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This thesis analyses and defines the forms and ornament of the Welsh sculptured crosses and cross-slabs of the pre-Norman period and attempts to use the data thus assembled as historical evidence for the period in which they were made.

The sculptural evidence confirms the historical evidence that there was very little artistic exchange between Wales and England and virtually no direct contact between Wales and the continent c. 750-1100, but testifies to the existence of contacts between Wales and Ireland, Scotland (particularly Strathclyde) and the Isle of Man. Sixteen Welsh monuments are found to exhibit evidence of Scandinavian influence and these help to corroborate the literary and place-name evidence for Scandinavian settlement on the coasts of Dyfed, South Glamorgan and Gwynedd in the pre-Norman period; the latter apparently associated with the trade route between the Scandinavian settlements of Dublin, the Isle of Man and Chester.

The material reflects the existence of a settled society and economy in Wales in the early Medieval period in which craftsmen, some of whom were itinerant, others apparently associated with religious establishments, were patronised by kings and affluent laymen and churchmen whose wealth was in land. The distribution of the monuments demonstrates areas of contemporary settlement and the lines of communication between them and certain groups of monuments imply the existence of otherwise undocumented religious establishments. Although generally associated with religious sites, groups of monuments were not confined to the monastic aggregations but they were confined to the bounds of the known historic kingdoms.

The Welsh sculptured crosses and cross-slabs were intimately associated with both the royal/aristocratic and ecclesiastical elements in society. Their production ceased when patronage was not continued by the new Norman landowners and churchmen.
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<td>Llanfihangel Esgeiflog 11a 389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82.</td>
<td>Whitford 189 389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83.</td>
<td>Ewenny 978 390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84.</td>
<td>Merthyr Mawr 245/246 390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85.</td>
<td>Merthyr Mawr 247 391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86.</td>
<td>Ewenny 979 392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87.</td>
<td>Laleston 202 392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88.</td>
<td>Llanafan Fawr 45 393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89.</td>
<td>Llantwit Major 974 393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90.</td>
<td>Llangan 982 394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91.</td>
<td>Llanddew 46a 395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92.</td>
<td>Llangamarch 57 395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93.</td>
<td>Llanglydwen 161 396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94.</td>
<td>Capel Colman 302 396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95.</td>
<td>Cerrig Ceinwen 2 397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96.</td>
<td>Clydai 308 397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97.</td>
<td>Ewenny 981 398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98.</td>
<td>Laleston 203 398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99.</td>
<td>Llanfaclan 90/91 399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.</td>
<td>Margam 230 399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.</td>
<td>Merthyr Mawr 968 400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102.</td>
<td>Merthyr Mawr 969 400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103.</td>
<td>St. Dogmaels 388 401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104.</td>
<td>St. Dogmaels 130 401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105.</td>
<td>Ewenny 980 402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106.</td>
<td>Merthyr Mawr 967 402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107.</td>
<td>Llanarth 110 403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108.</td>
<td>St. Ishmaels 396 403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109.</td>
<td>Llawhaden 343 404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110.</td>
<td>Steynton 404 404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111.</td>
<td>St. Davids 380 405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112.</td>
<td>St. Baires 392 405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113.</td>
<td>Llanveynoe 410 406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114.</td>
<td>St. Edrens 393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115.</td>
<td>St. Edrens 394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116.</td>
<td>Walton West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117.</td>
<td>St. Davids 381 and 383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118.</td>
<td>Baglan 191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119.</td>
<td>Margam 232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120.</td>
<td>Port Talbot 261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121.</td>
<td>Llangyfelach 211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122.</td>
<td>Llanwnws 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123.</td>
<td>Llandyfaelog Fach 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124.</td>
<td>Llanhamlach 61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125.</td>
<td>Llanfrynach 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126.</td>
<td>Reynoldston 266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127.</td>
<td>Builmore 290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128.</td>
<td>Caerleon 291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129.</td>
<td>St. Arvans 292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130.</td>
<td>St. Davids 377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131.</td>
<td>Llanrafhaeadr Ym Mochnant 181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132.</td>
<td>St. Ishmaels 397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133.</td>
<td>Llowes 408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134.</td>
<td>Llandrinio 293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135.</td>
<td>Nevern 359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136.</td>
<td>Meifod 295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137.</td>
<td>Newcastle-Bridgend 254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138.</td>
<td>St. Davids 374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139.</td>
<td>St. Davids 375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140.</td>
<td>St. Davids 376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141.</td>
<td>St. Davids 382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142.</td>
<td>Cerrig Ceinwen 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143.</td>
<td>Llanbadrig 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144.</td>
<td>Llanfihangel Tre'r Beirdd 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145.</td>
<td>Llangeinwen 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146.</td>
<td>Nash 250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147.</td>
<td>Llandeilo 155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148.</td>
<td>Llandeilo 155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149.</td>
<td>Llanwada 334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150.</td>
<td>Llanveynoe 411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151.</td>
<td>Llandovery 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152.</td>
<td>Llangors 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153.</td>
<td>Tregaron 133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154.</td>
<td>Llantwit Major 224 and 226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155.</td>
<td>Llanrhaidr Ym Mochnant 180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156.</td>
<td>Llanrhidian 218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157.</td>
<td>Pontardawe 256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158.</td>
<td>Seven Sisters 269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159.</td>
<td>Llandewi Aberarth 114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160.</td>
<td>Cribyn 107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161.</td>
<td>Silian 129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162.</td>
<td>Llangenydd 209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163.</td>
<td>Clynnog 85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164.</td>
<td>Cerrig Ceinwen 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165.</td>
<td>Heneglwys, font</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166.</td>
<td>Heneglwys, stoup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167.</td>
<td>Kinnerley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168.</td>
<td>Patrishow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169.</td>
<td>Llanbeulan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170.</td>
<td>Llangristiolus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171.</td>
<td>Llaniestyn Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172.</td>
<td>Newborough 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173.</td>
<td>Trefdraeth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174.</td>
<td>Merthyr Mawr 243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175.</td>
<td>Merthyr Mawr 244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176.</td>
<td>Devynock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177.</td>
<td>Llanfairfan 204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178.</td>
<td>Penmon tympanum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179.</td>
<td>Bangor 79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180.</td>
<td>Bangor 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181.</td>
<td>Bangor 80a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182.</td>
<td>Bangor 81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183.</td>
<td>Corwen 274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184.</td>
<td>Corwen 275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185.</td>
<td>Corwen, additional fragment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186.</td>
<td>Ewenny 975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187.</td>
<td>Ewenny 976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188.</td>
<td>Llangaffo 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189.</td>
<td>Llantwit Major 225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190.</td>
<td>Lanivet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191.</td>
<td>Creerton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192.</td>
<td>Clonmacnoise, south cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193.</td>
<td>Lanherne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194.</td>
<td>Maughold 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195.</td>
<td>Muncaster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196.</td>
<td>Dearham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197.</td>
<td>Chester, St. Johns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198.</td>
<td>Nassington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199.</td>
<td>St. Breward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200.</td>
<td>Michael 89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201.</td>
<td>Maughold 67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202.</td>
<td>Kells, unfinished cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203.</td>
<td>Codford St. Peter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204.</td>
<td>Conchan 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205.</td>
<td>Ballaugh 77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206.</td>
<td>Lonan 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207.</td>
<td>Breedon-on-the-hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208.</td>
<td>Sandbach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209.</td>
<td>Lanivet hog-back</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210.</td>
<td>Kilkieran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211.</td>
<td>Exeter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212.</td>
<td>Ahenny, north cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213.</td>
<td>Ahenny, south cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214.</td>
<td>Kells, cross of SS. Patrick and Columba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215.</td>
<td>Kells, market cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216.</td>
<td>Clonmacnoise, cross of the Scriptures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217.</td>
<td>Maughold 48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1. THE SCOPE OF THE THESIS

The sculptured free-standing cross and the erect cross-slab (1) comprise what is perhaps the largest class of material remains of the post-Roman and pre-Norman period in the British Isles which are still standing above ground. Despite Puritan destruction and defacement of these monuments in the seventeenth century, most of the counties of the British Isles yield several examples. More may come to light as the result of the restoration or repair of pre-nineteenth century churches, for fragments and even whole monuments frequently were used as building material in Norman and later churches. Occasionally, monuments may be revealed through excavation.

It follows, therefore, that these monuments are a valuable source of potential evidence for the period in which they were made. Yet although most of the regional groups of sculpture have been catalogued and defined, rarely have they been used as historical evidence for the society in which and by which they were made. In this thesis, an attempt is made to use the Welsh corpus of sculptured crosses and cross-slabs, which conforms largely to Nash-Williams' Group III (1950), in this way.

Following the introductory chapter which is concerned with previous work on the subject, the Welsh material is analysed with regard to the form of the monuments and the patterns which occur on them, in order to establish the existence of certain groups of monuments (Chapter 2). In order to use these groups as historical evidence it is then necessary to assess the purposes for which they were made, the location and distribution of the monuments within Wales, and the methods of their manufacture, as these factors may all influence the interpretation of the evidence (Chapter 3). Chapter 4 is devoted to the problem of dating these monuments so that the evidence they yield may be used in the appropriate historical context.

(1) A free-standing cross comprises one or more stones dressed to the shape of a cross, with no external means of support other than the hole in the ground or the stone base in which the shaft is set. A cross-slab comprises a monolithic stone dressed into a slab upon which a cross has been incised or carved in relief (Appendix A, I-III). 'Sculptured' refers to the ornamentation of the monument, namely that the stone is carved in relief to make the cross and its ornament stand out in some way from the surface of the design.
These three analytical chapters, which are concerned with the immediate Welsh context, are supplemented by a study of the monuments in the insular context. In Chapter 5 the form and style of the Welsh monuments are examined in the light of contemporary historical and archaeological evidence from the rest of the British Isles. This study affirms the existence of contacts between Wales and other areas, demonstrates the operation of external influence upon Wales, and helps to determine the position of Wales within the insular context.

In the final chapters (6 to 8) additional historical and archaeological sources are employed to augment the evidence of the monuments and to show the implications of this evidence for both the society and economy, and the ecclesiastical and political situation in Wales in the early medieval period. Topics which receive discussion are the social status of the craftsmen, the manufacture of the monuments as part of the economy and the relationship between groups of sculpture and known ecclesiastical establishments and kingdoms. These considerations serve to emphasise the potential value of this type of material as historical evidence for a period which is only sparsely and spasmodically documented.

The text is accompanied by three appendices which supply much of the evidence upon which the text is based and which should be consulted for reference purposes. Appendix A gives detailed definitions of the monumental forms discussed in this thesis. Appendix B defines the ornamental motifs in use on the Welsh sculptured material and an attempt is made to list the known occurrences in the insular context, c. 700-1100, of each form and motif in use on the Welsh sculptured crosses and cross-slabs of the pre-Norman period. Appendix B provides much of the evidence for Chapter 5. Finally, Appendix C lists the sculptured monuments according to their site and gives the oldest known position of the monument, its modern location, the main references to it and a brief outline of the known history of the site. Detailed descriptions of the monuments are provided only in the cases of monuments which are not documented, or which are inadequately documented, in Nash-Williams (1950).

Figures, tables and maps referred to in the text are to be found at the end of the chapter in which they are first cited. Plates are bound after the appendices in Volume 2.
The origins of these monuments are complex. Certain types of cross appear as symbols in pagan contexts. The Babylonians, for example, used a Maltese cross as a symbol of the sun god. In consequence there have been several attempts to prove that the free-standing crosses of the British Isles are not Christian artifacts. Dexter (1938) gave a pagan explanation and interpretation for each shape and element of the Cornish crosses, which he regarded as prehistoric pagan monuments. Bird-Allen (1921) suggested that the free-standing cross was in the first instance a memorial monument of Scandinavian origin, representing the worship of the sun with its four principal rays. Whilst agreeing that both free-standing crosses and erect cross-slabs are the relics and results of a particular religion, the vast majority of scholars would disregard these rather eccentric views and accept the more obvious hypothesis that the religion which inspired the erection of these monuments was Christianity.

Both the free-standing cross and the erect cross-slab seem to be the descendants of a series of funerary slabs or pillars inscribed with Latin capitals, which occur in northern Britain (Thomas 1971, Chapter 6), Wales (Nash-Williams 1950, 3-16) and south-west England (Fox 1973, Chapter 9), but not in Ireland (although Ireland does have other antecedents which are discussed below), from approximately the fifth to the eighth century. The inscriptions have affinities with Gaulish and Mediterranean models in both epigraphy and formulae. Thus they appear to be associated with the Atlantic nexus of the post-Roman period, rather than with the provincial Romano-British survivals. The Atlantic nexus is indicated elsewhere in the archaeological record by various classes of pottery imported from Gaul, North Africa and the eastern Mediterranean to Britain via the western sea routes (Thomas 1959; 1976). Both the pottery and the monuments inscribed with Latin capitals have a predominantly westerly distribution.

A similar funerary tradition seems to have reached, or independently to have been invented in, Ireland; the inscriptions are in the Ogham script, and a distinctive filiation formula is used (Bu'lock 1956).
The same script and formula are employed on a few monuments in Scotland (Thomas 1971, 110), Wales (Nash-Williams 1950, 7) and Cornwall (Fox 1973, Chapter 9). On other monuments from these areas, the Latin script is sometimes arranged vertically in the manner of the Ogham script. The monuments exhibiting such peculiarities are usually taken to represent Irish influence, if not settlement, in Britain in the early post-Roman period (Thomas 1972; Richards 1959 and 1960).

At an early period traces of decoration occur on some of the inscribed monuments of Britain and Ireland. The earliest decorative elements seem to have been the Chi-Rho monogram, often simplified into an upright cross with a looped upper arm. The Chi-Rho was adopted as a Christian symbol after the conversion of Emperor Constantine in 312/313 AD. It is found on certain mosaics (e.g. Hinton St. Mary, Dorset) and in other media (e.g. wall plaster at Lullingstone, Kent; a building stone at Catterick, Yorks) in Britain in the Roman period. The looped form is found on monuments in the west of Britain in the fifth, sixth and seventh centuries. The simple incised or outline cross of Greek or Latin form may have evolved from the Chi-Rho, or perhaps from representations in other media such as the initial crosses in liturgical manuscripts, or even the stamps of outline crosses on the bases of sherds of 'A-ware' pottery imported into western Britain from the Mediterranean areas during the sixth century (Thomas 1976, 247, 252). Whatever the source, these crosses occur frequently on insular monuments; in England and Wales they are generally subservient to the inscription, but in Ireland they most often occur alone, without inscriptions.

The initial impetus for the use of stone sculpted in the round in the post-Roman period is controversial. It is uncertain whether or not the art of sculpture was lost with the withdrawal of the Romans from Britain. Cramp (1970) suggested that the art of sculpture had to be re-introduced from abroad by continental workmen such as those known to have been employed by Benedict Biscop on his church at Monkwearmouth and also by Wilfrid at Hexham, in the last quarter of the seventh century. It is notable that there are fragments of ornamental architectural sculpture at Hexham, and also at Jarrow, which reflect provincial Roman and Visigothic motifs which could conceivably have been the work of these craftsmen (Cramp 1974, 120). In the absence of any obvious prototype, however, it is not possible to assume, as Brøndsted (1924) and others have done, that the earliest stone crosses in the British Isles were entirely the work of continental immigrant craftsmen.
In contrast to these views, Mercer (1964) went to the opposite extreme in developing Saxl's (1943) thesis, that demonstrated the similarity between the treatment of the figures on the Bewcastle cross and those on Roman tombstones, in order to support his hypothesis that the art of sculpture survived the advent of the Saxons at least in Rheged, and that the Ruthwell and Bewcastle crosses were the first examples of an art form that was entirely the result of internal evolution.

