Piety and power: the tomb and legacy of John Marshall, bishop of Llandaff 1478–96

By Madeleine Gray

In her study of the episcopal tombs in Llandaff Cathedral, Rhianydd Biebrach devoted only a short paragraph to the tomb of John Marshall (d. 1496), describing it as ‘a far inferior product to the thirteenth-century examples … a very stiff composition, with no naturalism in the folds of the vestments or fluidity in the figure’. There is no arguing with this judgement: the effigy is a frankly undistinguished piece of carving, on a tomb chest which seems to have been constructed out of architectural salvage. However, John Marshall was one of the few later medieval bishops of Llandaff with any clear sense of identification with his diocese. He is also one for whom a will survives, and he has been credited with much of the surviving medieval work in the parish church at Mathern (Mons.), where the Bishop’s Palace would have been his main residence (the palaces in Bishton and in Llandaff itself had long been in ruins). Putting these sources together, one might hope to be able to glean a little more about the pieties and material circumstances of this otherwise obscure cleric. The study has proved more complicated than at first anticipated and Marshall’s connection with the church at Mathern is by no means as simple as might at first appear. The traditional view (as found in the work of E. T. Davies and J. Newman) that the stained glass at Mathern was Marshall’s work has to be re-evaluated, and in the wake of this we can suggest some new ideas about Marshall’s relationship with the local community.

To begin with the tomb. Llandaff has some splendid examples of late medieval alabaster tombs, but Marshall’s effigy is made of Dundry stone. The choice of stone has possibly constrained the carving of the effigy. We can only guess at the reason, but it is at least conceivable that it was a deliberate attempt to link him with the earlier episcopal effigies (at least three of which were of Dundry stone) and with the traditional histories of the diocese and cathedral. Crudely carved though it is, the effigy is lively and full of interest. The bishop is shown in full pontificals, his crozier tucked into his right arm. His eyes are clearly wide open. His hands are raised, not in prayer or blessing but held slightly apart in adoration. This is an unusual pose for an effigy of this date and must surely have been deliberately chosen. The animal under the feet is difficult to identify. Biebrach says it is ‘best described as a lion’ but it has about it something of the boar and something of the reptile.

The effigy lies on a plinth which is far too wide for it. This may once have accommodated an inscription but the plinth is flat and it is difficult to see where in its present construction an inscription would have fitted. The tomb is, however, identified as Marshall’s by the coat of arms (now lost) which Browne Willis’s informant William Wotton recorded in 1719. It is also in the exact location that Marshall requested in his will, ‘in the north part of the steps of the high altar in the choir of the said cathedral church’.

Like the effigy, the tomb chest has a rather old-fashioned appearance. There are no saints, angels or weepers. Instead, the side panels are made up of blind tracery, which on examination seems to have come from a variety of sources. It is of course possible that the blank panels were once painted, but no paint traces remain. The whole assemblage is at present wedged between a pillar and the entrance to the north choir aisle. Stuck on the east end of the plinth is a strange little panel with a very crudely carved Image of Pity surrounded by the Instruments of the Passion. Devotion to the Image of Pity and the Instruments of the Passion is one of the most characteristic aspects of late medieval piety. It exemplifies an approach to the story of the Crucifixion and the theology of the Redemptive Sacrifice which is reflective.
and meditative rather than narrative. The story is represented by the artefacts involved—the palms of the Entry to Jerusalem, the pillar of the Flagellation, the cross, nails and so on: it could almost be described as an archaeology of the Crucifixion. Prayers and meditations were attached to each of the artefacts so that they could be applied to individual sins or aspects of the worshipper’s life. For all the crudity of the carving, the panel on John Marshall’s tomb has a fairly full set of the Instruments. As well as the central elements, the cross, crown of thorns, hammer, nails, spear and pincers, it has the palm leaves, the whips
and pillar of the Flagellation (the pillar depicted in the usual later medieval style with the cockerel of Peter’s betrayal sitting on it), the hand raised to strike from the Mocking episode, the dice which were cast for Christ’s seamless robe, the sponge and the ladder of the Deposition. It does not, however, include the sword, the money-bag, the seamless robe and the pestle and mortar, all of which are depicted on a plaque at the back of the ‘Bromfield’ tomb, just across the north choir aisle from Marshall’s.

