.M. 'The meaning of biblical imagery in churches: is the liturgy the answer?', in Z. Opačić and A. Timmermann (eds.), *Image, Memory and Devotion. Liber Amicorum Paul Crossley* (Turnhout, 2011), 61-67.

Keefer, Jolly, and Karkov (eds.). *Cross and Cruciform in the Anglo-Saxon World: Studies to Honor the Memory of Timothy Reuter* (Morgantown, West Virginia, 2010).

Kerr, J. 'The East Window at Gloucester Cathedral', in T.A. Heslop and V.A. Sekules (eds.), *Medieval Art and Architecture at Gloucester and Tewkesbury. BAA Conference Transactions 7 for the year 1985* (Leeds, 1985), 116-29.

Kessler, H. *Old St Peter's and Church Decoration in Medieval Italy* (Spoleto, 2002).

-----'. *Seeing Medieval Art* (Peterborough, Ont. and Orchard Park, New York, 2004).

-----'. and Wolf, G. (eds.). *The Holy Face and the Paradox of Representation* (Bologna, 1998).

Keynes, S. 'The *Liber Vitae* of the New Minster, Winchester', in D. Rollason, A.J. Piper, and M. Harvey (eds.), *The Durham Liber Vitae and its Context* (Woodbridge, 2004), 149-64.

Kingsford, C.L. 'Our Lady of the Pew. The King's Oratory or Closet in the Palace of Westminster', *Archaeologia*, 68 (1917), 1-20.

-----'. 'Two Forfeitures in the Year of Agincourt', *Archaeologia*, 70 (1919-20), 71-100.

E. Kirschbaum, and W. Braunfels (eds.). *Lexicon der Christlichen Ikonographie*. 8 vols. (Freiburg im Breisgau, 1968-76).

Kitzinger, E. 'The Coffin-Reliquary', in C.F. Battiscombe (ed.), *The Relics of St Cuthbert* (Oxford, 1956), 202-304.

Klukas, A. 'Durham Cathedral in the Gothic Era: Liturgy, Design, Ornament', in V. Raguin, K. Brush, and P. Draper, *Artistic Integration in Gothic Buildings* (Toronto, 1995), 69-83.

Kroesen, J.E.A. *Staging the Liturgy. The Medieval Altarpiece in the Iberian Peninsula* (Leuven, 2009a).

-----'. 'Recentring Side Altars in Medieval Church Interiors: The Example of Late Romanesque Churches in Groningen', in J. E. A. Kroesen and V. M. Schmidt, eds, *The Altar and its Environment 1150-1400*, *Studies in the Visual Cultures of the Middle Ages*, 4, (Turnhout 2009b), 147-68.

----- and Steensma, *The Interior of the Medieval Village Church/ Het middeleeuwse doepkerkinterieur* (Louvain, Paris, Dudley, Mass. 2004).

Kurath, H. and Sherman, M.K. (eds.). *Middle English Dictionary* (Ann Arbor, c.1952-c.2001).

- Kurmann, P. and Kurmann-Schwarz, B. 'Chartres Cathedral as a Work of Artistic Integration: Methodological Reflections', in V. Raguin, K. Brush, and P. Draper, *Artistic Integration in Gothic Buildings* (Toronto, 1995), 131-52.
- Ladner, 'St Gregory of Nyssa and St Augustine on the Symbolism of the Cross', in *Images and Ideas in the Middle Ages. Selected Studies in History and Art* (Rome, 1983). 2 vols. I: 197-208.
- Latham, R.E. (ed.). *Revised Medieval Latin Word-list, from British and Irish Sources* (London, 1999).
- Latour, B. and Weibel (eds.) *Iconoclasm: Beyond the Image Wars in Science, Religion and Art* (Cambridge, Mass. and London, 2002).
- Lautier, C. 'The sacred topography of Chartres Cathedral: the reliquary chasse of the Virgin in the liturgical choir and stained-glass decoration' in E.S. Lane, E.C. Pastan and E. M. Shortell (eds.) *Four Modes of Seeing: Approaches to Medieval Imagery in Honor of Madeline Harrison Caviness* (Aldershot, 2009), 174-96.
- Lawton, G. *Collectio Rerum Ecclesiaticarum de Dioecesi Eboracensi; or Collections Relative to Churches and Chapels with the Diocese of York. To which are added Collections Relative to the Diocese of Ripon* (London, 1842).
- Leach, P., & Pevsner, N. *The buildings of England: Yorkshire West Riding: Leeds, Bradford and the North* (London, 2009).
- Lehmberg, S.E. *The Reformation of Cathedrals: Cathedrals in English Society 1485-1603* (Princeton, 1988).