Media other than stone must have played a part in the development of the free-standing cross and cross-slab. Insular decorative motifs appear on manuscripts and metalwork long before they are found on stone sculpture, and it is presumably from these media that they were adopted into stone. Particularly relevant in this context is Henry's assertion that the Ossory group of Irish crosses 'are first and foremost enlargements into stone of metal crosses .... the big rope mouldings seem there to cover the joints of sheets of bronze; the bosses play the part of glass or enamel studs covering the riveting of the two sides' (1940, 29). Similarly, Collingwood derived the 'lorgnette cross', found on some Northumbrian monuments, from an appliqué metal cross fastened to a wooden monument (1927, 94).

Wood may have played an important part in this development, perhaps as an intermediate medium in which both free-standing cross shapes and sculptured ornament were first essayed. Evidence may be cited for the existence of wooden crosses of various forms in this period. Bede, for example, refers to king Oswald setting up a wooden cross at the site of the battle of Heavenfield (Historia Ecclesiastica: Book III, Chapter 2; Plummer 1896, 128). A large oak cross, probably dating to the Anglo-Saxon period, apparently was found under the chancel of the church of St. Bertelin, Stafford (Ordnance Survey 1973, 122). Further evidence is provided by a class of cross-slabs bearing incised crosses which have a spiked foot, notably from Ireland (Macalister 1909, Nos 29, 96, 97 etc) and from Wales (the Latin cross form of angular line cross-slabs, see Chapter 2). The form of these crosses may be regarded as skeuomorphic, derived from wooden crosses which were intended to be fixed in the ground by their spikes, perhaps as grave markers. The processional cross depicted on the base of the North Cross at Ahenny may give some indication of the original appearance of these crosses (Roe 1969, 21).

There is no direct evidence that these wooden crosses were ever decorated with sculptured ornament. Radford regarded the shallow carving
of some Irish monuments, for example the cross-slabs at Fahan Mura and Cardonagh, as the work of a wood carver employing his methods on stone work, and he spoke of this as 'an inheritance from the long period when insular sculpture was in wood' (1977, 117). It is remarkable that the carving on the majority of the Welsh monuments is also shallow and two-dimensional, but this may be explained in other ways. In the absence of any concrete evidence, Radford's theory must remain, at best, only a likely hypothesis.

In summary then, all contingencies are covered if the free-standing cross and cross-slab are regarded as having evolved in the British Isles from the earlier insular series of cross-incised slabs, modified perhaps by insular and/or Continental/Eastern works in other media (wood, ivories, manuscripts etc). The various forms of cross are likely to have been broadly contemporary, with different forms predominating in different areas at different times.
3. GENERAL SURVEY

The sculptural material falls into several regional groups characterised by the form, layout and nature of the ornament employed on the monuments. Many of these regional groups are at present under review (notably the British Academy's Corpus of Anglo-Saxon Sculpture under the leadership of Professor Cramp). Current interest in the subject recently was reflected by the Collingwood Symposium on insular sculpture from 800-1066 which was held at Durham in 1978 (Lang 1978). In this context of modern scholarship, any general survey of the material is necessarily superficial. Nevertheless, it is attempted here in order to provide a context for the study of the Welsh material which is the subject of this thesis.

The Irish group of high crosses is one of the most distinctive. These free-standing crosses, generally between three and five metres high, are characterised by a ringed cross and a quadrilateral shaft and massive base. Sculptured ornament is generally in relief and disposed in panels. These monuments are found mainly in the centre and in the north and east of Ireland and most are ascribed to the eighth to eleventh century. Much work on the subject has been done by Dr. Françoise Henry. She distinguished seven local groups according to the design, iconography and execution of the monuments (1964). The exact spatial and chronological relationships between the various groups is unclear, although several groups are likely to have been contemporary. Generally speaking, the trend seems to have been from crosses decorated chiefly with panels of spirals, interlacings and angular motifs, to crosses where panels of scriptural and other figural scenes predominate. It is reasonable to suppose that the appearance of figures representing bishops on certain crosses, for example Dysert O'Dea, is indicative of a date during or after the reform of the Irish church in the twelfth century which increased the importance of bishops, and gave them fixed sees (De Paor 1955-6, 53-71).

Alongside these high crosses, which apparently were non-funerary in character (the purpose of the monuments is discussed in Chapter 3, Section 3), must be considered a large contemporary group of horizontal grave slabs which were often adorned with plain or ornamented crosses (Lionard 1961). Like the high crosses, these seem to have been the work of monastic schools; the most important in this case being Clonmacnoise (Macalister 1909). This series may have continued into the twelfth century.
Similar, but probably independent, developments were taking place in the north of England in the pre-Norman period. At present, the most complete corpus is provided by the work of Collingwood (1907; 1909; 1911; 1915; 1927). The material is now under review for the first chapter of the British Academy's Corpus of Anglo-Saxon Sculpture (Lang 1978). Architectural sculpture aside, the basic division of the northern material is between Anglian monuments which exhibit no signs of Scandinavian influence, and Anglo-Scandinavian material which combines Anglian and Scandinavian trends. The latter is the subject of recent work by Bailey (1980). The Anglian crosses vary considerably in size, but they are usually free-armed, and with their decoration disposed in panels. One of the most distinctive decorative motifs is the vine-scroll, either plain or inhabited with birds and beasts. Scriptural scenes, classical in feeling, are found on what are generally regarded as early monuments, such as the Ruthwell and Bewcastle crosses (Saxl 1943). Interlace and angular motifs occur on Northumbrian monuments, but spirals are very rare. Several schools of sculpture have been identified, notably by Cramp (1965). The tendency of the decoration seems to be towards the increasing stylisation of the vine-scroll, and the biblical scenes die out. In the case of the inhabited vine-scroll, the beasts inhabiting the vine emancipate themselves from the surrounding foliage to appear in their own right as 'Anglian Beasts' (Brøndsted 1924, 56). Later crosses, which may take the ring-headed form, are often of poor quality, and show the influence of Scandinavian taste in both decorative motifs and occasionally in what seem to be scenes from Scandinavian mythology (Bailey 1980). A new form of monument, the hog-backed tombstone, seems to have evolved in the Scandinavian settlements in the north of England (Schmidt 1973; Lang 1976; Bailey 1980, 85-100).

The architectural sculpture of Northumbria may have provided the impetus for the development of the elaborate friezes and panels which seem to be the first examples of Anglo-Saxon sculpture in Mercian contexts (Cramp 1977, 192). Although Northumbrian traditions strongly influenced the sculpture of Mercia, Mercia produced certain distinctive forms, for example the round-to-rectangular-shafted cross (Kendrick 1949, Chapter 7). Zoomorphic and foliate ornament on the Mercian material at first reflects a distinctive mix of English and Continental trends (Clapham 1927, 219-80), but gradually becomes more stylised with the advent of Anglo-Scandinavian influence (Cramp 1977, 230).
Southern English sculpture is represented by fewer monuments than the areas already considered, and as a result there is no readily accessible corpus. Work is at present in progress on this material (Tweddle forthcoming). The little evidence there is suggests the existence of a number of schools of carving by the tenth century, producing crosses, cross-slabs and architectural sculpture. The ornamentation follows the contemporary style of manuscript illumination, with elegant foliage and figural styles (Cottrill 1935; Cramp 1975). Examples of stonework from the reigns of the Danish kings of England, for example the stone decorated in the Ringerike style from St. Paul's Cathedral, show that the later Scandinavian art styles reached, and were absorbed into, southern English sculpture.

A mixture of Irish and Northumbrian traits forming the Hiberno-Saxon style is exhibited by a prolific group of cross-slabs from Scotland (Allen 1903; 'Class II'). The monuments are confined to the southern area of the Pictish kingdom and are usually labelled Pictish (Henderson 1967, Chapter 5). These are not free-standing crosses but slabs two to three metres in height, on the front of which is a free-armed, or more commonly, a ringed cross. The backs of the slabs are often decorated with symbols. Class II stones appear to be successors to Class I stones which bear only incised symbols; the latter are dated by Henderson c. 625-700 (1967, 127). The surface of the cross on Class II slabs is generally decorated with abstract motifs incised or in low relief, the main elements of decoration being complex interlace, fretwork and spirals. Scriptural and other figural scenes occur on the slab around the shaft of the cross. The ornament is often very fine and executed with great technical skill. Class II slabs seem to have come to an end in the mid-to late-ninth century when the Pictish church and state were absorbed by the Dalriadic Scots (Henderson 1967, 160). Henderson's work on the sculpture belonging to the ninth century indicates the existence at this time of a hybrid art 'reflecting the last of the native tradition, the new Irishness of the area and the enduring nature of earlier Northumbrian contacts' (1978, 58). This hybrid art is expressed in a number of tall and narrow cross-slabs from which there is a logical development to the free-standing cross (Allen 1903, Class III). Unless it is stated otherwise, the Scottish monuments to which reference is made in this thesis are designated by the number given to them in Allen's work.

As in Scotland, the erect cross-slab is the predominate form of monument in the Isle of Man in the early medieval period. The most
accessible corpus of this material is still that of Kermode (1907) and where Manx cross-slabs are cited in this thesis, they are designated by the number given to them in this work. These cross-slabs, which may bear a free-armed or ringed cross, are almost exclusively manufactured from local slate and, perhaps as a result of this rather intractable material, are ornamented in low relief. The ornament consists at first of interlace, key patterns, and zoomorphic designs; there are virtually no scripture subjects. Scandinavian influence is apparent on many of the later monuments in the form of decorative motifs and figural scenes from Scandinavian mythology. Scenes from the 'Sigurd Saga' were particularly popular (Kermode 1907, 50). The slabs, made of local slate, are concentrated at a number of centres (Cubbon 1971, 2). In one case a distinctive school seems to have grown out of the work of one sculptor, 'Gautr', whose work is characterised particularly by the use of a ring-chain motif, which was an important element in the Scandinavian Borre style (Wilson and Klindt-Jensen 1966, 88). The Manx slabs seem to have been funerary in purpose throughout their main period of production from the ninth to the eleventh century.

With regard to Wales, in this context it is sufficient to note that the most coherent corpus of sculptured monuments is that of Nash-Williams (1950), updated for Glamorgan by the Royal Commission on Ancient and Historical Monuments in Wales (1976). The Welsh material comprises crosses and cross-slabs which vary considerably in form and size and which are frequently badly designed and executed. The principal decorative motifs are interlace and key patterns. Foliage and zoomorphic designs are rare, as are figural scenes of any sort. A number of local groups can be identified, the earliest dated to the second half of the ninth century, carrying on with progressive degeneration into the twelfth century.

The majority of the crosses of Cornwall are inferior in design and execution to those groups which have already been outlined. Langdon's work of 1896 still provides the basic corpus, although Thomas has reviewed some of the material (1967; 1978). The most common form of free-standing cross in Cornwall is the disc-headed cross, most of which are between one and two metres high. The main decorative motifs are debased interlace and fretwork, and a simple foliate scroll. A device peculiar to the Cornish crosses is the frequent use of panels of irregular pocking. The crucifix is common, usually in the centre of the cross head, but there is no other figure sculpture. Several monuments are devoid of ornament.
These unique sculptural traditions persisted in all parts of the British Isles up to and beyond the Norman conquests of the various areas, but inevitably the sculpture of crosses became subordinate to, and later swamped by, the architectural and artistic traditions of the Romanesque.

For the most part, the works cited in connection with these regional groups have been concerned with cataloguing and defining the material, and attempting to establish typological groupings and relative chronologies. Rarely have the sculptured monuments been regarded as historical sources which can be used to throw light on the historical and social conditions, the cultural and external contacts of the society in which they were made. (2) In this thesis, then, an attempt is made to determine what a corpus of such material, in this case the Welsh material, can yield when used in conjunction with other contemporary evidence, within a coherent geographical and cultural area.

(2) A notable exception is Bailey's *Viking Age Sculpture* (1980).
Previous work on the Welsh material is primarily in the form of short articles, often on individual monuments, in archaeological periodicals, notably Archaeologia Cambrensis. Allen, Hughes, Westwood and Macalister may be mentioned as prolific contributors in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Allen in particular was concerned with the sculptured crosses and cross-slabs, and produced in 1899 an article entitled 'Early Christian Art in Wales'. In this article he summarised the chief constructional features and the most characteristic types of Welsh sculptured crosses and cross-slabs, and listed the main decorative features of these monuments. It remains one of the most useful reference works to these aspects of the subject.

The first corpus was provided by Westwood's Lapidarium Walliae (1876-9) which surveyed the known material county by county. The product of thirty-five years work (op cit, iii), this was an impressive achievement and it often provides the first written references to the monuments. One hundred years after its publication, however, its frequent imprecision and inaccurate drawings considerably reduces its value. It is effectively this corpus which was updated and refined, with considerably more scholarly attention to detail, by Nash-Williams (1950).

Nash-Williams divided his material into four main groups, using his criteria changes in form, decoration and epigraphy:

**Group I:** 'Simple incised slabs, 5th to 7th century'.
**Group II:** 'Cross decorated stones, 7th to 9th century'.
**Group III:** 'Sculptured crosses and cross-slabs, 9th to 11th century'.
**Group IV:** 'Transitional Romanesque monuments, 11th to 13th century'.

Nash-Williams Group III is the subject of the present study, but it is necessary to list the main characteristics of the other three groups in order to place it in its local context.

(Group I: Simple incised slabs, 5th to 7th century'  
(Nash Williams 1950, 3-16).

This group consists of approximately 140 unshaped or roughly hewn stones and slabs, bearing inscriptions in Latin, or Oghams, or both. These inscriptions indicate that the monuments in question had a funerary
or memorial purpose. Their distribution is western and coastal. Much interest, and consequently study, has centred upon this group. In particular, emphasis has been laid on the fact that the Ogham inscriptions which are especially common in south Wales, seem to represent an infiltration of Irish colonists (Richards 1960; Thomas 1972). The formulae and lettering of the Latin inscriptions, which occur mainly in north Wales, seem to indicate direct contact with Gaul and north Africa in the immediate post-Roman period - an hypothesis which is corroborated in the archaeological record by the occurrence of imported pottery from these areas on certain Welsh sites (discussed below, 256).

'Group II: Cross decorated stones, 7th to 9th century'
(Nash-Williams 1950, 17-27).

This group comprises approximately 160 unshaped or roughly hewn stones and slabs decorated with a wide variety of simple forms of crosses, which are incised or lightly carved. A few are inscribed. Various purposes have been suggested for these monuments besides the usual funerary or memorial ones - namely as boundary stones or markers, landmarks and praying stations. The distribution is again predominantly western. The paucity of inscriptions renders this group virtually impossible to date, and it is possible that they were contemporary with other groups. The recent tendency has been to argue for an earlier date than that proposed by Nash-Williams (Alcock 1965, 203; Lewis 1976, 151).

'Group III: Sculptured crosses and cross-slabs, 9th to 11th century'

This group comprises approximately 200 pieces of which c. 70 are recognisable as free-standing or disc-headed crosses, c. 80 as cross-slabs and c. 20 as related sculptured monuments such as fonts. These are the subjects of the present study.

'Group IV: Transitional Romanesque monuments, 11th to 13th century'
(Nash-Williams 1950, 47-49).