The Instruments of the Passion were often depicted on shields interspersed with the emblems of the Five Wounds of Christ, a sequence known as the Arma Christi. In the case of the plaque from Marshall’s tomb, however, the Image of Pity is depicted below and surrounded by the Instruments. Also sometimes known as the Man of Sorrows, the Image of Pity is another example of the reflective and meditative approach to the central story of the Crucifixion, focused not on the narrative but on the detached image of Christ seated on or rising from a chest tomb and displaying his wounds. It also appears on the ‘Bromfield’ tomb at Llandaff, as a separate carving on the soffit of the tomb alcove.

This devotional image derived ultimately from the legend of the Mass of St Gregory. According to this story, while Gregory the Great was celebrating Mass in the church of Santa Croce in Gerusalemme in Rome, he had a vision of Christ on his tomb, showing his wounds and surrounded by the Instruments of the Passion. The story is thought to derive from an early medieval Byzantine icon in the church of Santa Croce. By the later medieval period, this had become a popular object of pilgrimage, part of the tour of Rome that also included veneration of several of the Instruments of the Passion. Copies of the icon spread across Europe in the fourteenth century, from Italy to France and then to England and Wales. An increasingly generous series of indulgences was offered by successive Popes to those repeating set sequences of prayers—typically, five Paternosters, five Aves and a Creed—before a copy of the image. Depiction of the Image of Pity was thus highly appropriate for a tomb.

Part of the problem with Marshall’s tomb is that it has clearly suffered at least one episode of damage and reconstruction. It is not mentioned in Richard Symonds’ invaluable account of his tour of duty in south Wales in the summer of 1645. It seems unlikely that Symonds could have missed it, as he describes the ‘Bromfield’ monument in the north choir aisle and three episcopal effigies in the choir itself. Marshall’s tomb is however marked in its present location and identified as ‘Bishop Marshall’s monument’ by Browne Willis’s informant William Wotton. When Wotton saw it the tomb had probably already suffered some reordering: the plaque with the Image of Pity was by then affixed to the east end, presumably in its present rather anomalous position near the base of the plinth. However, Wotton described the coat of arms as being ‘in the wall’. By this he may simply have meant the side panel of the chest. However, it is also possible that when he visited the cathedral there was a wall between the pillars north of the choir similar to the wall which still stands south of the choir. Wotton also described a ‘door’ west of the tomb and leading into the north choir aisle, opposite the door which still leads from the south of the choir to the chapter house. This door has now been replaced by a comparatively modern wrought iron gate. The west face of the tomb chest has a pilaster, scored at the top and with patches of mortar. This could have continued up to form an arch within which a door could have been set.

Key to our understanding of the tomb is the attitude of the effigy, with eyes wide open and hands raised in adoration. What is he looking at? After the British Archaeological Association visited the cathedral in 2004, Philip Lankester and the present author had a lengthy and illuminating email correspondence about this tomb. Philip Lankester’s initial suggestion was that the effigy might originally have been destined for the alcove tomb in the north wall of the north choir aisle which now houses the effigy traditionally identified as Bishop Edmund Bromfield (d. 1393). The effigy is in fact about a hundred years earlier in style. The niche, though, is later, probably fifteenth century, and incorporates a carving of the Image of Pity in the eastern soffit of the arch as well as a plaque of the Instruments of the Passion on the back wall. We wondered whether the Marshall effigy might have been designed to look at the Image of Pity.
Measurement suggests it would indeed have fitted within the alcove—possibly rather better than the ‘Bromfield’ effigy. But the alcove is some way away from the altar steps, and Marshall is carved looking at something immediately above his head.