- Lentes, T. ‘“As Far as the Eye Can See”: Rituals and Gazing in the Late Middle Ages’, in Hamburger, J. and Bouché, A-M. (eds.), *The Mind’s Eye: Art and Theological Argument in the Middle Ages* (Princeton, 2006), 360-73.
- Lepie, H. and Minkenber, G. and Dias Hargarter, M. (trans.). *The Cathedral Treasury of Aachen*(Aachen, 1990).
- Lepine, D. *A Brotherhood of Canons Serving God: English Secular Cathedrals in the Later Middle Ages* (Woodbridge, 1995).
- . ‘Cathedrals and Charity: Almsgiving at English Secular Cathedrals in the Later Middle Ages’, *English Historical Review* 126 (2011), 1066-1096.
- . ‘Begun by Me: The Artistic Patronage of the Higher Clergy’, in P. Binski and E. New (eds.), *Patrons and Professionals in the Middle Ages. Proceedings of the 2010 Harlaxton Symposium* (Donnington, 2012), 273-91.
- Lewis C.T. and C. Short (eds.). *A Latin Dictionary: founded on Andrews’ edition of Freund’s Latin dictionary* (Oxford, 1886). Also online:<http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3atext%3a1999.04.0059>, Accessed 17th June 2014.
- Le Goff, J. and Goldhammer, A (trans.). *The Birth of Purgatory* (Chicago, 1984).
- Liddy, C.D. *The Bishopric of Durham in the Late Middle Ages: Lordship, Community, and the Cult of St Cuthbert* (Woodbridge, 2008).
- Lidov, A. ‘The Flying Hodegetria. The Miraculous Icon as Bearer of Sacred Space’, in Thurnø, E. and Wolf, G. *The Miraculous Image In the Late Middle Ages and Renaissance* (Rome, 2004), 273-304.

- Lindley, P.G. 'The Great Screen at Winchester Cathedral, I', *Burlington Magazine*, 131 (1989), 604-617.
- .'The Great Screen at Winchester Cathedral, II', *Burlington Magazine*, 135 (1993), 796-807.
- .'The Great Screen of St Albans Abbey', in P. Lindley and M. Henig (eds.), *Alban and St Albans. Roman and Medieval Architecture, Art, and Archaeology*, BAA Conference Transactions 24 for the year 1999 (Donington, 2001), 256-270.
- Lipton, S. '“The Sweet Lean of His Head”: Writing about Looking at the Crucifix in the High Middle Ages', *Speculum* 80:4 (2005), 1172-1208.
- Little, C. (ed.). *Set in Stone: The Face in Medieval Sculpture*. exh. cat. (Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, 2006).
- Lomas, R.A. 'The Durham Landscape and the Battle of Neville's Cross', in D. Rollason and M. Prestwich (eds.), *The Battle of Neville's Cross 1346* (Stamford, 1998),
- Lutton, R. *Lollardy and Orthodox Religion in Pre-Reformation England: Reconstructing Piety* (Woodbridge, 2006).
- Lutz, G. *Das Bild des Gekreuzigten im Wandel. Die sächsischen und westfälischen Kreuzifixe der ersten Hälfte des 13. Jahrhunderts*. Studien zur internationalen Architektur- und Kunstgeschichte; 28 (Petersberg, 2004).
- Luxford, J.M. 'The Great Rood of Glastonbury Abbey', *Proceedings of the Somerset Archaeological and Natural History Society* 145 (2002), 83-87.
- '. *The Art and Architecture of English Benedictine Monasteries, 1300-1540: A Patronage History* (Woodbridge, 2005).

- '. 'The Patronage of the Church and its Purposes', in Ayers, T. (ed.) *The History of British Art 600-1600* (London, 2008), 81-105.
- '. 'The Late Medieval Abbey: Patronage, Buildings and Images', in J. Canon and B. Williamson (eds.), *The Medieval Art, Architecture, and History of Bristol Cathedral: An Enigma Explored* (Woodbridge, 2011a), 216-246.
- '. 'The Idol of Origins: Retrospection in Augustinian Art in the Later Middle Ages', in J. Burton and K. Stöber (eds.), *The Regular Canons in the Medieval British Isles* (Turnhout, 2011b), 417-442.
- '. 'Nichil ornatus in domo domini pretermittens: the Professional Patronage of Walter of Monington, Abbot of Glastonbury', in P. Binski and E. New (eds.), *Patrons and Professionals in the Middle Ages. Proceedings of the 2010 Harlaxton Symposium* (Donnington, 2012), 237-60.
- Maddison, J. 'The Gothic Cathedral: New Building in a Historical Context', in P. Meadows and N. Ramsay (eds.), *A History of Ely Cathedral* (Woodbridge, 2003), 113-41.
- Mâle, E. *L'Art Religieux du XIIe siècle en France: Étude sur les origines de l'iconographie du Moyen Age* (Paris, 1898).
- '. *L'Art Religieux du XIIIe siècle en France: Étude sur l'iconographie du Moyen Age et sur ses sources d'Inspiration* (Paris, 1922).
- '. *L'Art Religieux de la fin du Moyen Age en France* (Paris, 1949).
- Maniura, R. *Pilgrimages to Images in the Fifteenth Century: The Origins of the Cult of Our Lady of Częstochowa* (Woodbridge, 2004).

- ‘Image, Space and Holy Place in the Cult of Our Lady of Częstochowa’, in Z. Opačić and A. Timmermann (eds.), *Image, Memory and Devotion. Liber Amicorum Paul Crossley* (Turnhout, 2011), 113-120.
- Marks, R. *Stained Glass in England During the Middle Ages* (Abingdon, 1993).
- ‘The Thirteenth-Century Glazing of Salisbury Cathedral’ in L. Keen and T. Cocke, *Medieval Art and Architecture at Salisbury Cathedral. Transactions of the British Archaeological Association 17* (Leeds, 1996), 106-20.
- ‘Viewing Our Lady of Pity’, in *Magistro et Amico. Amici discipulique Lechowi Kalinowskiemu w osiemdziesięciolecie urodzin* (Cracow, 2002), 101-21.
- ‘The *Ymage Sacnti Loci* in the English Medieval Parish Church. Its Status and Function in the Liturgy and Private Devotion’, in A. Moraht-Fromm (ed.), *Kunst und Liturgie. Choranlagen des Spätmittelaltersihre Architektur, Ausstattung und Nutzung* (Ostfildern, 2003), 31-58.
- *Image and Devotion in Late Medieval England* (Stroud, 2004).
- ‘“To the Honour and the pleasure of Almighty God, and to the Comfort of the Parishoners”: The Rood and Remembrance’, in Z. Opačić and A. Timmermann (eds.), *Image, Memory and Devotion. Liber Amicorum Paul Crossley* (Turnhout, 2011), 213-224.
- ‘From Langford to South Cerney: The Rood in Anglo-Norman England’, *JBAA* 165 (2012a), 172-210.
- ‘Introduction’, in R. Marks, *Studies in the Art and Imagery of the Middle Ages* (London, 2012b): i-viii.