A miscellaneous series of 26 monuments scattered throughout Wales, which in form correspond to the later medieval material, but which in epigraphy and decoration preserve traces of the earlier period. Gresham's study of medieval stone carving in north Wales (1968) confirms that the Group IV monuments of north Wales belong to the post-Norman period.
Nash-Williams' Group III is characterised by the form of the cross expressed in sculpture; in the round as a free-standing or a disc-headed cross; in relief upon a cross-slab. In his classification of this group, Nash-Williams deals with north and south Wales separately under the assumption that the north Welsh monuments 'as well as being fewer are almost entirely intrusive, having their affinities mainly with the monuments or northern Britain' (1950, 31).

Nash-Williams divides the crosses into two main categories, namely pillar crosses 'in which the width and thickness are more or less equal' and slab-crosses 'in which the width is markedly greater than the thickness'.

He uses these categories as the basis for his sub-groups of crosses which are as follows (1950, 32-36):

**NORTH WALES**

(a) Wheel-headed pillar crosses  
(b) Ring-headed crosses  
(c) Round-shafted pillar crosses

**SOUTH WALES**

(d) Disc-headed slab-crosses  
(e) Wheel-headed slab-crosses  
(f) Moulded pillar crosses  
(g) Miscellaneous types

The main criticism to be made here is that the distinction between pillar and slab-crosses is to a large extent an artificial one. The form which the shaft takes is more likely to have been determined by the nature of the stone available than by a conscious desire on the part of the craftsman to have a pillar or a slab-like form. In the case of Nash-Williams' sub-group (a) his representatives of this group are two fragmentary cross heads of different types (Llangaffo 14 and Llanfachraeth 8). The form of the shaft cannot in either case be determined and yet Nash-Williams calls them both pillar crosses. The distinction between sub-groups (e) and (f) is by the form of the shaft only; the form of the cross head is not considered. Finally, the distinction between the 'wheeled', 'ringed' and 'disc' forms of cross head is unclear.
Nash-Williams groups the cross-slabs as follows (1950, 37-9):

(a) 'Crux Xri' slabs  
(b) Monogram slabs  
(c) Fretted ring-cross slabs  
(d) Plain cross slabs  
(e) Wheel cross slabs  
(f) Panelled cartwheel cross slabs  
(g) Round cross slabs  
(h) Figured slabs  
(i) Miscellaneous types

Several criticisms may be made here concerning the contents of these sub-groups. Of the 'Crux Xri' slabs, only two monuments actually express this formula; in the rest it is 'implied by the cross symbol' (1950, 37). Not all of the monogram slabs actually bear the monogram – it is absent for example on St. Davids 381 and St. Edrens 394. The 'plain' cross slabs have decoration (Llandyfaelog Fach 49). The panelled cartwheel monument does not look much like a cross slab at all.

It was perhaps with some of these criticisms in mind that the Royal Commission on Ancient and Historic Monuments in Wales recently redefined and re-catalogued the monuments of Glamorgan (1976, 18-21). (3) Corresponding to Nash-Williams' Group III are the following groups:

'Class D: Standing sculptured slabs, including sub-types  
Class E: Pillar-crosses, usually composite  
Class F: Other decorated stones'

The imprecise nature of the terminology, and thus of the content, of these groups robs them of any wider significance. Thus it is Nash-Williams' Group III which is used as the point of departure for the new terminology which is proposed in the next chapter, rather than the classes D, E and F.

(3) In future this work is abbreviated as RCAHMW 1976.
CHAPTER TWO

THE WELSH MATERIAL: MONUMENTAL FORMS AND GROUPS

In this chapter an attempt is made to revise Nash-Williams' classification largely within his Group III. The new sub-groups are identified by the form of the cross head rather than by the form of the shaft, although this is also considered. Reference should be made to Appendix A for the definitions of these forms. Only complete or near complete monuments are used to determine these groups. Monuments now represented by only small fragments are omitted from this chapter unless they exhibit characteristics which indicate that they can clearly be ascribed to a particular group. Similarly, monuments where only the shaft or the base survive are regarded as being of little use for the purpose of determining groups and are listed separately. No preconceived division is made between north and south Wales although this does in fact emerge from a study of the material. Inevitably some sub-groups correspond with those of Nash-Williams; in these cases his name for the group is used and acknowledged.

OUTLINE OF SCHEME

A: THE FREE-STANDING CROSS

1. The ringed cross with fan-shaped arms.
2. The 'moulded pillar cross'.
3. The composite-shafted cross.
4. The round-to-rectangular shafted cross.
5. Miscellaneous cross-heads:
   a. Round-hollow, ringed.
   b. 'Anglian', ringed.
   c. Key-hole, ringed.
   d. Fan-shaped, free-armed.

B: THE DISC-HEADED CROSS

1. The disc-headed cross with slab-like shaft:
   b. Ringed:
      i. Equal-armed.
      ii. Latin.
      iii. Fan-shaped.
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iv. Round-hollow.
v. Double-square hollow.

2. The north Welsh disc-headed crosses.
3. The 'Whithorn' type.
4. The 'panelled cartwheel' form.

A/B: INCOMPLETE CROSSES

1. Slab-like shafts.
2. Rectangular-sectioned shafts.
3. Square-sectioned shaft.
4. Cross bases:
   a. Rectangular.
   b. Square pyramid.
   c. Rectangular pyramid.
   d. Conical.

C: THE CROSS-SLAB

1. Angular line cross-slabs:
   a. Latin cross:
      i. With splayed arms and spiked foot.
      ii. With splayed arms and spiked foot and spirals to the side of the cross shaft.
      iii. With squared expansions at the end of the arms and a spiked foot.
      iv. With six round expansions and a spiked foot.
   b. Equal-armed cross.

2. Compass-drawn cross-slabs:
   a. Encircled equal-armed cross.
   b. Encircled fan-shaped cross.
   c. Encircled cross motif formed or arcs.

3. Unpatterned cross-slabs:
   b. Ringed.
   c. Monogram slabs:
      i. Latin, free-armed.
      ii. Round-hollow, ringed.

4. Interlaced cross-slabs:
   a. Round-hollow, ringed.
   b. Latin, ringed.
5. Free-armed cross-slabs:
   a. Latin.
   b. Maltese and Initial.
6. Panelled cross-slabs.
7. Full-length cross-slabs:
   a. Plain ringed cross-slabs.
   b. Decorated cross-slabs.
   c. Double cross-slabs.
8. Fretted cross-slabs.
10. Miscellaneous cross-slabs.

D: RELATED MONUMENTS

1. The round pillar.
2. Figured slabs.
3. The hogbacked tombstone.
4. The ornamented slab.
5. Sundials.
6. Fonts.

THE ORGANISATION OF THE MATERIAL

In the following scheme, the monuments catalogued by Nash-Williams (1950) are designated by the number given in that work. A number of monuments from Glamorgan do not appear in Nash-Williams' work but are published in RCAHMW (1976); these are designated by the number given to them in this work. It is possible to distinguish between the two sets of numbers as those given by Nash-Williams are all under 500 and those given by RCAHMW are all over 800. Monuments which do not appear in either of these two works are not numbered.

Where it is first cited, each monument is accompanied by a reference to a figure and a plate. The figures comprise outlines of the monuments drawn to the same scale (1:20); these are placed at the end of the chapter, together with the tables and maps referred to in the text. The photographic plates are bound separately in Volume II. (1) The type of

(1) Nash-Williams' photographs (1950) are used for a number of monuments which have been erected in places where photography is impeded (eg. Penally 363 and 364 are set in concrete in the corner of the church and it is now impossible to photograph all four faces). The source of these photographs is acknowledged in the Appendix.
material out of which the monument was made is given wherever this is
known; this is discussed in Chapter 3. Wherever possible the validity
of each sub-group is checked by an analysis of the patterns which occur
on the monuments assigned to it. These patterns are designated by names
and numbers (eg. Fret 6) which are defined and listed in Appendix B.
In addition, where a sub-group or type of monument is identified in
Wales it is placed in its wider context by brief reference to comparable
material in other parts of the British Isles. This aspect is the subject
of further discussion in Chapter 5.
A. THE FREE-STANDING CROSS

The free-standing cross is the most common form of erect stone monument in the British Isles between AD 700-1100. In Northumbria, the free-armed cross head seems to have been predominant in the early period, but it is rarely found elsewhere. The ringed form, which in Northumbria is often accompanied by Scandinavian decorative motifs, appears later and is common from the tenth century onwards in England. Throughout the period in question such Irish monuments are almost exclusively of the ringed form.

In Wales, complete examples of the free-standing cross are confined to the south, but the existence of fragmentary cross-heads in the north indicates that the type was known as far north as Anglesey. The ringed form of cross-head seems to have been favoured. The distribution is primarily coastal; central Wales is almost devoid of monuments.

The following types of free-standing cross may be identified in Wales:

1. THE RINGED CROSS WITH FAN-SHAPED ARMS

a. Square/slab-like shaft: Coychurch 194*, Glamorgan (fig.1; pl. 1).

b. Rectangular shaft: Nevern 360*, Dyfed (fig.2; pl. 2) 'local dolorite' (Nash-Williams 1950, 199).

c. Slab-like shaft: Carew 303*, Dyfed (fig.3; pl. 3). Merthyr Mawr 240, Glamorgan (fig.4; pl. 5). 'coarse sandstone' (RCAHMW 1976, 57). Penally 364, Dyfed (fig.5; pl. 4).

Table 1 indicates that these monuments also have several decorative motifs in common. The almost identical nature of the decoration of Nevern 360 and Carew 303 with that of the slab-like shafts Llanfynydd 159, Dyfed (fig.6i; pl. 6) 'local felspathic sandstone' (Nash-Williams 1950, 115) and Llantwit Major 222, Glamorgan (fig.6ii; pl. 7) 'local grit' (Nash-Williams 1950, 142) strongly suggests that these shafts once belonged to crosses of this type. The cross shaft Merthyr Mawr 239 (fig.6iii; pl. 8) 'sandstone' (RCAHMW 1976, 56) is so similar in form and layout to Merthyr Mawr 240 that it is reasonable to suppose that this shaft represents another monument of this type.

* Indicates that the monument is composite (See Chapter 3, Section 3).
This is the predominant form of free-standing cross in south Wales (Map 1) and is particularly characteristic when it is associated with a slab-like shaft. Outside Wales the form has a very scattered distribution (Appendix B, cross form B4); the only other significant concentration of the type is in north Cornwall, but here the shaft of the cross is generally rectangular in section (eg. Lanivet, pl. 190).


These are formed from a single rectangular-sectioned block of stone, with two horizontal scoops made at either side of the top of the block to form a spatulate cross head. The type is further distinguished by the use of heavy mouldings at the edges of the shaft:

- Llanynis 65, Powys (fig. 7ii; pl. 9).
- Llandewi'r Cwm 47, Powys (fragmentary: fig. 7iii; pl. 10).
- Llanbadarn Fawr 111, Dyfed (fig. 7i; pl. 11) 'medium grained granitic rock from the Yr Eifl region of the Lleyn peninsula' (Nash-Williams 1950, 95 note 3).

Table 2 indicates that these monuments are linked by decorative motifs as well as by form.

Despite Nash-Williams' attempt to trace devolved forms of this type in south Glamorgan, these are the only true examples and would thus seem to represent a type peculiar to mid-Wales (Map 2).

3. **THE COMPOSITE-SHAFTED CROSS**

This type is represented by Llandough 206, Glamorgan (fig. 8i; pl. 12) which is made of Sutton stone (Nash-Williams 1950, 134). The shaft consists of three separate pieces, namely an upper and a lower shaft divided by a central baluster. The heavy mouldings on the lower shaft led Nash-Williams to suggest that this was a Glamorgan adaptation of the moulded pillar cross (ibid), but this is the only point of resemblance between the two forms. It is possible that Llandaff 205, Glamorgan (fig. 8ii; pl. 13), of 'Sutton stone' (Nash-Williams 1950, 134), which has a ringed cross head of Anglian type, may be the upper member of a similar monument.

No comparable monuments may be cited, but the central baluster of the shaft may perhaps be related to a number of English monuments where the shaft of the cross has a central block-like swelling (Appendix B, Monumental Form 1; eg. Creeton, Lincs; pl. 191).
4. **THE ROUND-TO-RECTANGULAR SHAFTED CROSS**

Where the upper portion of the shaft of the monument is rectangular in section and the lower portion is round. This form is represented in Wales by only one example: Llantisilio Yn Ial 182, Clwyd, which is commonly called 'Eliseg's Pillar' (fig. 9; pl. 14). The pillar is situated in the Vale of Llangollen at a place called Valle Crucis. It is probable that the valley and the nearby abbey of the same name took their name from the monument in question which must therefore originally have been capped by a cross.

The Vale of Llangollen provides a natural line of entry into Wales from the Derbyshire region, and thus it is not surprising to find that the pillar belongs to the series of plain round-to-rectangular shafted monuments which are found in the north Mercian area of England (Kendrick 1949, 74; Appendix B, Monumental Form 3; Map 3).

5. **MISCELLANEOUS CROSS HEADS FROM FREE-STANDING CROSSES**

a. **Round-hollow, ringed:** St. Fagan's 267, Glamorgan (fig. 10; pl. 15). 'Oolitic limestone from the Lias outcrop between St. Fagan's and Tregrynog' (Nash-Williams 1950, 165). As a free-standing form, this type of cross head is almost exclusively confined to Irish monuments (Appendix B, Cross Form B10; eg. South Cross, Clonmacnoise; pl. 192).

b. **Anglian, ringed:** Llanfachraeth 8, Anglesey (fig. 10ii; pl. 16). St. David's 378, Dyfed (fig. 10iii; pl. 17). This is a relatively rare form which has a scattered distribution throughout the British Isles (Appendix B, Cross Form B1). There are a number of monuments of this form in Yorkshire and Cornwall which bear crude crucifixes comparable to that of Llanfachraeth 8 (eg. Lanherne, Cornwall; pl. 193).

c. **Key-hole, ringed:** Llangaffo 14, Anglesey (fig. 10iv; pl. 18).

At first sight this seems to be the only free-standing ringed example of a rare type of cross which appears in its free-armed form at only two places - Burnsall and Osmotherly, Yorkshire. The key-hole ringed cross is more frequently found as a disc-headed form, here called the Whithorn type (form B3, below). However, the size of the gaps between the tips of the cross arms on Llangaffo 14 would suggest that it is to be related to the ringed round-hollow form (Appendix B, Cross Form B10) rather than to the Whithorn type. As the three-stranded twist which ornaments this cross head cannot be paralleled elsewhere, it is perhaps best to regard it as a unique form.
d. **Fan-shaped, free-armed:** Coity 192, Glamorgan (fig.10v; pl.19).
Fragmentary, comprising two arms and the central hub of the cross which was made of Sutton stone (RCAHMW 1976, 62). Around the hub there are six small square sockets, and there is a small rectangular socket in the centre of each arm of the cross. RCAHMW (ibid) suggested that these may have served as settings for 'enamelled, glass or jewelled studs to affix metal ornament' (discussed in Chapter 3, Section 3).

This type of cross head has a widespread distribution in England (Appendix B, cross form A4), but there are no known parallels for the small sockets on monuments of this form. This is the only example of the free-armed fan-shaped cross in Wales and the form probably owes something to the south Welsh group of ringed crosses with fan-shaped arms.