While the tomb chest in its present form is clearly a patchwork and has presumably been reconstructed at least once, it is possible that the plinth on which the effigy rests is part of the original. At the four corners are pillar bases, those at the east end being scored and with traces of mortar. These could have supported a tester over the tomb. This might also explain the unusual width of the plinth. While we cannot prove conclusively that the plaque of the Image of Pity was part of the original fabric of the tomb, it is at least possible that was originally incorporated in such a tester, vertically above the effigy and hence within its direct field of gaze. There are analogies in tombs elsewhere. The effigy of Bishop Walter de Stapledon (d. 1326) in Exeter Cathedral looks up at the Image of Pity painted on the tester of his tomb.13 Nearer to the date of the Marshall tomb, at Long Melford in Suffolk the effigy of the rebuilder of the church, John Clopton (d. 1497), looks up at a standing figure of the resurrected Christ, blood streaming from his hands, feet and side.14 The Llandaff plaque is less graphic in its present form but it is of course quite likely that it was originally painted.15 (This might also explain the crudity of the carving: it was not meant to be seen so clearly, and not in its present form.)

We are perhaps especially prone in Wales to read depictions of Christ’s wounds and the Instruments of the Passion through the refracting lens of our Nonconformist heritage of hell fire and damnation preaching.
and to assume that they are intended to inspire guilt and fear. As the Book of Revelation warns, ‘Behold, he is coming with the clouds, and every eye will see him, all who pierced him; and all tribes of the earth will wail on account of him’. But John Marshall’s ecstatic expression and the text on the Clopton tomb make it clear that the Image of Pity is an image of hope. The resurrected Christ at Long Melford holds a banner reading ‘Omnis qui vivit et credit in me non morietur in aeternum’ (‘All who live and believe in me shall not die eternally’).16 The Instruments depicted on both the Marshall and the ‘Bromfield’ tombs resonated with the Old Testament readings for the Holy Week liturgy: ‘I gave my back to the smiters, and my cheeks to them that plucked off the hair: I hid not my face from shame and spitting’. Marshall’s choice of location for his tomb might even have been intended to place it near the Easter sepulchre, linking his burial with a profound meditation on the twin mysteries of redemption and resurrection.

John Marshall’s will is a remarkably human document, with its meticulous bequests of personal items as well as its spiritual endowments. It merits detailed consideration for the light it throws on the personal and material circumstances as well as the devotional perspectives of a minor member of the episcopal hierarchy. The will makes clear his affections for and identification with his diocese and cathedral, but this was only one aspect of his career which he wished to recall. He also retained his affection for his birthplace, the village of Bottesford (Leics.), and evidently still had connections there. His foundation of a chantry there is commemorated by a shield above the south-east pillar of the nave with his arms impaling the old arms of the diocese of Llandaff.17 He also left the chantry his little missal, his best chalice, a chest and vestments. There is a sense in which these bequests of personal items for the further performance of the sacred mystery of the Mass are intended to perpetuate Marshall’s own links with the sacrament. A further endowment paid the priest Thomas Vincent (Marshall’s cousin) to celebrate for two years at Bottesford. Marshall left Vincent his best portiforium and surplice, and the use of his best chalice and missal while he was celebrating at Bottesford: at the end of the two years they were to go to his chantry there. For the priest of Bottesford there was a silver bowl without a cover. His years in Oxford also seem to have been remembered with affection: he left a small sum to the fabric of the church of St Peter in the Bailey ‘because I was principal of the hall there called Colshill hall’.