- , 'Picturing Word and Text in the Late Medieval English Church', in R. Marks, *Studies in the Art and Imagery of the Middle Ages* (London, 2012c), 123-60.
- , 'Images of Henry VI', in R. Marks, *Studies in the Art and Imagery of the Middle Ages* (London, 2012d), 607-31.
- Marks, R. and Williamson, P. (eds.), *Gothic: Art for England 1400-1547*, exh. cat. (London, Victoria & Albert Museum, 2003).
- Marner, D. *St Cuthbert: His Life and Cult in Medieval Durham* (Toronto, 2000).
- Martinelli, S. 'The *Volto Santo* of Lucca: An Iconographical and Devotional Theme in East-Central Europe', in M. Ciglenc̃ki and P. Vidmar (eds.) *Art and Architecture Around 1400* (Maribor, 2012), 181-85.
- Matthew, D. 'Durham and the Anglo-Norman World', in D. Rollason, M. Harvey, and M. Prestwich (eds.). *Anglo-Norman Durham 1093-1193* (Woodbridge, 1994), 1-24.
- Mayr-Harting, H. 'The Idea of the Assumption in the West, 800-1200', in R.N. Swanson (ed.), *The Church and Mary*. *Studies in Church History* 39 (2004), 86-111.
- McKinnell, J. 'For the people, by the people: public and private spaces in the Durham Sequence of the Sacrament', in F. Andrews (ed.), *Ritual and Space in the Middle Ages. Proceedings of the 2009 Harlaxton Symposium*. *Harlaxton Medieval Studies* 21, (Donington, 2011), 213-31.
- McNeill, J. 'A Prehistory of the Chantry', *JBA* 164 (2011), 1-38.
- Meller, H., Mundt, I. Hans Shchmuhl, B.E. (eds.). *Der Heilige Schatz im Dom zu Halberstadt* (Regensburg, 2008).

- Meurer, H. *Württembergisches Landesmuseum Stuttgart. Die mittelalterlichen Skulpturen, I Stein und Holzskulpturen 800-1400* (Stuttgart, 1989).
- Miles, L.S. *Mary's Book: The Annunciation in Medieval England* (Yale University, PhD Dissertation, 2011).
- Miles, M. *Image as Insight: Visual Understanding in Western Christianity and Secular Culture* (Boston, Mass., 1985).
- Milner, M. *The Senses and the Reformation* (Farnham, 2011).
- Montgomery, S.B. *The Use and Perception of Reliquary Busts in the Late Middle Ages* (PhD Dissertation, Rutgers University, 1996).
- , 'Mittite capud meum...ad matrem meam ut osculetur eum: The Form and Meaning of the Reliquary Bust of Saint Just', *Gesta* 36:1 (1997), 48-64.
- , *St. Ursula and the Eleven Thousand Virgins of Cologne. Relics, Reliquaries, and the Visual Culture of Group Sanctity in Late Medieval Europe* (Bern, 2010).
- Morgan, C. 'A Life of St Katharine of Alexandria in the Chapter-House of York Minster', *JBAA* 162 (2009), 179-95.
- Morgan, N. 'Texts and Images of Marian Devotion in Thirteenth-Century England', in W.M. Ormrod (ed.), *England in the Thirteenth Century. Proceedings of the 1989 Harlaxton Symposium*, Harlaxton Medieval Studies 1 (Stamford, 1991), 69-103.
- , 'Texts and Images of Marian Devotion in Fourteenth-Century England', in N. Rogers (ed.), *England in the Fourteenth Century. Proceedings of the 1991 Harlaxton Symposium*, Harlaxton Medieval Studies 3 (Stamford, 1993), 34-57.

-----'. 'The Coronation of the Virgin by the Trinity and Other Texts and Images of the Glorification of Mary in Fifteenth Century England', in *England in the Fifteenth Century. Proceedings of the 1992 Harlaxton Symposium*, Harlaxton Medieval Studies 4 (Stamford, 1994), 223-41.

-----'. 'Texts and Images of Marian Devotion in English Twelfth-Century Monasticism, and Their Influence on the Secular Church' in B. Thompson (ed.). *Monasteries and Society in Medieval Britain. Proceedings of the 1994 Harlaxton Symposium*, Harlaxton Medieval Studies 6 (Stamford, 1999), 117-36.

Morello, G. and Wolf, G. (eds.). *Il Volto di Cristo*, exh. cat. (Rome, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 2000).

Morris, R.K. 'The Development of Later Gothic Mouldings in England, c.1250-1400: Part I', *Architectural History* 21 (1978), 18-57.

-----'. 'The Development of Later Gothic Mouldings in England, c.1250-1400: Part II', *Architectural History* 22 (1979), 1-48.

Munns, J. *The Cross of Christ and Anglo-Norman Religious Imagination* (PhD Dissertation, University of Cambridge, 2010).