6. **MISCELLANEOUS FREE-STANDING CROSSES**

a. **Llanbadarn Fawr 112, Dyfed** (fig.11; pl.20) 'Local sandstone' (Nash-Williams 1950, 96). A crude, roughly shaped free-armed cross with incised ornament that forms no recognisable pattern.

b. **Llanfair Mathafarn Eithaf 11, Anglesey** (fig.12; pl.21). A free-standing cross with slab-like shaft. The cross head is of the Maltese type, with blocks between the arms of the cross. It is without any other ornament.
B. THE DISC-HEADED CROSS

Disc-headed crosses are most numerous in the Isle of Man and along the west coasts of northern England and Scotland and the north and south coasts of Wales and Cornwall. Four types of disc-headed cross may be identified in Wales:

1. **THE DISC-HEADED CROSS WITH SLAB-LIKE SHAFT**

   A variety of cross forms are used on the head of the monument which in outline is a smooth disc:

   a. **Free-armed Latin cross**: Laugharne 145, Dyfed (fig. 13iv; pl. 22). This monument is apparently unique.

   b. **Ringed**:

      i. **Equal-armed**: Llangan 207, Glamorgan (fig. 13i; pl. 23) 'local coal measures sandstone' (Nash-Williams 1950, 136). No comparable monument is known, but elements comprising the crucifixion scene which figures prominently on the cross head may be regarded as Irish (see Chapter 5, Section 3).

      ii. **Latin**: St Edren's 391, Dyfed (fig. 13ii; pl. 24). This is related by its mode of execution to a group of cross-slabs from the Dublin region (see Chapter 5, Section 3).

      iii. **Fan-shaped**: Margam 235, Glamorgan (fig. 13iii; pl. 25) 'local Pennant sandstone' (Nash-Williams 1950, 152). The form of this monument is reminiscent of certain Manx cross-slabs such as Maughold 39 (pl. 194).

      iv. **Round-hollow**: Margam 231, Glamorgan (fig. 14i; pl. 26) 'local Pennant sandstone' (Nash-Williams 1950, 146). St Lawrence 398, Dyfed (fig. 13v; pl. 27). This is a common Manx form (see Chapter 5, Section 5).

      v. **Double-square hollow**: Llantwit Major 220, Glamorgan (fig. 14ii; pl. 28) 'local grit' (Nash-Williams 1950, 140). Llanarthney 147, Dyfed (fig. 14iii; pl. 29). Margam 234, Glamorgan (fig. 15i; pl. 30) 'local Pennant sandstone' (Nash-Williams 1950, 148). Port Talbot 263, Glamorgan (fig. 14iv; pl. 31) 'local Pennant sandstone' (Nash-Williams 1950, 165). The frag-
mentary cross head Llangiwg 210, Glamorgan (fig. 15ii; pl. 32) of 'Pennant sandstone' (RCAHMW 1976, 45) belongs to a monument of this type. It is otherwise unornamented. The double-square hollow disc-headed cross seems to be peculiar to mid south Wales.

In north Wales, Whitford 190 is strictly a disc-headed cross with a slab-like shaft, but this monument has features which identify it as a member of the north-western form B2. Form B1 is a predominantly south Welsh phenomenon (Map 4). It is remarkable that of the south Welsh crosses of this group, only Margam 231 and 234 have three or more patterns in common (Table 3). It is suggested below that the shape of these crosses was dictated by the nature of the stone which was locally available. The monument at Morvil, Dyfed (fig. 15iii; pl. 33) may be an unfinished disc-headed cross (see Chapter 3, Section 3).

2. THE NORTH WELSH DISC-HEADED CROSSES

The four disc-headed crosses from north Wales form a distinctive group. In each case the head of the monument is formed by an encircled cross which has the slightly splayed arms of the Maltese type. With the exception of Whitford 190 each cross has rectangular projections at the top and the sides of the disc suggestive of the arms of the cross continuing beyond the ring.

a. Rectangular-shafted: Penmon 37, Anglesey (fig. 16i; pl. 34).
Penmon 38, Anglesey (fig. 16ii; pl. 35).

b. Slab-like shaft: Diserth 185, Clwyd (fig. 17ii; pl. 36) 'local sandstone' (Nash-Williams 1950, 126). Whitford 190, Clwyd (fig. 17i; pl. 37).

Another monument from Whitford, Clwyd (fig. 17iii; pl. 38) may be related to this group. This monument comprises a slab-like shaft with a disc-head which has a central boss on either side. The monument is now fragmentary, but in 1886 its height was given as five feet (Owen 1886, 199-201). The edges of the disc and the bosses are defined by roll moulding, but there is no other ornament and no cross. There are projections similar to those of Diserth 185, at what would have been the neck of the cross. It is possible that this monument represents an unfinished example of this group.

The north Welsh monuments belong to a group of disc-headed crosses found along the coastal lowlands of Cumberland, Cheshire and north Wales.
(Bullock 1958, 1-11). The type seems to have evolved in the Scandinavian settlements of Cumbria (where it is represented by more than ten examples including Muncaster (pl.195), Dearham (pl.196), Aspatria, Rockcliffe and Bromfield) and to have diffused to the other areas (Maps 5 and 6). The pure Cumbrian type is represented in Wales by Penmon 38 and to a lesser extent by Penmon 37, which is likely to have been a local derivative from number 38.

A school of stone masons at Chester, perhaps working at the collegiate church of St John's, seems to have introduced the innovation of placing bosses between the arms of the cross (pl.197; Cooper Scott 1893, 86). This feature is also found on Whitford 190 which is so similar in decoration to one piece from Chester (Grosvenor Museum) that they may have been the work of one craftsman. The Chester school also introduced decorative projections at the neck of the cross and this feature occurs on Diserth 185. The connection between Diserth 185 and the work of the Chester school is further emphasised by the pelleting of the encircling ring which, according to Bailey, is a feature of the 'Cheshire type' of 'circle head' (1980, 179). The circle is not, as stated by Bailey, decorated with interlace which he regards as a feature of the 'Cumbrian type' (ibid. 180).

The neck projections and three-lobed sinkings between the arms of the Diserth cross are paralleled by a number of Cornish crosses (Allen and Langdon 1888, 322-4, eg. St Breward, pl.199). This seems to corroborate Bullock's hypothesis that the type was diffused as far as Cornwall but it is remarkable that no comparable monument is known from south Wales. The contact between the various regions was presumably coastal; no examples of the type are found far inland.

Table 4 indicates that this group of monuments exhibits some correspondence in patterns as well as form. It is notable that the north Welsh and Chester crosses (A-I) are distinguished from the Cumbrian monuments (J-N) by having a preponderence of fret patterns.

3. **THE 'WHITHORN' TYPE**

This term was used by Collingwood (1927, 64) to describe a disc-headed cross with a rectangular sectioned shaft and a key-hole form of cross head. This is a distinctive form apparently emanating from northern England or southern Scotland. The centre of production of this type seems to have been Whithorn, as five of the eight known examples are found here (Appendix B, cross form 5).
Margam 233, Glamorgan (fig. 18; pl. 3) is the only known example of the type outside the Whithorn area (Map 7). It is made of 'local Pennant sandstone' (Nash-Williams 1950, 148). It does not however have the type of interlace incorporating free-rings which is so characteristic of the northern monuments and is probably to be regarded as an independent development of the form.

4. THE 'PANELLED CARTWHEEL' FORM

This term was used by Nash-Williams (1950, 38) to describe a number of monuments peculiar to south Glamorgan (Map 8) which appear to be a hybrid form standing midway between the disc-headed cross and the erect cross-slab. These are massive slabs, sometimes with scooped out sides suggesting the form of a cross, which are decorated on one or both faces with a cross formed by a number of sunken panels.

a. Four panels: Ewenny 196 (fig. 19iv; pl. 40). Kenfig 200 (fig. 19i; pl. 41) 'local Pennant sandstone' (Nash-Williams 1950, 133). Llangan 208 (fig. 19vi; pl. 42) 'local rhaetic sandstone' (Nash-Williams 1950, 137). Neath 251a (fig. 19vii; pl. 43). Resolven 265 (fig. 19v; pl. 44) 'sandstone' (RCAHMW 1976, 55). Tythegston 270a (fig. 19iii; pl. 45).

b. Six panels: Port Talbot 262 (fig. 19ii; pl. 46) 'rhaetic sandstone from the Bridgend-Pyle area' (Nash-Williams 1950, 166).

c. Eight panels: Margam 236 (fig. 20i; pl. 47) 'local Pennant sandstone' (Nash-Williams 1950, 152). Margam 237 (fig. 20ii; pl. 48) 'local Pennant sandstone' (op. cit.). Merthyr Mawr 241 (fig. 20ii; pl. 49) 'Sutton stone' (RCAHMW 1976, 52). Merthyr Mawr 242 (fig. 20v; pl. 50) 'rhaetic sandstone from the Bridgend-Pyle area' (Nash-Williams 1950, 155). Pen Y Fai (fig. 20iv; pl. 51) 'local rhaetic sandstone' (Lewis 1970, 71).

Nash-Williams suggested that these monuments were adaptations of cross-slabs bearing ringed crosses. However, as about half these monuments are decorated on all four faces with developed forms of ornament, it seems more likely that the type was a local simplification of the free-standing or disc-headed cross. The group is confirmed by the presence of devolved and 'rustic' ornament which in some cases looks like devolved fretwork, and by the use of a boss in the centre of the cross head (Table 5).
FORM A/B: INCOMPLETE CROSSES

When it is obvious that a fragmentary monument belongs to a particular form of cross, it has been treated above in the relevant section. In the majority of cases where only the shaft or base of the cross survives, it is impossible to say whether the complete monument was a free-standing or disc-headed cross. These are listed below.

1. SLAB-LIKE SHAFTS

a. Bardsey Island 82, Gwynedd (fig.21i; pl.52). The splayed shaft is decorated on the surviving wide face with a skirted panel above a panel of knotwork. The surviving narrow face bears an inscription. The shaft is reminiscent of that from Nassington, Northants (pl.198), where the decoration incorporates a skirted figure and knotwork on the reverse, but there are no Welsh parallels.

b. Oamore 255, Glamorgan (fig.21ii; pl.53) 'local sandstone' (RCAHMW 1977, 55). The two wide faces are inscribed; the two narrow faces are decorated with debased incised ornament. The inscription on one face refers to Glywys and Nertan; these names occur also on Merthyr Mawr 239. There is a tenon at the bottom of the shaft which suggests that it was once mounted in a separate base.

c. Penally 365, Dyfed (fig.21iii; pl.54). Decorated on all faces with panels of interlace and there is an inscription on one wide face. This fragment is related to Penally 364; both monuments employ in their design three-stranded knotwork of similar character and may have been the work of one man. It is possible, therefore, that this fragment once formed part of a ringed cross with fan-shaped arms (form A1).

d. Penally 366, Dyfed (fig.21iv; pl.55). Decorated on all faces with knotwork and frets of which fret 13 relates it most closely to the rectangular-sectioned shaft Penally 363.

2. RECTANGULAR-SECTIONED SHAFTS

a. Coychurch 193, Glamorgan (fig.22i; pl.56). 'Local rhaetic sandstone, probably from the St Mary Hill region' (Nash-Williams 1950, 130 note 1).

b. Newcastle-Bridgend 252, Glamorgan (fig.22ii; pl.57). 'Sandstone' (RCAHMW 1977, 60).
These two shafts have massive mouldings at their edges, and both are decorated with debased interlace and fretwork, with traces of incised rings around the top of the shaft. Both have sockets at the top of the shaft, presumably for the attachment of a cross-head. It is not inconceivable that these two shafts were the work of one man, but both are so worn and damaged that it is impossible to substantiate this hypothesis.

c. Llangaffo 15, Anglesey (fig. 22iii; pl. 58). This is a very weathered and damaged fragment of a splayed shaft which was decorated on all faces.

d. Llantwit Major 221, Glamorgan (fig. 22iv; pl. 59). 'Local rhaetic sandstone from the Bridgend-Pyle area' (Nash-Williams 1950, 142). The splayed shaft is decorated on all faces with double-stranded knotwork. There are no apparent parallels.

e. Llantwit Major 223, Glamorgan (fig. 23i; pl. 60). 'Local rhaetic sandstone from the Bridgend-Pyle area' (Nash-Williams 1950, 144). There is a socket at the top of the shaft for the attachment of a cross-head. The surviving wide face bears an inscription (of which the form of the 'M' relates it to Llantwit Major 222 - below), and on the surviving narrow face is a panel of interlace.

f. Penally 363, Dyfed (fig. 23ii; pl. 61). The slightly splayed shaft is decorated on all faces with interlace, frets, foliate and zoomorphic designs. There is nothing exactly like it in Wales.

g. Rhuddlan 188, Clwyd (fig. 23iii; pl. 62). Two fragments of a shaft decorated on all faces with interlace.

h. St David's 379, Dyfed (fig. 23iv; pl. 63). Remains of what was once a rectangular-sectioned cross shaft which at some later date was made into a cylindrical stoup.

i. Llandewi Aberarth 113, Dyfed (fig. 23v; pl. 64). Two sculptured fragments of a rectangular-sectioned cross shaft with sculptured decoration on all faces, including interlace, fretwork and an inscription.

3. SQUARE-SECTIONED SHAFT

Corwen 276, Clwyd (fig. 23vi; pl. 65). The square-sectioned shaft of a composite monument, splayed towards the base. At the top of the shaft is a plinth defined on each side by a moulded arc. Within each arc there are vestiges of interlace. In the centre of this plinth is a socket, presumably for holding the cross head.
4. **CROSS BASES**

a. **Rectangular:** Llanguicke 986, Glamorgan (fig. 24i; pl. 66). Llangynwyd 988, Glamorgan (fig. 24ii; pl. 67). Merthyr Mawr 987, Glamorgan (fig. 24iii; pl. 68) 'local conglomerate' (RCAHMW 1976, 68). All these bases are formed of a simple rectangular block, with rounded corners, in the centre of which is a rectangular socket.

b. **Square pyramid:** Beaumaris 1, Anglesey (fig. 24iv; pl. 70). Decorated on three faces with frets and knots. Nash-Williams suggested that this base may have belonged to Penmon 37 (1950, 51). Both Beaumaris 1 and Penmon 37 include in their designs a triquetra knot (1) and a T fret (4), but these patterns are too common to be significant. The rarer square-arrow fret (18) which fills one face of the base does not occur on the cross. The base may therefore be of an independent monument. Its form is apparently unique.

c. **Rectangular pyramid:** Llangyfelach 212, Glamorgan (fig. 24v; pl. 69). 'Gritstone' (RCAHMW 1976, 58). Decorated on all faces with designs which seem to have been taken from Llantwit Major 220 (below, 207). The rectangular pyramid base is the most common form of base in Wales and Ireland.

d. **Conical, with flat back:** Diserth 186, Clwyd (fig. 24vi; pl. 71). Decorated on the curved face with debased plaitwork and foliate designs. The lightly incised loose three-stranded plaitwork and the free-rings in the design link it to Diserth 185 of which it may have been the base. The conical form of base has few parallels and is unique in Wales.
Sculptured cross-slabs exist alongside free-standing crosses in all areas of the British Isles c. 700-1100, but they are more common in some areas than in others. In Ireland, large erect slabs are rare, but local groups of small recumbent monuments, identified by their inscriptions as grave slabs, are commonly found in association with the larger monasteries, such as Clonmacnoise. The lorgnette, round-hollow, square and double square-hollow types of cross in both their free-armed and ringed forms were favoured. It is noteworthy that in Ireland there seems to have been a distinction between the types of ornament employed on the free-standing crosses and on these cross-slabs - interlace, for example, is rare on the slabs.

The majority of Manx monuments comprise large erect cross-slabs. Most usually the cross is of the round-hollow type, and may be free-armed or ringed. Simple interlace, frets and figure scenes fill the whole of the front face of the typical Manx cross-slab. Similarly the whole field of decoration was utilised by the carvers of the Pictish cross-slabs, but they generally used more sophisticated ornament, arranged carefully on the slab. The round-hollow and double square-hollow in both their free-armed and ringed forms are the most common types of cross on the Pictish cross-slabs.