Nor had Marshall lost touch with his family: his brother Henry, his sister-in-law, and his cousin Thomas Auger, received money, clothes and household goods. To Thomas he left his collection of reliquaries. They are described with surprising brevity, in contrast with the very detailed enumeration of household furnishings: he simply lists them as ‘omnia scrinea mea’. The brevity of the reference to his collection of reliquaries is surprising but not unusual: medieval wills and inventories are often cautious about personal reliquaries. They were probably containers of tiny fragments, with labels which were apt to go astray. Not all reliquaries were major works of devotional art: some of those assembled for the British Museum’s ‘Treasures of Heaven’ exhibition resembled exhibition cases with miniature pigeonholes for fragments of bone and hair.18 We may be able to read in the brevity of the description the stirrings of unease about the cult of relics, or about the authenticity of so many of them: but if he was really sceptical, why preserve them or mention them at all? And how and why did he acquire them? Possibly they were themselves bequests which he was sentimentally unwilling or unable to discard: and the ambiguity of his references to them is in itself revealing.

It was his cathedral and diocese, though, that were first in his thoughts. His will opens with the customary bequest of his soul to God, but he links this with the dedicatory saints of the cathedral, Peter and Paul, Teilo, Dyfrig and Euddogwy. It is ironical that one of the few Welsh probate documents to mention Welsh saints should be the will of an incomer.19 After the specifications for his tomb, he leaves his psalter to be chained at the head of the tomb and his portiforium to be chained in the south part of the choir.20 Here they could have been used in the liturgy, but they would also provide a permanent focus for devotion and commemoration.
Marshall’s bequest to the tower at Llandaff is well known. He also left his pontifical ring, his best amber rosary and a gilt belt to the shrine of St Teilo (another claim to associate himself with his distinguished predecessor) and money for the purchase of two silver gilt candelabra for the cathedral. The reference to the shrine of St Teilo suggests a statue, and a shrine devoted to one specific saint, though the bequest by Reynbourn Mathew 25 years earlier of money for ‘images of silver gilt to be made around the shrine [feretrum] of SS Theliaus, Dubricius and Odocius’ suggests a single structure. Further on in Marshall’s will, he left his chaplain William Lewis a small portiforium, a surplice and a silver belt, an amice, a pair of beads, a coverlet, two old blankets and mattresses, and ten marks a year for two years to pay him to celebrate Mass for Marshall’s soul at Llandaff. While we are well aware of the financial difficulties of many of the later medieval clergy, it is salutary to be reminded that an episcopal chaplain might be expected to be grateful for a bequest of old blankets as well as the silver belt and the vestments.

Marshall also left small bequests to a number of religious institutions, in his diocese and elsewhere. The 20 shillings each to the Cistercian houses at Llantarnam, Tintern, Margam and Neath were presumably formulaic, as were the smaller sums to the friaries. These gifts may have been to secure indulgences: in the absence of episcopal registers we have no way of knowing how many small indulgences had been secured by Welsh religious communities. Other bequests may be more connected to actual need. The nuns at Usk and the priory at Abergavenny both received 20s towards the fabric of their churches. This was a period of reconstruction for many religious houses after the crisis years of the fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries, and it certainly links with the installation of new choir stalls at Abergavenny. Then there were bequests to parish churches: 13s 4d for the bell tower at Caerwent, 10s for the bell tower at Llanmartin. As bishop he was titular rector of several parishes in his diocese, but Llanmartin was an independent rectory and Caerwent was part of the endowment of the archdeacon and chapter of Llandaff. It seems likely that these bequests, too, responded to specific fund-raising campaigns. Both churches have towers in the perpendicular style. Bequests for bells and bell towers were a particularly cost-effective way of securing intercessory prayer. Bells were rung at the time of death and to announce the funeral and month’s mind, and on the eve or the day of All Souls, many churches rang their bells ‘for all crystyn souls’. Giving money for bells or bell tower would ensure that the donor was specifically remembered at these times.