Murray, S. *A Gothic Sermon. Making Contact with the Mother of God, Saint Mary of Amiens* (Berkeley, California, 2004).

Nelson, R.S., and Bryson, N. (eds.). *Visuality Before and Beyond the Renaissance: Seeing as Others Saw* (Cambridge, 2000).

Netzer, N. and Reinburg, V. (eds.) *Fragmented Devotion: Medieval Objects from the Schnütgen Museum Cologne*, exh. cat. (Chesnut Hill, MA, McMullen Museum of Art, Boston College, 2000).

- Newman, B. 'What Did It Mean to Say 'I Saw'? The Clash Between Theory and Practice in Medieval Visionary Culture', *Speculum* 80:1 (2005), 1-43.
- Neve, John le. and Jones, B.E.A. (eds.). *Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae, 1300-1541: VI, Northern Province; York, Carlisle and Durham* (London, 1963).
- Nilsén, A. and Naylor, M (trans.). *Focal Point of the Sacred Space: the boundary between chancel and nave in Swedish rural churches: from Romanesque to Neo-Gothic* (Uppsala, 2003).
- Nilson, B. *Cathedral Shrines of Medieval England* (Woodbridge, 1998).
- Norton, C. 'The Buildings of St Mary's Abbey, York and their Destruction', *The Antiquaries Journal*, 74 (1994), 256-288.
- '. 'The Anglo-Saxon Cathedral at York and the Topography of the Anglian City', *JBAA CLI* (1998a), 1-42.
- '. 'The York Fire of 1137: Conflagration or Consecration?', *Northern History* 34 (1998b), 194-204.
- '. *Archbishop Thomas of Bayeux and the Norman Cathedral at York*. Borthwick Papers no. 100 (York, 2001).
- '. 'Sacred Space and Sacred History: The Glazing of the Eastern Arm of York Minster', in R. Becksmann (ed.), *Glasmalerei im Kontext: Bildprogramme und Raumfunktionen* (Nuremberg, 2005), 167-181.
- '. *St William of York* (Woodbridge, 2006).
- '. 'Richard Scrope and York Minster', in P.J.P. Goldberg (ed.), *Richard Scrope, Archbishop, Rebel, and Martyr* (Donington, 2007), 138-213.

- Oakes, C. *Ora Pro Nobis. The Virgin as Intercessor in Medieval Art and Devotion* (Turnhout, 2008).
- Oakes, R. 'Pennies to Heaven': *The nature and influence of public donations made to the fabric fund of York Minster, 1469-1485* (MA Dissertation, University of York, 2003).
- O'Connor, D. and Haselock, J. 'The Stained and Painted Glass', in G. Aylmer and R. Cant, *A History of York Minster* (Oxford, 1977), 313-94.
- O'Laughlin, T. 'Adomnán's Plans in the Context of his Imagining 'the Most Famous City'', in L. Donkin and H. Vorholt (eds.), *Imagining Jerusalem in the Medieval West. Proceedings of the British Academy 175* (Oxford, 2012), 15-41.
- O'Neill, J.P. (ed.). *Enamels of Limoges* exh. cat. (New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1995).
- Oosterwijk, S. and Norton, C. 'Figure Sculpture from the twelfth-century Minster', *Friends of York Minster Annual Report* 61 (1990), 11-30.
- O'Reilly, J. 'The Rough Hewn Cross in Anglo-Saxon Art', in M. Ryan (ed.), *Ireland and Insular Art, A.D. 500-1200* (Dublin, 1987), 153-58.
- Opačić, Z. and Timmermann, A. (eds.). *Architecture, Liturgy and Identity. Liber Amicorum Paul Crossley* (Turnhout, 2011).
- Orme, N. *Exeter Cathedral As It Was 1050-1550* (Exeter, 1986).
- '. 'Access and Exclusion: Exeter Cathedral, 1300-1540', in P. Horden (ed.), *Freedom of Movement in the Middle Ages. Proceedings of the 2003 Harlaxton Symposium* (Donington, 2007), 267-286.
- '. *Exeter Cathedral: The First Thousand Years* (Exeter, 2009).

- Page, W. (ed.). 'Parishes: Blunham with Moggerhanger and Charlton' in *Victoria County History. A History of the County of Bedford*, vol. 3 (1912), 228-33. <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=42421> Accessed 26th July, 2014.
- (ed.). 'Houses of Augustinian Canons: Priory of Marton', in *A History of the County of York*, vol. 3 (1974), 223-26.
- Palazzo, E. 'Iconographie et liturgie dans les études médiévales aujourd'hui: un éclairage méthodologique', *Cahiers de civilisation médiévale*, 41 (1998), 9-18.
- 'Relics, Liturgical Space, and the Theology of the Church', in M. Bagnoli, H.A. Klein, C. Griffith Mann, and J. Robinson (eds.). *Treasures of Heaven. Saints, Relics and Devotion in Medieval Europe* (London, 2011), 99-110.
- Panofsky, E. *Imago Pietatis: Ein Beitrag zur Typengeschichte des 'Schmerzensmanns' und der 'Maria Mediatrix'*, in Max J. Friedländer (ed.), *Festschrift für Max J. Friedländer zum 60 Geburtstag* (Leipzig, 1927), 261-308.
- *Gothic Architecture and Scholasticism* (Cleveland, Ohio, 1957).
- Park, D. 'The Wall Paintings in the Galilee Chapel of Durham Cathedral', *Friends of Durham Cathedral 57th Annual Report* (1990), 21-34.
- 'The Interior Decoration of the Cathedral', in D. Pocock (ed.), *Durham Cathedral. A Celebration* (Durham, 1993), 57-67.
- 'The Interior Decoration of the Cathedral', in D. Pocock (ed.), *Durham Cathedral. An Architectural Appreciation* (Durham, 2014), 54-64.