This thesis is concerned primarily with the cross-slabs which exhibit sculptured ornament in the form of interlace, fretwork, etc and which are encompassed by Nash-Williams Group III. There are a number of cross-slabs without this ornament and which are placed by Nash-Williams in his Group II which nevertheless have claims to be regarded as sculptured. It is often difficult to make the distinction between sculptured and incised ornament. 'Sculptured' has been defined as any stone carving in relief which makes the cross and its ornament stand out in some way from the surface of the design (Chapter 1, note 1). Thus in the case of a cross represented in the manner illustrated below, although it is otherwise unornamented it is obviously sculptured.
It would seem arbitrary then to exclude from this thesis a cross-slab where the cross is represented by an identical design, but without the carving out of the arm-pit spaces. Thus the compass drawn cross-slabs (C2) are included as a group although all are not, strictly speaking, sculptured.

A further problem arose with Merthyr Mawr 247 which bears on one side a sculptured compass drawn cross and on the other an incised equal-armed cross with splayed expansions at the ends of the arms. The latter conforms to a number of other cross-slabs. As the position of the two types of cross on the cross-slab in question (ie. central, one on each broad face) suggests that they may have been contemporary, it was impossible to separate one from the other. The inclusion of the equal-armed type of cross led to the identification and inclusion of the group of angular line cross-slabs (C1).

Thus the definition 'sculptured' has been widely rather than narrowly interpreted. It does not, however, extend to include cross-slabs where the cross is represented by two simple straight lines which may or may not be encircled. Nor does it include cross-slabs where the cross is represented by a simple Latin or Greek cross in outline.

In Wales, sculptured cross-slabs are most commonly found in the south although there are several examples from mid and north Wales, notably Anglesey. In comparison with the Welsh free-standing and disc-headed forms of cross, the cross-slabs employ fewer types of cross, and their repertoire of ornament is more limited. It is often impossible to say whether they were erect or recumbent. The following groups of cross-slabs may be identified in Wales:

1. **ANGULAR LINE CROSS-SLABS**

   This group comprises cross-slabs formed of a rectangular block of stone bearing a simple angular free-armed cross in outline. The slabs are otherwise unornamented with the exception of four Anglesey slabs which have simple spirals to the side of the cross shaft. There is a northern and a southern group (Map 9). The only anomaly is Ewenny 977, Glamorgan, where the form of the cross conforms to the northern rather than to the southern group.

   a. **Latin cross**: The material is confined to Anglesey with outliers at Whitford, Clwyd and Ewenny, Glamorgan. These slabs are decorated on one wide face with crosses of the Latin type.
i. With splayed arms and spiked foot: Llangaffo 19 (fig. 25i; pl. 72). Llangaffo 20 (fig. 25ii; pl. 73). Llangaffo 24 (fig. 25iii; pl. 74) Llangeinwen 30 (fig. 25iv; pl. 75).

ii. With splayed arms and spiked foot and spirals to the side of the cross shaft: Llangaffo 17 (fig. 25v; pl. 76). Llangaffo 18 (fig. 25vi; pl. 77). Llangeinwen 28 (fig. 25vii; pl. 78). Llangeinwen 29 (fig. 26i; pl. 79).

iii. With squared extensions at the end of the arms and a spiked foot: Ewenny 977 (fig. 26ii; pl. 80) 'Sutton stone' (RCAHMW 1976, 66). Llangaffo 22 (fig. 26iii; pl. 72) 'gritstone' (Nash-Williams 1950, 59). Llanfihangel Esgeifiog 11a (fig. 26iv; pl. 81). Whitford 189 (fig. 26v; pl. 82).

iv. With six round expansions and spiked foot: Llangaffo 23 (fig. 26vi; pl. 72) 'gritstone' (Nash-Williams 1950, 59).

The spiked foot may be regarded as a skeuomorphic representation of a wooden cross where the spike was the means of supporting the cross in the ground (above, 25).

b. Equal-armed cross: These slabs bear angular equal-armed crosses in outline, with splayed expansions at the ends of the arms. All are from Glamorgan: Ewenny 978 (fig. 27i; pl. 83) 'Sutton stone' (RCAHMW 1976, 66). Merthyr Mawr 245/6 (fig. 27ii; pl. 84). Merthyr Mawr 247 (fig. 27iii; pl. 85) 'limestone' (RCAHMW 1976, 65). Merthyr Mawr 247 has crosses on both faces suggesting that this slab once stood erect.

2. COMPASS DRAWN CROSS-SLABS

Rectangular slabs bearing a ringed cross formed by compass arcs, but no other decoration.

a. Encircled equal-armed cross: Ewenny 979, Glamorgan (fig. 28i; pl. 86). Laleston 202, Glamorgan (fig. 28ii; pl. 87) 'local rhaetic sandstone from the Bridgend-Pyle area' (Nash-Williams 1950, 133). Llanafan Fawr 45, Powys (fig. 28iii; pl. 88). Llangan 982, Glamorgan (fig. 28iv; pl. 90) 'rhaetic sandstone' (RCAHMW 1976, 66). Llantwit Major 974, Glamorgan (fig. 28v; pl. 89) 'sandstone' (RCAHMW 1976, 65).
Llanddeu 46a, Powys (fig. 28vi; pl. 91) is related to this group, but the design on the slab is only lightly incised and roughly cut. Llangammarch 57, Powys (fig. 28vii; pl. 92) also bears a cross of this kind, but this has simple ornament beneath it. Finally, Llanglydwen 161, Dyfed (fig. 28viii; pl. 93) is related to this group in that it bears an encircled cross of Latin type.

b. **Encircled fan-shaped cross:** Capel Colman 302, Dyfed (fig. 29i; pl. 94). Cerrig Ceinwen 2, Anglesey (fig. 29ii; pl. 95). Clydai 308, Dyfed (fig. 29iii; pl. 96). Ewenny 981, Glamorgan (fig. 29iv; pl. 97) 'Sutton stone' (RCAHMW 1976, 66). Laleston 203, Glamorgan (fig. 29v; pl. 98) 'Sutton stone' (Nash-Williams 1950, 133). Llanfaglan 90 and 91, Anglesey (fig. 29vi; pl. 99). Margam 230, Glamorgan (fig. 29vii; pl. 100) 'local Pennant grit' (Nash-Williams 1950, 146). Merthyr Mawr 247, Glamorgan (fig. 29viii; pl. 85). Merthyr Mawr 968 (fig. 29ix; pl. 101). Merthyr Mawr 969 (fig. 29x; pl. 102). St Dogmael's 388, Dyfed (fig. 29xi; pl. 103). St Dogmael's 130 (fig. 29xii; pl. 104) is also of this form but beneath the cross is the lightly incised figure of a man.

c. **Encircled cross motif:** Ewenny 980, Glamorgan (fig. 29xiii; pl. 105). Merthyr Mawr 967, Glamorgan (fig. 29xiv; pl. 106) 'Sutton stone' (RCAHMW 1976, 65). On these two slabs, the compass arcs do not form a recognisable cross, but make four or more 'petals'.

The compass drawn cross-slabs form a predominantly Glamorgan group (Map 10). From the evidence of Merthyr Mawr 247, which has crosses on both faces, it would seem that this group of cross-slabs was intended to stand erect.

3. **UNPATTERNED CROSS-SLABS**

Comprising a slab which may be a natural boulder (*) or a stone hewn to a roughly rectangular shape. With the exception of Walton West which is edged with simple knotwork, the ornament is limited to the outline of a cross.

a. **Free-armed; round-hollow:** Llanarth 110, Dyfed (fig. 30i; pl. 107). St Ishmael's 396, Dyfed (fig. 30ii; pl. 108).

b. **Ringed; Latin:** Llawhaden 343, Dyfed (fig. 30iii; pl. 109). Steynton 404, Dyfed (fig. 30iv; pl. 110).
c. **Monogram slabs** (Nash-Williams 1950, 37). A number of otherwise un-patterned cross-slabs are inscribed with the alpha and omega and the sacred monograms ΙΗΕ and ΧΡΣ:

i. **Free-armed; Latin:** St David's 380*, Dyfed (fig.31i; pl.111). St Edren's 392*, Dyfed (fig.31ii; pl.112). Llanveynoe 410, Hereford (fig.31iii; pl.113).

ii. **Round-hollow; ringed:** St Edren's 393*, Dyfed (fig.31iv; pl.114). Walton West*, Dyfed (fig.31v; pl.116) 'Sandstone' (Kay 1958, 122-3).

These two monuments, together with a fragment from St David's 381 (fig.31vi; pl.117) are so similar that it is reasonable to suppose that they were the work of one craftsman or school of craftsmen.

With the exception of Llanveynoe 410, this form is confined to the coasts of Dyfed (Map 11). Llawhaden 343 is set within its own roughly-hewn stone base, indicating that it was designed as an erect cross-slab. The bases of the monuments Steynton 404 and Walton West are undressed and unornamented, indicating that these once stood in a similar base or the ground. By analogy, it is likely that St David's 380 and 381 and St Edren's 392 and 393 were also erect cross-slabs. The coped form of the monument Llanveynoe 410 suggests that it was designed to be recumbent.

4. **INTERLACED RING CROSS-SLABS**

Comprising small rectangular slabs where the ornament is confined to a ringed cross formed of, or decorated solely by, interlaced bands. Two slabs, Llangyfelach 211 and Port Talbot 261 are inscribed with the descriptive term *'Crux Xri'* - the cross of Christ. On a third, Baglan 191, this is implied by the use of an initial cross - hence Nash-Williams' description of them as *'Crux Xri slabs'* (1950, 37). Llanwnws 125 has *'xra' at the top right of the slab, and an elaborate inscription to the side of the cross motif (see Chapter 3, Section 1).

a. **Round-hollow, ringed:** Baglan 191, Glamorgan (fig.32i; pl.118) 'sandstone' (RCAHM 1976, 43). Margam 232, Glamorgan (fig.32v; pl.119) 'local Pennant sandstone' (Nash-Williams 1950, 148). Port Talbot 261, Glamorgan (fig.32ii; pl.120) 'sandstone' (RCAHM 1976, 43).

b. **Latin, ringed:** Llangyfelach 211, Glamorgan (fig.32iii; pl.121) 'gritstone' (RCAHM 1976, 42). Llanwnws 125, Dyfed (fig.32iv; pl.122)
'dark grit characteristic of the Cwm Ystwyth district' (Nash-Williams 1950, 100).

Cross-slabs on which the cross is ornamented by interlaced bands are also found in the Isle of Man. In particular, there would seem to be a relationship between Margam 232 and Manx cross-slabs such as Michael 89 (pl.200) where the arm-pits of the cross are pierced (discussed below, 240). The Manx slabs, however, are much larger than the Welsh examples and the whole of the slab is decorated. Small cross-slabs of this kind with ornament confined to the cross itself seem to be a phenomenon peculiar to West Glamorgan. Llanwnnws 125 is thus isolated geographically and it is possible that this slab represents an independent development from Group II (Map 12). Margam 232 has an expanse of roughly dressed stone beneath the cross suggesting that it was designed to stand erect. This slab, like the others of the group, is decorated on one face only. In the absence of any feature to indicate how the other slabs might have been set in the ground, it seems reasonable to suppose that they were recumbent upon the ground.

5. **FREE-ARMED CROSS-SLABS**

These are characterised by a narrow slab decorated with one or more small free-armed crosses and other ornament which fills one of the wider faces of the slab.

a. *Latin cross*: Llandyfaelog Fach 49, Powys (fig.33i; pl.123). Llanhamlach 61, Powys (fig.33iii; pl.124).

b. *Maltese and initial crosses*: Llanfrynach 56, Powys (fig.33ii; pl.125). Reynoldston 266, Glamorgan (fig.33iv; pl.126) 'sandstone' (RCAHMW 1976, 40).

This is a mid-Welsh group with an outlier in Glamorgan (Map 13). The slabs are linked by form rather than by ornament (Table 6). Llanhamlach 61 is inscribed on one edge of the slab, and Llanfrynach 56 is unornamented at the base. These features suggest that these slabs once stood erect in the ground. The absence of ornament on the back of the slabs may indicate that they stood against an upright feature, perhaps a building.

6. **PANELLED CROSS-SLABS**

On these slabs, both the cross and the surrounding fields are divided into panels and decorated. In each case the cross is of the round-hollow ringed form:
Bulmore 290, Gwent (fig. 34ii; pl. 127).
Caerleon 291, Gwent (fig. 34iv; pl. 128).
St Arvan's 292, Gwent (fig. 34i; pl. 129).
St David's 377, Dyfed (fig. 34ii; pl. 130).

Table 7 indicates that the Gwent slabs form a distinctive south-eastern group (Map 14). The occurrence of peculiar bird-headed angels on Caerleon 291 and St Arvan's 292 suggests that they may have been the work of one hand. St David's 377 is not related to the Gwent slabs in the style of its decoration. The practice of panelling the fields to the side of the cross is perhaps best paralleled on Pictish slabs. The fragmentary nature of the Welsh slabs makes it impossible to say whether they were designed to be erect or recumbent.

7. THE FULL LENGTH CROSS-SLAB

Where the cross extends the full length of the slab.

a. Plain ringed cross: Llanrhaeadr Ym Mochnant 181, Clwyd (fig. 35i; pl. 131). St Ishmael's 397, Dyfed (fig. 35iv; pl. 132). On these two slabs ornament on the wide face is limited to the fields to the side of the cross. One narrow face of Llanrhaeadr Ym Mochnant 181 is ornamented with the Z fret (3). It is possible that another monument took this form, namely Llandrinio 293, Powys (fig. 35v; pl. 134). This is a rectangular slab of similar width and thickness to number 181, but the decoration on both wide faces has been dressed away, and the top of the slab is missing. The narrow faces are ornamented with a four-cord plait (interlace 4) and a row of arrow fret (11). These may have stood erect.

b. Decorated cross: Llowes 408, Gwent (fig. 35ii; pl. 133). Nevern 359, Dyfed (fig. 35iii; pl. 135). On these two slabs the cross alone is ornamented. Any resemblance between the two cross-slabs ends here. Llowes 408 has one wide face decorated with a ringed round-hollow cross filled with chevron-like ornament, whilst the free-armed Latin cross on Nevern 359 is formed of interlace. The Llowes slab is decorated on both wide faces and still stands erect, but it is now impossible to determine if this was the case with Nevern 359.

c. The double-cross-slab: Meifod 295, Powys (fig. 36i; pl. 136). Newcastle-Bridgend 254, Glamorgan (fig. 36ii; pl. 137). Meifod 295 bears two crosses; an encircled Maltese cross above and connected to a free-armed Latin cross with slightly splayed arms. The whole slab is decorated with haphazardly disposed interlace, knots and zoomorphs. Newcastle-
Bridgend 254 bears a double encircled equal-armed cross with another Latin cross adjacent to this design. It is otherwise plain. The two slabs are not related and both are apparently unique.

8. **FRETTED RING CROSS SLABS**

This term was used by Nash-Williams (1950, 37) to describe a group of four cross slabs peculiar to St David's, Dyfed. Each bears an ornamental cross enclosed in a circle of simple Z-shaped fretwork and, with the exception of Number 382, they are all formed of rough blocks of stone dressed only on one surface.

374 (fig. 37iii; pl. 138), cross formed of interlace.
375 (fig. 37iv; pl. 139), cross formed of frets.
376 (fig. 37i; pl. 140), round-hollow cross with alpha and omega, IHS and XPS.
382 (fig. 37ii; pl. 141), Maltese cross above encircled interlace cross with alpha and omega, IHS and XPS.

These slabs are unique in Wales, but Irish material yields close parallels to St David's 374 and 375 (see Chapter 5, Section 3).