Marshall’s main home during his time as bishop of Llandaff was the palace at Mathern. Here, too, the rectory belonged to the archdeacon and chapter of Llandaff, but Marshall was generous to the church in his will. He is generally credited with the virtual rebuilding of the church in the later fifteenth century. Newman says he ‘grandiosely enlarged’ it, widening the nave aisles and adding the south porch. The architecture of the north aisle is particularly distinctive, with coupled buttresses between the windows. Marshall is also credited with building the west tower, described as ‘noble’ by Newman. This was presumably a different building campaign, as the tower is built of squared ashlar blocks while the rest of the work is in the local rubble limestone. His identification with the rebuilding rests on local tradition but he certainly left £20 in his will to the fabric of the bell tower, a gift commemorated by the carvings of his arms on the tower. He also left the church his little chalice. Other bequests have the endearing suggestion of a man with a wide circle of family and friends and a willingness to remember places which had been important in his career.

In view of Marshall’s connection with Mathern, it is suggestive that the fragments of medieval stained glass assembled in the south-west window of the church there include depictions of some of the Instruments of the Passion: the column and whips of the Flagellation, and Judas’s money-bag with the thirty pieces of silver. There is also a depiction of a heart pierced with four staves, and a rather nondescript bird which could just possibly be the cockerel of Peter’s betrayal. There are, however, some differences in detail between the Mathern glass and the Llandaff carving: the Mathern design has the money-bag which is missing from the Llandaff plaque, but the cockerel is missing from the column. Other fragments
at Mathern include two of the persons of the Trinity, God the Father and the dove of the Holy Spirit, sitting in radiant cloudbursts, the IHS monogram and a letter M (possibly for Maria) and several heraldic emblems. The glass can be dated quite specifically to Marshall’s time as bishop or shortly afterwards by the portcullis emblem of Henry VII’s mother Lady Margaret Beaufort (d. 1509) and numerous Prince of Wales feathers. These could refer to Prince Arthur (prince of Wales 1489–1502) or to the future Henry VIII (prince of Wales 1504–09). Most of these fragments seem to have been part of the same design: they are linked together by a twisted-rope border.

A series of historians writing about the church and its glass has claimed that it contains Marshall’s heraldry, or heraldry associated with him. Unfortunately, this is something of an exaggeration. Marshall’s arms, depicted on a panel from his episcopal throne in Llandaff and blazoned by Browne Willis’s informant William Wotton from the wall above his tomb, are Party per chevron in fess or and vert, a M sable below and a falcon or above. John Newman has suggested that the bird in the Marshall arms on
The tower at Mathern is in fact an eagle. The eagle was the emblem of St John the Evangelist, and this would make the arms a rebus with the eagle for John and the M for Marshall. (The design of the arms is in fact poor heraldry: strictly speaking, letters should not be used on the shield part of the arms. However, there was something of a tradition among late medieval clergy of using the letter M on their shields. This has usually been understood to refer to the Virgin Mary, but in the case of Simon of Meopham, archbishop of Canterbury 1328–33, the M could refer to his surname.)

But Marshall’s arms do not appear in the stained glass at Mathern. The two shields in the window are sable with a chevron or and three hawks’ lures argent, which was one of the achievements of the Arnold family, and argent a chevron sable between three thistles, which could be Bowden or Fulham. The Arnold family did have local connections: a John Arnold, who may have been an ancestor of the Llanfihangel Crucornau family, held the manor of Moyne’s Court in 1510. There are no records of the Bowden family locally, and none for Fulham at the right date. Furthermore, none of these families has any direct connection with Marshall.