- and Welford, P., 'The Medieval Polychromy of Winchester Cathedral', in J. Crook (ed.), *Winchester Cathedral. Nine Hundred Years 1093-1993* (Chichester, 1993), 123-66.
- Pelikan, J. *Mary Through the Centuries. Her Place in the History of Culture* (New Haven and London, 1996).
- Pevsner, N. and Willamson, E. *The Buildings of England. County Durham* (London, 1983), 2nd edition.
- Pfaff, R. W. *New Liturgical Feasts in Later Medieval England* (Oxford, 1970).
- *The Liturgy in Medieval England: A History* (Cambridge, 2009).
- Pinder, W. *Die Pietà* (Leipzig, 1922).
- Piper, A. 'The First Generation of Durham Monks and the Cult of St Cuthbert', in G. Bonner, D. Rollason, C. Stancliffe (eds.), *St Cuthbert, His Cult and Community to AD 1200* (Woodbridge, 1989), 437-46.
- Piroyansky, D. '“Martyrio pulchro finitus”: Archbishop Scrope's Martyrdom and the Creation of a Cult', in P.J.P. Goldberg (ed.), *Richard Scrope, Archbishop, Rebel, and Martyr* (Donington, 2007), 100-113.
- Pocock, D. 'Place Evocation: The Galilee Chapel in Durham Cathedral', *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers, New Series*, 21:2 (1996), 379-86.
- Prestwich, M. 'The English at the Battle of Neville's Cross', in D. Rollason and M. Prestwich (eds.), *The Battle of Neville's Cross 1346* (Stamford, 1998), 1-14.
- Prigent, C. *Les sculptures anglaises d'albâtre au musée national du Moyen Age, Thermes de Cluny* (Paris, 1998).

Purey-Cust, A.P. *Walks Around York Minster* (Leeds, 1907).

Radler, G. *Die Schreinmadonna "Vierge Ouvrante" von den bernhardinischen Anfäng bis zur Frauenmystik im Deutschorensland mit beschreibendem Katalog* (Frankfurt, 1990).

Ramsay, N. 'Alabaster', in J. Blair and N. Ramsay (eds.), *English Medieval Industries: Craftsmen, Techniques, and Products* (London and Rio Grande, Ohio, 1991), 29-40.

Rauguin, V.C., Brush, K., and Draper, P. (eds.). *Artistic Integration in Gothic Buildings* (Toronto, 1995).

Raw, B. *Anglo-Saxon Crucifixion Iconography and The Art of the Monastic Revival*. Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England 1 (Cambridge, 1990).

Recht, R. *Believing and Seeing: The Art of Gothic Cathedrals* (Chicago, 1998).

Rees Jones, S. 'Richard Scrope, the Bolton Hours and the Church of St Martin in Micklegate: Reconstructing a Holy Neighbourhood in Later Medieval York', in P.J.P. Goldberg (ed.), *Richard Scrope, Archbishop, Rebel, Martyr* (Donington, 2007), 214-36.

----- . *York. The Making of a City 1068-1300* (Oxford, 2013).

Reeve, M.M. *Thirteenth-Century Wall Painting of Salisbury Cathedral: Art, Liturgy and Reform* (Woodbridge, 2008).

Reynolds, R. E. 'The Drama of Medieval Liturgical Processions', *Revue de Musicologie*, 86:1 (2000), 127-142.

- Ridyard, S.J., 'Condiga veneratio: post-Conquest attitudes to the saints of the Anglo-Saxons', in R. Allen Brown (ed.), *Anglo-Norman Studies: Proceedings of the Battle Conference, 1986* (Woodbridge, 1987), pp 179–206.
- , *The Royal Saints of Anglo-Saxon England: a study of West Saxon and East Anglian Cults* (Cambridge, 1988).
- Ringbom, S. 'Devotional Images and Imaginative Devotions. Notes on the Place of Art in Late Medieval Private Piety', *Gazette des Beaux-Arts*, series 6, 73 (1969) 159-70.
- Ringbom, S. *Icon to Narrative: the rise of the dramatic close-up in fifteenth century devotional painting*. 2nd Edition. (Doornspijk, 1983).
- Roberts, E. *The Wall-Paintings of St Albans Abbey* (St Albans, 1993).
- Roberts, M. 'Neville's Cross, Durham: A Suggested Reconstruction', in D. Rollason and M. Prestwich (eds.), *The Battle of Neville's Cross 1346* (Stamford, 1998), 102-111.
- Rollason, D. 'St Oswald in Post-Conquest England', in C. Stancliffe and E. Cambridge (eds.) *Oswald. Northumbrian King to European Saint* (Stamford, 1995).
- Rollason, L. 'Spoils of War? Durham Cathedral and the Black Rood of Scotland', in D. Rollason and M. Prestwich (eds.), *The Battle of Neville's Cross 1346* (Stamford, 1998), 57-65.
- Rosewell, R. *Medieval Wall Paintings in English and Welsh Churches* (Woodbridge, 2008).
- Ross, A. *Pagan Celtic Britain* (London and New York, 1967).

Ross, E.M. *The Grief of God: Images of the Suffering Jesus in Late Medieval England* (Oxford, 1997).

Rubin, M. *Corpus Christi: The Eucharist in Late Medieval Culture* (Cambridge, 1991).

------. *Mother of God: a History of the Virgin Mary* (London, 2009).