9. **CIRCLED ANGLESEY GROUP**

This group comprises five rectangular cross-slabs with miscellaneous linear decoration which are linked by the use of circles in their design:

Cerrig Ceinwen 3 (fig. 38i; pl. 142).
Llanbadrig 7 (fig. 38v; pl. 143).
Llanfihangel Tre'r Beirdd 12 (fig. 38iii; pl. 144).
Llangaffo 21 (fig. 38ii; pl. 72).
Llangainwen 31 (fig. 38iv; pl. 145).

Of these cross-slabs, only Cerrig Ceinwen 3 and Llangaffo 21 pay any attention to the form of the cross. The others all have apparently abstract linear designs, of which the interpretation is unclear.

10. **MISCELLANEOUS CROSS-SLABS**

a. **Llandeilo 155 and 156, Dyfed** (fig. 39ii; pl. 1470). Llandeilo 156 comprises a small cross-slab decorated on both wide faces and thus intended to stand erect. On one side is a double-square-hollow cross filled with interlace, and on the other an encircled lorgnette motif. Only one wide face of Llandeilo 155 survives, but this bears a double-
square-hollow cross identical to that of Llandeilo 156 and was presumably the work of the same craftsman. The lorgnette motif occurs elsewhere in the stonework of the British Isles (Appendix B, cross form 19), but the cross with the square ring is better paralleled in manuscripts than in stonework (see Chapter 5, Section 8).

b. Nash 250, Glamorgan (fig. 39i; pl. 146). 'Sandstone' (RCAHMW 1976, 44). A tall and narrow cross slab decorated on one wide face with a round-hollow ringed cross which extends less than half way down the slab. The cross shaft is flanked by two figures and beneath the cross there are two panels with figures. The whole is executed in low relief. The fact that the lower part of the slab is undecorated may indicate that it was set erect in the ground. The affinities of this slab are Manx, with a particularly close resemblance to Maughold 67 (pl. 201; discussed below, 241).

c. Llanyhyd 334, Dyfed (fig. 39iii; pl. 149). The lower part of a rectangular slab decorated on one wide face with what seems to have been an open disc within two lines of 'T' fret pattern. It is apparently unique.

d. Llanveynoe 411, Herefordshire (fig. 40i; pl. 150). Included in this survey because of its proximity to Offa's Dyke (Map 15). A rectangular slab bearing on one wide face a representation of the Crucifixion on a Latin cross. Christ’s head is inclined to the left, the eyes are open and the face is beardless. The arms are outstretched, the legs together and slightly bent with the feet turning to the right. The figure wears a loin cloth; there are no attendants. The whole may be compared with the southern English rood figures (see Chapter 5, Section 2).

e. Llandetty 46, Powys (fig. 40ii; pl. 151). A tall block of stone, squareish in section decorated on all faces with incised ornament forming free-armed and ringed Latin crosses. Three faces are also inscribed. The monument was obviously designed to stand erect. There are no known parallels and it is suggested that this was the product of an amateur craftsman (below, 334).

f. Llancorsa 59, Powys (fig. 40iii; pl. 152). The upper part of a cross-slab ornamented on one wide face and with an incised inscription on one narrow face. The ornament is very roughly incised and comprises an encircled Latin cross flanked by what appears to be degenerate interlace or fretwork. Above the cross is a horizontal line of zig-zag.
g. Tregaron 133, Dyfed (fig. 40iv; pl. 153) 'local gritstone' (Nash-Williams 1950, 104). A rectangular cross-slab ornamented on one wide and one narrow face. The wide face bears a ringed cross formed of four sunken panels and with the bottom arm of the cross extended to a point. Above the cross are traces of a sunken triangular panel. On the side of the slab is an inscription flanked above by a triangular motif (Knot 7) and below by a chequered panel. The slab was presumably designed to stand erect.

h. St David's 383, Dyfed (fig. 40v; pl. 117). Part of a roughly rectangular shaped cross-slab decorated on one face with a ringed equal-armed cross, the arms of which are splayed at the ends. The cross is filled with irregular interlace and there are inscriptions between the arms of the cross. Beneath the cross is a band of 'Z' fret and several intersecting circles, irregularly disposed.
D. RELATED MONUMENTS

The following monuments are included in this thesis because they are related to the sculptured crosses and cross-slabs by the insular ornament with which they are decorated.

1. THE ROUND PILLAR

Llantwit Major 224, Glamorgan (fig. 41i; pl. 154). 'Local rhaetic sandstone from the Bridgend-Pyle area' (Nash-Williams 1950, 144). A round pillar diminishing in circumference towards the top. The pillar was designed with a vertical groove which the panels of ornament incorporate in the design. Allen (1889) suggested that a pair of these pillars once held a wooden screen. This hypothesis was corroborated in 1900 by the discovery of two fragments, Llantwit Major 225 and 226 (pl. 189), which most probably formed part of the twin pillar (Halliday 1901, 148). It seems unlikely that the pillars at Llantwit were ever capped by a cross head as there is nothing to secure an upper member. It is just possible that the very small rounded fragment Llanrhaeadr Ym Mochnant 180 (pl. 155) formed part of a similar monument, but otherwise there are no known parallels. Llantwit Major 224 bears little resemblance to the round-shafted monuments found elsewhere in the British Isles.

2. FIGURED SLABS

Three Glamorgan slabs bear representations of figures in the orans position of prayer but no cross (Map 16):

Llanrhydian 218 (fig. 42i; pl. 156).
Pontardawe 256 (fig. 42ii; pl. 157) 'Pennant sandstone' (RCAHM 1976, 65).
Seven Sisters 269 (fig. 42iii; pl. 158) 'Coarse sandstone' (RCAHM 1976, 45).

Figures in the orans position are most commonly seen on Irish monuments (see Chapter 5, Section 3). The stylised design of the ornament on Llanrhydian 218 and Pontardawe 256 is reminiscent of certain pieces of manuscript illumination and metalwork (discussed in Chapter 5, Section 8). The figure on Seven Sisters 269 wears a kilt-like tunic comparable to that worn by the figures represented on cross shafts at Bardsey 82, Gwynedd and Nassington, Northants (above, 48).
3. THE HOGBACKED TOMBSTONE

Llandewi Aberarth 114, Dyfed (fig. 41ii; pl. 159) is one of the few examples of this type of monument to be found outside of the north of England and Scotland (Appendix B, Monumental form 4; Map 17). Lang proposed a typology for the English and Scottish hogbacks according to the decorative elements used on them (1976, 206-233). The hogback from Llandewi does not fall into any of these groups as it is decorated with only a simple ribbing.

4. THE ORNAMENTED SLAB

Two monuments from Dyfed; Cribyn 107 and Silian 129 (figs. 43i and ii; pls. 160; 161) are both comprised of a rectangular block of stone, apparently complete in itself, decorated with insular ornament but without a cross, unless the crossed cords of the interlace are regarded as symbolic of this. Silian 129 is decorated on both wide faces and was thus intended to stand erect. Only one face of Cribyn 107 is decorated; this bears three rows of thick single-stranded interlace (28) identical in layout and execution to that on one face of Silian 129. It is reasonable to suppose that both slabs were the work of one man. No close comparisons are known.

In Glamorgan, Llangenydd 209 (fig. 43iii; pl. 162) comprises a splayed slab decorated on the visible wide face with dense and complex interlace incorporating a cruciform break in its design. The monument is made of sandstone (RCAHMW 1976, 46). The upper and lower portions are missing and the surviving piece is very worn. It is impossible to identify the original form of the monument, or to point to any close comparisons.

5. SUNDIALS

Clynnog Fawr 85, Gwynedd (fig. 43iv; pl. 163) is a sundial comprising a narrow rectangular erect slab widening at the top into a flat semi-circular expansion. There is a hole for the gnomon at the centre of the diameter of the circle, and three radial lines indicating the tides of the day. Green (1928, 493) indicated that the day was divided into eight tides, of which four occur in the hours of daylight and can therefore be measured by a sundial. The three radial lines mark the middle of each day time tide, and the branch lines may indicate more precise times for prayer etc. (ibid). The closest affinities of Clynnog Fawr 85 are to the Irish group of free-standing slab dials (Appendix B, Monumental form 5).
6. **Fonts**

Comprising a number of monuments formed of a hollowed out cubical or cylindrical block of stone, mostly from Anglesey (Map 18). These fonts contained water for the administration of the rite of baptism—which presumably took place within a church (Bond 1908, 29). Certain elements in the decoration of these fonts indicate that they were subject to Romanesque sculptural influence (below, 201). The following are included in this survey because they have features which link them to the pre-Norman sculptural traditions:

- *Cerrig Ceinwen 4*, Anglesey (fig. 44i; pl. 164).
- *Heneglwys* 1 and 2, Anglesey (figs. 44ii and iii; pls. 165, 166).
- *Kinnerley*, Powys (fig. 44iv; pl. 167).
- *Patrishow*, Powys (fig. 44v; pl. 168).
- *Llanbeulan*¹, Anglesey (fig. 44vi; pl. 169).
- *Llangristiolus*, Anglesey (fig. 44vii; pl. 170).
- *Llaniestyn Rural*, Gwynedd (fig. 44viii; pl. 171).
- *Newborough*, Anglesey (fig. 44ix; pl. 172).
- *Trefdraeth*, Anglesey (fig. 44x; pl. 173).

*$ indicates that the font is formed of a cubical block of stone.

The Anglesey fonts *Cerrig Ceinwen 4*, *Newborough 36*, *Llangristiolus* and *Trefdraeth* are linked by the division of the decorated surface into fields, each of which contains a separate motif. The form of the fonts, and the small area in which they occur suggests that the Anglesey sculptors were familiar with each others work. In only one case, however, is it possible to suggest that two pieces were the work of one man. These are the rectangular stoup at *Llanbeulan* and the cylindrical font at *Heneglwys*; the decoration of both comprises finely cut motifs in relief, which include arcading, the T-fret ($) and a chevron design (see Table 8).

7. **Architectural Sculpture**

*Merthyr Mawr 243* and 244, Glamorgan (fig. 45i and ii; pl. 174-5) comprise two small, almost square, slabs of Sutton stone (RCAHMW 1975, 63). On the underside, each slab has a chamfered edge. These slabs may once have formed part of a larger work, perhaps as ornamental sculpture adorning a building. These slabs are included in this survey because they are both decorated with a double looped square, a design which at first sight looks insular. In fact its distribution indicates that this is a Norman and later motif (Appendix B, Knot 6).
The narrow rectangular slab built into the wall of the church at Devynock, Powys (fig. 45iii; pl. 176) which bears the insular knot 7, alongside an illegible inscription in Romanesque capitals, was presumably carved as a piece of architectural sculpture. Similarly Llancarfan 204, Glamorgan (fig. 45iv; pl. 177) most probably had an architectural purpose, although this cannot now be determined. This block of Sutton stone (Nash-Williams 1950, 133) bears a row of figure-of-eight knots (interlace 22) and an inscription in Romanesque capitals.

The decorated tympanum is a Norman architectural device, but its decoration may sometimes exhibit influence from the earlier period. This is the case with the tympanum over the doorway of the Priory church at Penmon, Anglesey (pl. 178), where the animal surrounded by interlace is reminiscent of pre-Norman work.
Table 1. Decorative motifs of the ringed cross with fan-shaped arms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knots</th>
<th>194</th>
<th>360</th>
<th>303</th>
<th>240</th>
<th>364</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interlace</th>
<th>194</th>
<th>360</th>
<th>303</th>
<th>240</th>
<th>364</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frets</th>
<th>194</th>
<th>360</th>
<th>303</th>
<th>240</th>
<th>364</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Decorative motifs of the moulded pillar cross.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motifs</th>
<th>65</th>
<th>47</th>
<th>111</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knots</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interlace</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Frets</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65: Llanyris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47: Llandewi'r Cwm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111: Llanbadarn Fawr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. Decorative motifs of the disc-headed cross with slab-like shaft.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>145</th>
<th>207</th>
<th>391</th>
<th>235</th>
<th>231</th>
<th>398</th>
<th>220</th>
<th>147</th>
<th>234</th>
<th>263</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knots</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross on head</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross on neck</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosette</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'rustic'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cable moulding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure scene</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4. Decorative motifs of the north Welsh disc-headed cross.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knots</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interlace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross on head</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross in armpits</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cable moulding</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure scenes</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key to table 4

A Diserth 185, Clwyd
B Penmon 37, Anglesey
C Penmon 38, Anglesey
D Whitford 190, Clwyd
E Chester - Grosvenor museum shaft
F Chester - Grosvenor museum head
G Chester - St. John's 1
H Chester - St. John's 2
I Chester - St. John's fragments
J Muncaster, Cumb.
K Dearham, Cumb.
L Aspatria, Cumb.
M Rockcliff, Cumb.
N Bromfield, Cumb.
Table 5. Decorative motifs of the panelled cartwheel form.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ewenny 196</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenfig 200</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Llangan 208</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neath 251a</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolven 265</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tythegston 270a</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Talbot 262</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margam 236</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margam 237</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merthyr Mawr 241</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merthyr Mawr 242</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pen Y Fai</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A: Boss on head
B: wavy line
C: 'rustic' ornament
D: ring and dot
E: fret 2
F: fret 3
Table 6. Decorative motifs of the free-armed cross-slab.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>49</th>
<th>61</th>
<th>56</th>
<th>266</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knots</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interlace</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frets</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cable moulding</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoomorphs</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orans figure</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

49: Llandyfaelog Fach
61: Llanhamlach
56: Llanfrynach
266: Reynoldston
Table 7. Decorative motifs of the panelled cross-slab.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>290</th>
<th>292</th>
<th>291</th>
<th>377</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knots</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interlace</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fret</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cable moulding</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Foss on head</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bird-angels</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Animal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Triskile</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Seraph</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

290: Bulmore
292: St. Arvan's
291: Caerleon
377: St. David's
Table 8. Decorative motifs of fonts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knots</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interlace</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chevron</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arcading</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A: Cerrig Ceinwen
B: Heneglwys 'stoup'
C: Heneglwys font
D: Kinnerley
E: Llanbeulan
F: Llangristiolus
G: Llaniestyn
H: Newborough
I: Trefdraeth
Map 1. The ringed cross with fan-shaped arms.

- Definite
- Probable
Map 2. The moulded pillar cross and composite-shafted cross.

- Moulded pillar cross
- Composite-shafted cross
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Fig. 40.—The frontier Dykes of Wales in the VIIIth century. Offa's Dyke, Wat's Dyke, and certain cross-ridge and cross-valley Dykes of central Wales are shown. The shaded area represents the outcrop of Old Red Sandstone. Based on Arch. Camb., 1930, Fig. 27, and lent by the National Museum of Wales.
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After Lang (1976).
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CHAPTER THREE

THE WELSH MATERIAL: ITS PURPOSE, LOCATION AND MANUFACTURE

1. PURPOSE

The cross, by its very form, is an outward expression of Christian belief, and as such must have been dedicated to God. This is explicit in the inscriptions of the following monuments which bear the Alpha and Omega and the sacred monograms IHC and XPC: Llanveynoe 410, St David's 376, 380 and 382, St Edren's 292 and 293 and Walton West. Llandetty 46 is more explicit in stating that it is 'crux Xpi' - the cross of Christ.