The Marshall identification dates back to 1924, when Gerald Vaughan-Thomas of Wyelands (a substantial house to the north of Mathern village) showed the Monmouthshire and Caerleon Antiquarian Association round the church. He identified the nondescript bird in one of the lower panels of medieval stained glass as the falcon from Marshall’s arms, and the letter M as the letter from the lower part of the shield. Vaughan-Thomas knew the church well. His father, the Revd Robert Vaughan-Hughes, was...
a wealthy cleric who bought Wyelands and settled there. He was never incumbent of the parish but he funded much of the restoration work on the church in the late nineteenth century. Elements from a coat of arms could be used to identify a patron in stained glass: as well as the full shield for the Arnold family, they are also represented in the Mathern glass by a single hawk’s lure. However, the identification of these elements as part of Marshall’s arms is tenuous: the bird does not look like a falcon, and the letter M is more likely be for Maria, not Marshall (as a companion to the IHS trigram). In an earlier report in the Transactions of the Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society, a Mr F. Were suggested that the bird might have been intended to represent the heathcock of the Mathew family crest, but there was no local branch of that family at the date in question. The most we can say about the glass, therefore, is that it is from the period of Marshall’s episcopacy or shortly afterwards, that the installation of the glass may relate to Marshall’s rebuilding of much of the church, and that the imagery of the Instruments of the Passion may link it with Marshall’s tomb.

To return, then, to the tomb. John Marshall was very specific about where he wanted it placed, but he said nothing in his will about its design. Nor did he leave any money for its construction. This could mean that he had already commissioned a tomb, though in that case one might have expected him to say so. It is possible, therefore, that both the tomb and the stained glass were designed by his neighbours and colleagues as a memorial to him. This would place a slightly different inflection on the use of Dundry stone for the tomb, suggesting that Marshall’s colleagues in the diocese may have wished to link him with the earlier bishops to acknowledge his role in the restoration of the cathedral. The stained glass, too, may have been not commissioned by him but designed as a memorial by the local gentry of the Mathern area. The tomb and the stained glass may still be linked by the iconography of the Instruments of the Passion: the tomb may have reflected the glass, but it is equally possible that the glass was inspired by a plaque on the tomb.

NOTES

1. A preliminary version of this article, without references, appeared in the ‘Monument of the Month’ section of the Church Monument Society’s website for May 2012: http://www.churchmonumentssociety.org/Monument%20of%20the%20Month-2012-05.html (accessed 12 May 2013). I am grateful to members of the Society for subsequent discussion during the summer symposium in Cardiff that year. I am also grateful to Chris Woolgar of Southampton University for help with John Marshall’s will; to Neil Fortey of Botlesford for information about Marshall’s connections there; and to Tony Utting of Mathern for help with the carvings and stained glass in the church there.


7. See, for example, the carvings on the Easter sepulchres at Coity (Glam.) and Bedwelly (Mons.) and on the late medieval panelling now at Cefn-tila (Mons.) but originally either at Usk Priory or Raglan Castle.

8. For an overview see Schiller op. cit. (note 5), 197–211.


11. A survey of the cathedral church of Landaff, 20–1 and fold-out plan.

12. For a detailed analysis see Biebrach op. cit. (note 2).


16. Illustrated in Rosewell op. cit. (note 13), 175 (though on p. 174 Rosewell mistranscribes the text).


18. Chris Woolgar, by email. For examples of some of these tiny reliquaries see the British Museum exhibition catalogue, M. Bagnoli, H. A. Klein, C. G. Mann and J. Robinson (eds), Treasures of Heaven (London: British Museum, 2011).

19. A similarly paradoxical pattern can be found in both the later medieval tomb carvings and elegaic poetry: the few saints depicted and asked for intercession in marwnadau are almost all from the international tradition (on the poetry, David Hale, pers. comm.)

20. I am grateful to Chris Woolgar for help in elucidating this part of the will. The wording is complex: he describes the books by quoting the text at the beginning of the second folios, as the first folio was so often damaged. Similar examples can be found in the inventory of John Trefnant, bishop of Hereford, c. 1404: C. M. Woolgar (ed.), Testamentary Records of the English and Welsh Episcopate, 1200–1413 (Woodbridge: Boydell Press for the Canterbury and York Society, 2011), 256–62.

21. TNA, PROB 11/6/7.


25. I am grateful to Tony Utting of Mathern for drawing these to my attention and photographing them for me.


28. Dr A. Tanner, by email.