Russo, T. E. 'The Romanesque Rood Screen of Durham Cathedral: Context and Form', in D. Rollason, M. Harvey, and M. Prestwich (eds.). *Anglo-Norman Durham 1093-1193* (Woodbridge, 1994), 251-268.

Salisbury, M.C. *The Use of York: Characteristics of the Medieval Liturgical Office in York. Borthwick Papers 113* (York, 2008).

Santing, C., Baert, B. and Traninger, A. (eds.). *Disembodied Heads in Medieval and Early Modern Culture* (Leiden and Boston, 2013).

Sauerländer, W. 'Integration: A Closed or Open Proposal?', in V. Raguin, K. Brush, and P. Draper, *Artistic Integration in Gothic Buildings* (Toronto, 1995a), 3-18.

------. 'Integrated Fragments and the Unintegrated Whole: Scattered Examples from Reims, Strasbourg, Chartres, and Naumburg', in V. Raguin, K. Brush, and P. Draper, *Artistic Integration in Gothic Buildings* (Toronto, 1995b), 153-66.

Schade, K. *Andachtsbild. Die Geschichte eines kunsthistorischen Begriffs* (Weimar, 1996).

Schiller, G. *Iconographie der Christlichen Kunst*. 5 vols. (Gütersloh, 1968-1991).

------. and Seligman, J. (trans.). *Iconography of Christian Art*. 2 vols. (London, 1971).

Schmidt, P. 'Bildgebrauch und Frömmigkeitspraxis. Bemerkungen zur Benutzung früher Druckgrafik', in F. Kammel (ed.), *Spiegel der Seligkeit: Privates Bild und Frömmigkeit im Spätmittelalter* (exh. cat. Germanisches Nationalmuseum, Nürnberg, 2000), 69-83.

Schmitt, J-C. *Le corps des images. Essais sur la culture visuelle au Moyen Age* (Paris, 2002).

-----, 'L'Exception corporelle: à propos de l'Assomption de Marie', in J.F. Hamburger and A-M Bouché (eds.), *The Mind's Eye: Art and Theological Argument in the Middle Ages* (Princeton, 2006), 151-85.

Sedlmayr, H. *Die Entstehung der Kathedrale* (Zurich, 1950).

Sheils, W.J. 'The Altars in York Minster in the Early Sixteenth Century', in R.N. Swanson (ed.), *Continuity and Change. Studies in Church History* 35 (1999): 104-15.

Sheppard Routh, P. 'A Gift and its Giver: John Walker and the East Window of Holy Trinity, Goodramgate, York', *Yorkshire Archaeological Journal* 58 (1986), 109-122.

Shortell, E. M. 'Dismembering Saint Quentin: Gothic Architecture and the Display of Relics', *Gesta* 36:1 (32-47).

Shinners Jr., J.R. 'The Veneration of Saints at Norwich Cathedral in the Fourteenth Century', *Norfolk Archaeology*, 40 (1987-9), 133-44.

Slater, L. 'Visual Reflections on History and Kingship in the Medieval English Great Church', *JBAA* 167 (2014), 83-108.

Snape, M.G. 'Documentary evidence for the building of Durham Cathedral', in N. Coldstream and P. Draper (eds.), *Medieval Art and Architecture at*

Durham Cathedral. BAA Conference Transactions 3 for the Year 1977 (Leeds, 1980), 30-36.

Sparks, M. 'The Liturgical Use of the Nave' in K. Blockley, M. Sparks, and T. Tatton-Brown, *Canterbury Cathedral Nave Archaeology, History and Architecture. The Archaeology of Canterbury New Series*, vol. 1 (Canterbury, 1997), 121-127.

Stancliffe, C. and Cambridge, E. (eds.). *Oswald: Norhumbrian King to European Saint* (Stamford, 1995).

Stanley, A.P. *Historical Memorials of Canterbury: the landing of St Augustine, the murder of Becket, Edward the Black Prince, Becket's shrine*. 10th ed. (London, 1904).

Stanton, R. *A Menology of England and Wales: Or, Brief Memorials of the Ancient British and English Saints* (London and New York, 1887).

Stevenson, J. *Performance, Cognitive Theory, and Devotional Culture: Sensual Piety in Late Medieval York* (New York, 2010).

Stones, E. L. G. 'Allusion to the Black Rood of Scotland in 1346', *Scottish Historical Review* 38 (1959), 174-175.

Surtees, R. *The History and Antiquities of the County Palatine of Durham*. 4 vols. (London, 1816-40).

Sutcliffe, S. 'The Cult of St Sitha in England: an introduction', *Nottingham Medieval Studies*, 37 (1993), 83-9.

Swanson, R.N. 'Appropriate Anomaly: Topcliffe Parish and the fabric fund of York Minster in the later middle ages' in D. Wood (ed.), *Life and Thought in the Northern Church c.1100-1700: Essays in Honour of Claire Cross* (Woodbridge, 1999), 105-123.