A small number of Welsh monuments may have been dedicated to the evangelists; Llanfrynach 56 and Llanhamlach 61 bear the name 'Iohannis' and Margam 236 'Petri'. This would be in line with the contemporary Irish practice of dedicating monuments to saints and evangelists - for example the cross of saints Patrick and Columba at Kells. It is noteworthy that the schematised plan of a monastery in the Book of Mulling pictures twelve crosses within and around the monastic enclosure, and several of these are dedicated to evangelists and prophets (Henry 1965, 135). This distribution may have been followed at sites such as Llantwit Major, Margam, St David's and Llangaffo which have yielded several monuments, now gathered together at one spot. The purpose was presumably to sanctify the site and its precincts.

In the majority of cases it is evident from the inscriptions (which occur especially on free-standing and disc-headed crosses) that not only was the cross dedicated to God, but that it was also erected in order to commemorate one or more persons. More often than not the person/s commemorated seem still to be alive. The erection of the monument is often stated to have the additional purpose of storing up merit for the soul of the person who was responsible for it.

Llandetty 46: 'guadan sacerdos fecit crux p(ro) an(ima) ni(n)id' (Nash-Williams 1950, 71).

Llantwit Major 220: 'ni (=in) nomine d(e)i patris et f(ili et s)peretua san(d)i (= sancti) (h)anc (cr)ucem houelt prope(ra)bit pro anima res(n(atr)es (=patris) e(i)ua' (Nash-Williams 1950, 140).

(1) The letters or words in brackets in the following inscriptions are those supplied by the scholar cited in the reference.
Ilantwit Major 222: 'Samson posuit hanc crucem pro anima eius'.

Ilantwit Major 223: 'in nomine d(e)i summi incipit crux salutoris quae preparavit samsoni apatri pro anima sua (et) pro anima iuthahelo rex et artmali et tec(ai)n' (Nash-Williams 1950, 144).

Margam 231: 'crux xpi. enniaun p(ro) anima suororect fecit'.

Margam 233: 'i(n) nomine d(e)i sum(n)i crux crizdi (=christi) preparabit crutne pro an(i)ma ahest' (Nash-Williams 1950, 148).

Llantisilio Yn Ial 182: '... concenn itaque pronepos eliseg edificavit hunc lapidem pro auo ...'

Merthyr Mawr 239: '(co)nbelani (p)ossuit hanc crucem pro anima eius sci (=sancti) giiuissi nerttan et fratri eius et pater eius a me preparatus scilloc' (Nash-Williams 1950, 154).

Several Welsh crosses and cross-slabs bear an inscription comprising the name of one individual:

Baglan 191: 'brancuf'
Carew 303: 'margiteut rex etg(uin) filius' (Radford 1949)
Coychurch 194: 'ebisar'
Llandough 206: 'irbic'
Llandyfaelog Fach 49: 'briamail flou'
Llanfynydd 159: 'eiudon'
Llanhraiadr Yn Mochnant 181: 'concom filiu edelstan' (Radford and Hemp 1957)
Tregaron 133: 'eneveri'

In these cases the purpose of the monument must be to commemorate the person named, but it is impossible to say whether the person is alive or dead. The inscriptions on only two Welsh monuments, both cross-slabs, indicate that they were funerary in character:

Llanfihangel Gwedu 54a: 'hic iacet ...'
St David's 382: 'pontificis abraham filii hic hed et isac quiescunt'

A third cross-slab, Llanwnws 125, may also have been funerary in character as indicated by its inscription: 'q(u)icunq(ue) explicau(er)it h(oc) no(men) det benedixionem pro anima hiroidil filius carotinn (Nash-Williams 1950, 100).

In fact it is probable that there was some division in function between the crosses and cross-slabs. The form of the latter would be con-
sistent with a funerary and memorial purpose. This is supported by analogy with material from other areas. In Ireland, for example, the small cross-slabs are obviously funerary and often carry an invocation for prayer for the deceased (Macalister 1949, 43-70). The Scandinavian runic inscriptions on the Manx slabs often state that they were erected 'to the memory of' a certain person (Ballal106, Andreas 131, Michael 132).

The purpose of two Welsh monuments seems to have been to record gifts of land, apparently to ecclesiastical authorities:

Ogmone 255: '(sciendum) est (omnibus) quod ded(it) arthmail agrum d(e)o et episcopi et hertan et fili epi(scopi)'. (Williams 1932, 233).

Merthy Mawr 240: 'i(n) nomine d(e)i patris et filiu (et) speri(tus) ... ...(eight lines illegible)... ... isto in crefium in proprium usq (usque) in diem judicii'. 'In the Name of the Father and of the Son (and) of the (Holy) Spirit ... ... in this writing into its possession until the day of judgement' (Nash-Williams 1950, 155).

Parallels to this practice may be found in Ireland, for example at Kilnasaggart, where a stone decorated with an ornamented cross bears an inscription translated 'this place has been given by Ternoc son of Garan the Little under the protection of Peter the Apostle' (Macalister 1949, 115). It is reasonable to suppose that these stones were originally erected at the centre, or near the boundary, of the property which was the subject of the grant.

With regard to secondary evidence, saints 'Lives' often corroborate the evidence of the inscriptions to show that the purpose of the monuments was often commemorative - but of an incident in the life or death of the saint in question. It should be noted that some accounts may be stories invented to explain the erection and location of well-known crosses of the hagiographers' time.

Adomnan's Life of Columba (2)
"the cross was set up in that place before the doorway of the shed (where Columba's uncle Ernan died) and likewise the other cross set up where the saint stood where Ernan died stands even today" (Anderson 1961, 307).
"The saint (Columba) left the barn and returning towards the monastery sat down midway. In that place a cross was later fixed in a mill stone and is seen standing by the roadside even today". (Anderson 1961, 523).

(2) Written in the late seventh century by Adomnan, ninth abbot of Iona (Anderson 1961, 1-20).
Eddius' Life of Wilfrid (3)
"The monks erected a cross to mark the spot (where Wilfrid's body was washed) and many miracles were later performed there". (Webb 1973, 203).

Bede's Ecclesiastical History (4)
"When king Oswald was about to give battle to the heathen, he set up the sign of the holy cross ... The place is pointed out to this day and held in great veneration ... At this spot ... innumerable miracles of healing are known to have been performed". (Book III, Chapter 2; translated by Sherley-Price 1968, 142-3).

William of Malmesbury's Life of Aldhelm (5)
This states that crosses were erected at each place where the body of Aldhelm rested on the way to his burial place. (Hamilton 1870, 383-384).

Joscelin's Life of Kentigern (6)
"The venerable father and bishop Kentigern has a custom, in the places in which at anytime by preaching he had won the people to the dominion of Christ, or had dwelt for any length of time, there to erect the triumphant standard of the cross". (Forbes 1874, 109).

Simeon of Durham's History of the Kings (7)
Records that the head and foot of Bishop Acca's grave at Durham were marked by crosses. "On one, that at his head, was an inscription stating that he was there buried". (Stevenson 1855, 643).

Life of Illtud (8)
Described how Illtud was responsible for the burial of Samson at Llantwit Major: "The body was received and laid by the clergy with honour in the midst of stones placed four square in the cemetery, and a stone cross was erected over it with an inscription stating that a bishop lay there". (Evans 1971, 112).

(3) Written between 710 and 720 by a priest of Ripon church called in later documents Eddius Stephanus (Webb 1973, 28).

(4) Written in the first half of the eighth century by Bede, a monk of Jarrow (Latin text edited by Plummer, 1896).

(5) The Life of Aldhelm forms part of William of Malmesbury's De Gestis Pontificum which he completed c. 1125 (Hamilton 1870, vii note 1). Hamilton's edition of the text is based on Magdalen College Oxford MS 172.

(6) Written at the end of the twelfth century by a monk of Furness (Forbes 1874, lxiv).

(7) The work of a twelfth-century historian (Stevenson 1855, Vol 3, Pt 2).

(8) Written in the early twelfth century at Llantwit Major (Evans 1971, 144). This is presumably a fabrication of events to explain the existence
Life of Willibald (9)

This suggests that the cross might function as a marker for a place of public or private worship and prayer. "It is the custom of the Saxon race that on many of the estates of nobles and of good men they are wont to have not a church but the standard of the Holy Cross dedicated to our Lord and reverenced with great honour, lifted up on high so as to be convenient for the frequency of daily prayer". (Holder-Eggar 1887).

Excavations of St Bertelin's, Stafford, yielded a wooden cross buried beneath the church which may have marked the place of open-air services before the building of the church (Ordnance Survey 1973, 122). Crosses may have continued to function in this way after the building of the church. Monuments such as Ruthwell and Bewcastle and the Irish scripture crosses may have acted as the focus of didactic preaching in societies where the majority of people were illiterate. The latter purpose cannot be argued for the Welsh monuments as these bear very few scriptural representations. Nevertheless, it is evident from their size alone that the larger Welsh crosses (particularly such as Carew 303, Nevern 360 and Whitford 1Q0) must have been impressive local landmarks. As such they would have made convenient meeting places for secular as well as ecclesiastical gatherings - whether or not this was the original purpose of the monument. This is illustrated by a charter appended to the Life of Cadog which records that one grant was confirmed 'near to the Cross, which is on the road known to many' (Evans 1932, 152).

The church, with the stone cross as its principal standard, penetrated the lives of all the inhabitants of the British Isles, but none more so than the lives of the Welsh, if we are to believe Giraldus Cambrensis:

"They show a greater respect than any other nation to churches and ecclesiastical persons, to the relics of saints, bells, holy books, and the cross which they devoutly revere". (Hoare 1968, 507).

(8) Cont'd. of the cross shaft Llantwit Major 222 which bears the names of Samson and Illtud.

(9) The Life is an eighth-century compilation.

(10) The Life is an eleventh-century compilation, but the charters appended to it appear to be based on earlier material. The extract is from Evans' Charter I which he believed was made in the sixth century in the lifetime of Cadog Abbot of Llancarfan (Evans 1932, 151-152).

(11) From Giraldus' account of the itinerary of Archbishop Baldwin through Wales, which was compiled early in the thirteenth century (Hoare 1968, 334)

* For a more detailed account see Oswald, A. (ed.) The Church of St. Bertelin at Stafford and its cross. Birmingham Museum and Art Gallery (n.d.).
2. DISTRIBUTION AND LOCATION

This section is concerned with a factual account of the distribution and location of the monuments; the implications of these factors are reserved for discussion elsewhere.

The Welsh crosses and cross-clubs of Group III, like their predecessors of Group II, are found almost exclusively on low-lying ground below 500 ft. Both monumental groups are concentrated on the northern and southern coasts of the country, with a scattered distribution inland along river valleys. Group II has a western emphasis with many monuments concentrated in the north of Dyfed and few in Glamorgan (Map 1). Group III monuments, however, are clustered in the Glamorgan sea plain, and in north Wales extend further west along the valleys of the Dee and the tributaries of the river Severn, (Map 2). Both groups have representatives along the rivers Usk, Towy and Teifi, but it is remarkable that in southern Powys Group II monuments are far more numerous than those of Group III.

There is remarkably little coincidence of site between monuments of Groups II and III. Only ten sites (Corwen, Kenfig, Llandeilo, Llanwnda, Llawhaden, Neath, Nevern, Port Talbot, St. David's and St. Dogmael's) have examples of monuments from both groups. Of the sites which produced four or more examples of Group II stones (Llandewi Brefi (4), Llanwnda (8), Llanchlwydog (4) and St. Dogmael's (4)), only Llanwnda and St. Dogmael's also yielded examples of Group III. Similarly, the sites most prolific in Group III monuments (Bangor (4), Ewenny (6), Llangaffo (11), Llantwit Major (6), Margam (7), Merthyr Mawr (7), St. David's (10) and St. Edren's (4) are devoid of representatives of the earlier group.

It is often difficult to determine the original location of the monuments as there was a tendency in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries for antiquarians to remove monuments from their original settings and to place them in churches or churchyards for their better preservation. In the late nineteenth century, for example, Sir John Nichol made a collection of monuments at the oratory of Merthyr Mawr house (Spencer 1970, 27). More recently, stones from the neighbourhood of Margam and Port Talbot were collected together in the old school house at Margam (Radford 1972, 7).

The following lists record the oldest known associations of the monuments. A brief outline of the site and situation of each monument of
Group III is given in Appendix C. These aspects receive further discussion in Chapter 7.

i. Churchyard

Baglan 191  
Bangor 80  
Caerleon 291  
Cerrig Ceinwen 2,4,5  
Clydai 308  
Corwen 276  
Coychurch 193,194  
Diserth 185  
Laugharne 145  
Llanarth 110  
Llanbadarn Fawr 11  
Llandough 206  
Llandrindio 293  
Llandyfaelog Fach 49  
Llanfair Mathafarn Eithaf 11  
Llangaffo 15-24  
Llangamarch 57  
Llangan 207  
Llangiwg 210

ii. Built into the fabric of churches

Corwen 275  
Devynock  
Ewenny 977-981  
Llanfan Fawr 45  
Llanbadrig 7  
Llanarthfan 204  
Llandeilo 155  
Llandetty 46  
Llandewi Aberarth 113,114  
Llanfihangel Cwmdu 54a  
Llanfihangel Tre'r Beirdd 12  
Llanfrynach 56  
Llangaffo 14  
Llangiwn 28-31  
Llangeinwen 209  
Llangors 59  
Llanguafael Fach 49  
Llanedeyr 110  
Llandrindio 293  
Llandyfaelog Fach 49  
Llanfair Mathafarn Eithaf 11  
Llangaffo 15-24  
Llangamarch 57  
Llangan 207  
Llangiwg 210

ll. Built into the fabric of churches
iii. Inside church

Bangor 79
Corwen 274
Diserth 186
Heneglwys
Ilanbeulan
Ilandew 46a
Ilanfaglan 90,91
Ilanfihangel Esgeifog 11a
Ilanegfni

iv. Vicinity of church

Bangor 80a
Bardsey 82
Caper Colman 302
Clynnog 85
Ilandaff 205
Ilandeilo 156
Ilanfachraeth 8
Ilangoan 208
Ilanhamlach 61

v. No known ecclesiastical association

Beaumaris 1
Bulmore 290
Carew 303
Coity 192
Cribyn 107
Kenfig 200
Kinnerley
Laleston 202
Llanfynydd 159
Llantisilio Yn Ial 182
Ilanynis 65

Llangristiolius
Llaniestyn Rural
Llantwit Major 221
Newborough 36
Penally 363
St Arvan's 292
St David's 379-381
St Dogmael's 388

Ilanveynoe 410
Margam 232,234,235
Penally 365,366
Penmon 37,38
Resolven 265
Rhuddlan 188
St David's 378

Margam 230,236,237
Merthyr Mawr 239,240
Nash 250
Newcastle-Bridgend 252
Ogmore 255
Pen Y Fai
Port Talbot 261,262
Reynoldston 266
St David's 374-376
Seven Sisters 269
Whitford 190
It is evident that the vast majority of monuments of Group III have ecclesiastical associations, although it is not always possible to tell whether or not these associations date back to the pre-Norman period. Nevertheless, it seems reasonable to suppose that many monuments originally stood on ecclesiastical ground. Several have been discovered in grave-yards in the process of grave digging (for example Walton West), and there seems little reason to doubt that this was their original location. In 1903 the cross shaft Llantwit Major 222 was removed from the churchyard to the church and excavations which took place at this time indicated that it was supported in the ground by over a metre of undressed stone, and that the ground showed no previous signs of disturbance (Halliday 1903, 60-1). The shaft is probably to be identified with the cross referred to by the twelfth century Life of Illtud as being in the cemetery of the monastery at that time (above,140). The restoration, and occasionally the destruction, of churches and their environs has yielded a large number of monuments which were built into the fabric of these churches (List ii), or occasionally into the churchyard walls. In these cases, it is probable that the original position of the monument was on or near the spot where it was later reused.