- Tatton-Brown, T. 'Canterbury and the architecture of pilgrimage shrines in England' in C. Morris and P. Roberts (eds.), *Pilgrimage. The English Experience from Becket to Bunyan* (Cambridge, 2002), 90-107.
- , Saul, N. and Lepine, D., '“*Incomparabilissime Fabrice*”: The Architectural History of Salisbury Cathedral c. 1297 to 1548', *JBAA* 166 (2013), 51-98.
- Taylor, A.J. 'Edward I and the Shrines of St Thomas of Canterbury', *JBAA* 132 (1979), 22-28.
- Tervarent, G. de. *Le Légende de Saint Ursule dans la Literature et l'art du Moyen Age*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1931).
- Thacker, A. 'Lindisfarne and the Origins of the Cult of St Cuthbert', in G. Bonner, D. Rollason, C. Stancliffe (eds.), *St Cuthbert, His Cult and Community to AD 1200* (Woodbridge, 1989), 103-124.
- , 'Membra Disjecta: the Division of the Body and the Diffusion of the Cult', in C. Stancliffe and E. Cambridge (eds.), *Oswald: Northumbrian King to European Saint* (Stamford, 1995), 97-127.
- Thomas, I.G. *The Cult of Saints' Relics in Medieval England* (PhD Dissertation, University of London, 1974).
- Thompson, Mephram, S.L. & Knight, S. *Nether Poppleton, City of York, Yorkshire: archaeological evaluation and assessment of results*, Wessex Archaeology (Salisbury, 2005).
- Thordeman, B. and Andersson, A. *Medieval Wooden Sculpture in Sweden*, 4 vols (Stockholm, 1964-1975).

- Threfall-Holmes, M. *Monks and Markets: Durham Cathedral Priory 1460-1520* (Oxford, 2005).
- Thurlby, M. 'The Roles of the Patron and the Master Mason in the Design of the Romanesque Cathedral at Durham', in D. Rollason, M. Harvey, and M. Prestwich (eds.). *Anglo-Norman Durham 1093-1193* (Woodbridge, 1994), 161-84.
- Tibbets Schuenburg, J. 'Gender, Celibacy, and Proscriptions of Sacred Space: Symbol and Practice', in V. Chieffo Raguin and S. Stanbury (eds.) *Women's Space: Patronage, Place, and Gender in the Medieval Church* (Albany, NY, 2005), 185-206.
- Tillot, P.M. (ed.). *A History of the County of York. The City of York* (London, 1961).
- Toulmin Smith, L (ed.). *The Itinerary of John Leland 1535-43*. 5 vols. (London, 1964).
- Townsend, E. "'For the Loving of Almighty God': The Pre-Reformation Furnishings of St Anthony's Church, Cartmel Fell', in R. Marks (ed.) *Late Gothic England: Art and Display* (Donington, 2007), 104-114.
- Trexler, R.C. 'Being and Non Being. Parameters of the Miraculous in the Traditional Religious Image', in Thurnø, E. and Wolf, G. *The Miraculous Image In the Late Middle Ages and Renaissance* (Rome, 2004), 15-28.
- Tristram, E.W. and Constable, W.G. *English Medieval Wall Paintings. The Twelfth Century*. (Oxford, 1944-50).
- Tuck, A. 'Neville, John, fifth Baron Neville (c.1330–1388)', *ODNB*, vol. 40 (Oxford, 2004), 505-508.

- Tudor, V. 'The Cult of St Cuthbert in the Twelfth Century: The Evidence of Reginald of Durham', in G. Bonner, D. Rollason, C. Stancliffe (eds.), *St Cuthbert, His Cult and Community to AD 1200* (Woodbridge, 1989), 447-68.
- Tudor-Craig, P. 'The 'Large Letters' of the Litlington Missal and Westminster Abbey in 1383-84', in M.P. Brown and S. McKendrick (eds.), *Illuminating the Book. Makers and Interpreters. Essays in Honour of Janet Backhouse* (London and Toronto, 1998): 102-120.
- Turner, P. *With Favoure in hir Face: Marian Devotional Images in the Cathedrals of Wells and Durham, 1300-1540* (MA Dissertation, University of York, 2006).
- Turner, V. 'Betwixt and Between: The Liminal Period in *Rites de Passage*', in V. Turner, *The Forest of Symbols. Aspects of Ndembu Ritual* (Ithaca, 1967), 93-111.
- '. 'Liminality and Communitas', in V. Turner, *The Ritual Process. Structure and Anti-Structure* (London, 1969), 94-130.
- '. 'Passages, Margins, and Poverty: Religious Symbols of Communitas', in V. Turner, *Dramas, Fields, and Metaphors. Symbolic Action in Human Society* (Ithaca and London, 1974), 231-271.
- '. and Turner, E. *Image and Pilgrimage in Christian Culture. Anthropological Perspectives* (Oxford, 1978).
- Turville-Petre, T. 'A Middle English Life of St Zita', *Nottingham Medieval Studies*, 35 (1991), 102-05.
- Vallance, A. *Greater English Church Screens* (London, 1947).

- van der Ploeg, K. *Art, Architecture and Liturgy: Siena Cathedral in the Middle Ages* (Groningen, 1993).
- van Gennep, A. *The Rites of Passage* (London, 1960; reprinted 2004).
- van Os, H. *The Way to Heaven. Relic Veneration in the Middle Ages*, exh. cat. (Nieuwe Kerk, Amsterdam, and Catharijneconvent, Utrecht, 2000).
- Vauchez, A. and Birell, J. (trans.). *Sainthood in the Later Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 1987).
- '. 'Les images saintes: représentations iconographiques et manifestations du sacré', in *Saints, prophètes et visionnaires. Le pouvoir surnaturel au Moyen Age* (Paris, 1999), 79-91.
- Venables, E. 'The Head Shrine of St Hugh of Lincoln', *The Archaeological Journal* 50 (1893), 37-61.
- Verdi Webster, S. 'Shameless Beauty and Worldly Splendor. On the Spanish Practice of Adorning the Virgin', in Thurnø, E. and Wolf, G. *The Miraculous Image In the Late Middle Ages and Renaissance* (Rome, 2004), 249-72.
- von der Osten, G. 'Job and Christ: The Development of a Devotional Image', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 16:1/2 (1953), 153-58.
- von Simson, O. *The Gothic Cathedral. The Origins of Gothic Architecture and The Medieval Concept of Order* (London, 1956).
- Walker, S. 'Political Saints in Later Medieval England', in R.M. Britnell and A.J. Pollard (eds.), *The McFarlane Legacy: Studies in Late Medieval Politics and Society* (Stroud, 1995), 77-106.

- Wall, V. 'Malcolm III and the Foundation of Durham Cathedral', in D. Rollason, M. Harvey, and M. Prestwich (eds.). *Anglo-Norman Durham 1093-1193* (Woodbridge, 1994), 325-37.
- Ward, B. *Miracles and the Medieval Mind: Theory, Record and Event, 1000-1215* (London, 1982).
- Ward, S. L. 'Who sees Christ? An alabaster panel of the Mass of St Gregory', in S. Blick and L. Gelfand (eds.). *Push Me, Pull You: Imaginative and Emotional Interaction in Late Medieval and Renaissance Art*, vol.1 (Leiden, 2011), 347-381.
- Warf, B. and Arias, S. 'Introduction', in B. Warf and S. Arias, *The Spatial Turn: Interdisciplinary Perspectives* (London and New York, 2008), 1-10.
- Warner, M. *Alone of All Her Sex. The Myth and Cult of the Virgin Mary* (London, 1976, reprinted Oxford, 2013).
- Waterton, E. *Pietas Mariana Britannica. A History of English Devotion to the Most Blessed Virgin Marye Mother of God* (London, 1879).
- Watson, G. 'The Black Rood of Scotland', in *Transactions of the Scottish Ecclesiological Society*, 2 (1906-07), 27-46.
- Weigart, L. 'Velum Templi: Painted Cloths of the Passion and the Making of Lenten Ritual in Reims', *Studies in Iconography* 24 (2003), 199-229.
- Wells, E. J. 'Making 'Sense' of the Pilgrimage Experience of the Medieval Church', *Peregrinations*, III:2 (2011), 122-46.
- Westlake, H.F. *Westminster Abbey: the Church, Convent, Cathedral and College of St Peter, Westminster*. 2 vols. (London, 1923).

White, E. *The St Christopher and St George Guild of York. Borthwick Papers*, 72 (York, 1987).

Williams, M. A. *Medieval Roodcreens, with special reference to Devon* (PhD Dissertation, University of Exeter, 2008).

Williamson, B. 'Altarpieces, Liturgy, and Devotion', *Speculum* 79: 2 (2004), 341-406.

-----.'“The ordered exercise of intellection”: The Manipulation of Devotional Technologies', in Z. Opačić and A. Timmermann (eds.), *Image, Memory and Devotion. Liber Amicorum Paul Crossley* (Turnhout, 2011), 121-128.

Williamson, P. *Northern Gothic Sculpture 1200-1450* (London, 1988).

-----'. *Gothic Sculpture 1140-1300* (New Haven and London, 1995).

Wilson, C. *The Shrines of St William of York* (York, 1977).

-----'. 'The Neville Screen', in N. Coldstream and P. Draper (eds.), *Medieval Art and Architecture at Durham Cathedral*. BAA Conference Transactions 3 for the Year 1977 (Leeds, 1980), 90-104.

Willis, B. *A Survey of the Cathedrals of York, Durham, Carlisle, Chester, Manchester, Litchfield, Hereford, Worcester, Gloucester and Bristol*. 2 vols. (London, 1727).

Willis, R. *The Architectural History of Canterbury Cathedral* (London, 1845).

-----'. *The Architectural History of York Cathedral* (London, 1848).

Wixom, W.D. *Medieval Sculpture at the Metropolitan 800-1400* (New York, 2005).

- . *Late Medieval Sculpture in the Metropolitan 1400-1530* (New York, 2007).
- Wolf, G. 'From Mandylion to Veronica: Picturing the <<Disembodied>> Face and Disseminating the True Image of Christ in the Latin West', in H. Kessler and G. Wolf (eds.), *The Holy Face and the Paradox of Representation* (Bologna, 1998), 153-179.
- Wood, I. 'Constantinian Crosses in Northumbria', in C.E. Karkov, S.L. Keefer, and K.L. Jolly (eds.), *The Place of the Cross in Anglo-Saxon England* (Woodbridge, 2006), 3-13.
- Wood-Legh, K.L. *Perpetual Chancies in Britain* (Cambridge, 1965).
- Woodruff, C.E. 'The Chapel of Our Lady in the Crypt of Canterbury Cathedral', *Archaeologia Cantiana* 38 (1926), 153-172.
- Woolgar, C.M. *The Senses in Late Medieval England* (New Haven and London, 2006).
- Wormald, F. 'The Rood of Bromholm', *Journal of the Warburg Institute*, 1 (1937-38), 31-45.
- Young, C.R. *The Making of the Neville Family in England* (Woodbridge, 1996).
- Young, K. *The Drama of the Medieval Church*. 2nd ed. 2 vols. (Oxford, 1967).
- Zarnecki, G. 'The Coronation of the Virgin on a Capital from Reading Abbey', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 13 (1950), 1-12.
- . 'The Chichester Reliefs', *Archaeological Journal* 110 (1954), 106-120.

Zarnecki, G. *et al.* *English Romanesque Art 1066-1200*, exh. cat. (Hayward Gallery, London, 1984).