It is equally certain that some monuments were erected away from any ecclesiastical site. The Maen Achwyfan (Whitford 190) and Carew 303 are both large crosses which seem to stand in their original positions by the roadside at cross-roads. Others have been found in ditches or in fields - for example Pen Y Fai (Lewis 1970, 71). The location of these monuments must have been determined by the purpose for which they were intended, but whether this was to mark a route (perhaps to a monastery), commemorate a particular person or event, or act as a focal point of local ecclesiastical and/or secular gatherings, it is now impossible to determine.
3. MANUFACTURE: MATERIAL AND EXECUTION

a. Material

Owing to the difficulties and presumably also the expense, involved in the transport of stone, it is likely that the vast majority of Welsh monuments of Group III were manufactured from locally available stone. In a number of cases natural boulders were employed and their shape modified only slightly by the craftsman. This is evident in the case of Laleston 202, Glamorgan, where the weathered surface of the back of the stone (which is described as local rhaetic limestone) indicates that it was found lying on the surface (RCAHM 1976, 64). The monument at Walton West was described as a fine-grained grey sandstone boulder (Kay 1958, 122-3) and it is closely comparable to the boulders which are still to be found on the local beach, whence it most probably came. Other monuments made from natural boulders include St David's 374, 375 and 380 and St Edren's 392.

Larger blocks of stone (such as those employed in the manufacture of free-standing and disc-headed crosses) must have been quarried or taken from exposed outcrops of stone. Where data is available, mainly from Glamorgan, it is apparent that in most cases locally available stone was exploited. Sandstone seems to have been particularly popular. This is a sedimentary rock; sedimentaries are bedded and are thus easier to extract than igneous rocks (Zim and Shaffer 1965, 154).

The following monuments are identified as being made from local rhaetic sandstone; Llangan 208 and 982, Coychurch 193 and Pen Y Fai. The rhaetic sandstone of which six monuments were made - Tythegston 270a, Margam 242, Laleston 202 and Llantwit Major 221, 223 and 224 was further identified as coming from the Bridgend-Pyle area. The identifications used by Nash-Williams (1950) were provided by Dr F T North, FGS; but no indication was given of his method of study. There is no evidence from the monuments themselves to show that they have been subject to petrological sampling. If however the identifications are correct, then it would appear that the stone used for the monuments at Llantwit Major had to travel c. 10 miles from its source, presumably by sea. That stone was occasionally moved long distances by sea in this period is indicated by the discovery on Iona of a shaft of a cross made of slate from the Isle of Man (Reece 1978, 9).
A number of monuments were identified as Pennant sandstone, a type so-called because it occurs in the Pennant or Upper Coal Measures of the Glamorgan coalfield (George and Pringle 1970, 92) - namely Kenfig 200, Llangan 207, Llangyw 210, Margam 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236 and 237, Merthyr Mawr 969, Pontardawe 256 and Port Talbot 263. Margam 230 was identified as local Pennant grit. This would suggest that the stone sculptors at Margam used a single source of stone for the majority of their monuments, although the exact location of this cannot now be determined.

An equally large number of monuments in Glamorgan were made of Sutton stone; Coity 192, Ewenny 977, 978, 981, Laleston 203, Llancarfan 204, Llandaff 205, Ilan-dough 206 and Merthyr Mawr 241, 243, 244 and 967. This type of stone is a form of Lias limestone (another sedimentary) which is found as a littoral deposit in south Glamorgan (Trueman 1964, 251). Sutton stone is exposed in large quantities in the cliffs of the south Glamorgan coast, extending from Southerndown to Barry (Randall 1961, 6). These cliffs provide the most easily accessible source of this stone.

Of the other monuments known to have been manufactured from local stone, Ogmore 255 and Baglan 961 in Glamorgan and Diserth 185, Clwyd were described as local sandstone, and Llantwit Major 220 and 222 and Llangyfelach 212 as local grit; the types were not further specified. St Fagan's 267 was composed of oolitic limestone from the outcrop between St Fagan's and Tregwynog.

The Llantwit Major monuments 221, 223 and 224 have already been mentioned in connection with the movement of stone. Llantbadarn Fawr 111, Dyfed was identified as 'medium grained granitic stone possibly from the Yr Eifl region of the Lleyn peninsula'. If this identification is correct (and the cross apparently has not been subject to detailed petrological examination), then a greater distance was involved, the stone presumably being transported by sea. Even if this identification is confirmed, the evidence assembled above suggests that in Wales, long distance movement of stone in this period was exceptional. This conforms with the evidence from other areas of the British Isles (Bailey 1980, 238).

Even when the movement of stone can be shown, it is frequently unclear whether the stone was transported in the form of rough blocks, or of finished monuments. The transport of finished monuments is confirmed by the monument of Manx slate found at Iona, as its form and decoration
indicates that it was made in the Isle of Man. There is no evidence, however, that this took place in Wales. The Llantwit Major monuments Llantwit Major 221, 223 and 224 have no affinity with the monuments of the Bridgend-Pyle area, which one would expect if they had been manufactured there. Similarly, Llanbadarn Fawr 111 is unrelated in form and decoration to monuments from the Lleyn peninsula. Furthermore, the evidence assembled in Chapter 6, concerning the craftsmen and patrons of these monuments, suggests that the movement of craftsmen over long distances was more common than the long-distance movement of stone, whether or not in the form of finished monuments. For example, it is suggested that the monuments Llantwit Major 222, Llanfynydd 159, Carew 303, Nevern 360 and the cross shaft from Exeter were the work of one craftsman or a small family group of craftsmen, and each one of these monuments was manufactured from locally available stone. What little evidence there is suggests that most monuments would have been manufactured at or near the place where they were to be erected. Indeed, some may have been completed in situ (see Section 3b). The most likely interpretation is that the transport of stone was generally confined to roughly dressed slabs.

The majority of Welsh monuments of Group III cannot yet be discussed with regard to the material of which they are composed. Whilst it is often possible to pronounce a monument to be made of sandstone or limestone, the untrained eye cannot distinguish between the different types of these stones. A full study of the types of stones used to make the crosses and cross-slabs must be referred to a specialist. Petrological examination coupled with a detailed study of the geology of the area would be helpful to determine the general sources of the stone. It is by no means certain that such an investigation would yield conclusive results in every case (sandstone, for example, is a rock not easily recognisable as belonging to one particular location owing to the homogenous nature of the beds over large areas), but it could help to illuminate questions concerning the exploitation of stone as an industry in pre-Conquest Wales.

b. Execution

The nature of the available stone seems to have been a factor in determining the shape of the finished crosses and cross-slabs. In the majority of cases the stone is coarse and relatively intractable, lending itself to bold easily cut forms rather than to delicate work. An illustration of this is provided by the south Welsh disc-headed crosses with slab-like shafts (B1), the shape of which seems to have been dictated by the nature of the sandstone of the area which is particularly fissile and can easily be split into layers (Davey 1976, 12).
In execution, the Welsh monuments of Group III may be divided into classes, according to the number of blocks of stone used in their composition.

i. Monolithic

All cross-slabs and the following free-standing and disc-headed crosses are formed of one piece of stone:

Form A1: Penally 364
Form A2: Llanbadarn Fawr 111
    Ilanynis 65
Form B1: Laugharne 145
    Llanarthney 147
    Ilengan 207
    Llantwit Major 220
    Margam 231,235
    Port Talbot 263
    St Edren's 391
    St Lawrence 398
Form B2: Diserth 185
    Whitford 190
Form B4: Ewenny 196
    Kenfig 200
    Ilengan 208
    Margam 236,237
    Merthyr Mawr 240
    Pen Y Fai
    Port Talbot 262
    Resolven 265
    Tythegston 270a

The monolithic free-standing and disc-headed cross is a common form throughout the British Isles.

ii. Composite

Where the monument is formed from more than one block of stone. In all cases the separate pieces seem to have been joined together by means of a mortice and tenon joint.
a. Two pieces: head and shaft, no separate base:

Carew 303
Coychurch 193
Llanfynydd 159
Llantwit Major 222, 223
Nevern 360

In Wales, this combination seems to be peculiar to the southern group of ringed crosses with fan-shaped arms (Form A1).

b. Two pieces: head/shaft and base:

Llantwit Major 221
Margam 233 (Form B3)
Margam 234 (Form B1)
Ogmore 255
Penmon 37 (Form B2)

The use of a separate base is a particularly common feature of Irish monuments.

c. Three pieces: head and shaft and base:

Corwen 276
Coychurch 194 (Form A1)
Llantisilio Yn Ial 182 (Form A5)
Penmon 38 (Form B2)

Outside of Wales this is a rare form, but it can be paralleled at Muncaster (Cumb.), Copplestone (Devon), Padstow (Cornwall) and Eyam (Derbs).

d. Five pieces: head and upper shaft and baluster and lower shaft and base:

The monument Llandough 206, Form A3, is unique

The existence of other composite monuments is attested by the occurrence of cross bases at Penmon (Beaumaris 1), Diserth 186, Llangyfelach 212 and Newcastle Bridgend 252 and by a number of cross heads. Of the latter, only Llangaffo 14 possesses a tenon as conclusive proof of its composite nature, but the survival of the frag-
mentary cross heads Coity 192, Laleston 202, Llanfachraeth 8, Illogan 210, St David's 378 and St Fagan's 267 may be due to them having been detached from their shafts which were probably used as building material.

It is evident, therefore, that the moulded pillar cross (A2), the disc-headed cross with slab-like shaft (B1) and the panelled cartwheel cross (B4) were typically formed from one block of stone. Other forms, notably the ringed cross with fan-shaped arms (A1), have a large proportion of composite monuments.

**METHOD**

The initial stage in the manufacture of a monument was the selection of the stone. In some cases, natural boulders were used, but in the majority of cases, the stone is likely to have been taken from an exposed outcrop such as a cliff face, or from a shallow quarry. There is at present no archaeological or historical evidence to suggest that deep quarrying for stone was carried out during this period. Neaverson (1953, 1-13) used medieval building records to show that, in north Wales at least, medieval quarrying was restricted to shallow quarrying at the outcrop of stone. North (1957, 42) suggested that the stone was extracted from a shallow quarry or an exposed outcrop by means of wooden levers and wedges which were driven dry into the joints and bedding planes of the stone, and then wetted to make them swell. The resulting block of stone would then be transported to the site where it was to be worked. It has already been suggested that the distances involved were not usually very great, but it is reasonable to suppose that wherever possible the stone would have been transported by water rather than by land.

The stone having been selected and transported to the site, the next stage in the manufacture of a monument must have been the dressing of the stone to the shape of the monument and the provision of at least one flat and smooth surface on which ornament could be carved. The stone at Morvil is likely to be a putative disc-headed cross which was abandoned at this stage in its production. The monument in Whitford church may be another unfinished disc-headed cross (above, 45). The 'Unfinished Cross' at Kells may be cited as a more famous example; here the stone has been cut to the shape of a cross and panels left in blocks of high relief to carry the design (pl.202; Henry 1964, 17-18). The monuments at Morvil and Kells both stand within churchyards, apparently in their original positions.
This strongly suggests that work on the monuments was usually carried out at or near the place where the finished product was to be erected.

The outline shapes of the majority of Welsh crosses and cross-slabs are extremely simple. In the case of the moulded pillar crosses (A2) and the panelled cartwheel form (B4), the cross shape is suggested merely by the scooping out of a horizontal hollow to either side of a rectangular block of stone. A number of cross-slabs, including St David's 374 and 375, were given only one flat face for decoration, the rest of the stone being left rough.

It is reasonable to suppose that the tool used in this process differed little from that used by sculptors today, namely a simple pointed chisel made of iron and used with a mallet of some kind (Rich 1947, 248). The point is applied to the surface of the stone at an angle; the more oblique the angle the smoother will be the result.

After the monument had been roughed out it seems likely that the design was in some way marked upon it, perhaps in paint or charcoal. The use of paint prior to the cutting of the design is suggested by the words 'Connarch pinxit hoc' of the incised inscription on Eliseg's Pillar (line 26). The compass-drawn cross-slabs (C2) attest the use of geometrical aids in the setting out of the design.

In the case of the elaborately ornamented monuments, the constituent panels of the design must first have been delimited and the ornament comprising these panels marked out within them. In the case of the illuminated manuscripts, it is evident that abstract ornament such as interlace, knotwork and fret designs were often laid out on a grid basis. Bruce-Mitford, for example, was able to demonstrate the pricks and rulings which guide the ornament in the Lindisfarne Gospels (Kendrick et al 1960, 263-273). Adcock (1978, 33-34) recently suggested that a square or rectangular grid is more likely to have been used as the basis of interlace designs than the diagonal grid proposed by Allen (1903). She also indicated that the hole points in the grid rather than the crossing points are more likely to have been used as guides for the designs.

Examination of the interlace of a number of Welsh crosses and cross-slabs suggests that the square grid was in use in Wales in this period. On Nevern 360, for example, there is a panel of eight cord plait where the holes in the interlace may be aligned with a square grid and where the lines of the interlace are not strictly diagonal as one would expect.
were the lines of a diagonal grid being followed (pl. 2). The diagonal grid must also have been used, however. The panel of sixteen cord plait on Llantwit Major 222 has diagonal lines of interlace, but the holes between the interlace do not match a strictly square grid (pl. 7).

Practical considerations make it likely that Adcock was right in thinking that in the majority of cases the hole points rather than the crossing points of the grid were used as guidance, whatever type of grid was used. It would be much easier for the craftsman to begin his design by poking out the hole points of the grid, than by sketching in the lines of the interlace from the crossing points of the grid.

It is probable that wherever there is any degree of balanced and symmetrical composition, sculptural designs were set out on square, rectangular or diagonal grids. Asymmetrical ornament and zoomorphic and figural designs must have been drawn free-hand, or with the help of templates. Bailey has indicated that templates made of wood, metal or leather could have been employed for almost any type of ornament and also for the form of cross heads and shafts (1978, 179-204; 1980, 242-254). The use of templates may be put forward as a likely hypothesis where the designs on one monument or group of monuments are closely similar in both shape and size, but their use can only be proved by detailed analysis of rubbings of these designs. In the case of the Welsh sculptured material, there are no obvious instances where similarities of size and shape can only be explained by the use of templates. For example, the monuments Llantwit Major 222, Llanfynydd 159, Carew 303 and Nevern 360 have several motifs in common (above, 40), but the same motifs differ in size not only between the different monuments, but also on each individual monument. The use of pattern books may provide an alternative explanation for the similarities in these cases.

In his study of the carving technique of the Scottish symbol stones, Gordon indicated that many of the designs had been executed by pocking with a sharp metal tool (perhaps to be identified with the pointed chisel used in the roughing out process). The pocks were then joined together by a sharp metal chisel and the resulting groove rubbed smooth by stone tools (Gordon 1956). Cramp and Lang have also drawn attention to the punch marks on monuments from Tynemouth, Levisham and Kirklevington (1977, numbers 4, 11 and 12). Close study of the Welsh monuments relatively unaffected by weathering reveals marks which would be consistent with the use of a pointed pick and chisel in this way. These marks are especially clear on Llangyfelach 212 and Llantwit Major 222 (pls. 69 and 7). The
type of relief most commonly employed on the Welsh monuments is flat and two-dimensional rather than rounded.

The hypothetical processes involved in the manufacture of a monument after the quarrying of the stone are summarised here and illustrated with reference to the cross-shaft Llantwit Major 222:

i. Stone(s) hewn to the rough shape of the finished monument.

ii. Exposed surface(s) made smooth by rubbing with stone tools.

iii. Panels marked out, first in paint, then defined by grooves (fig. 1i).

iv. Grid lines for symmetrical interlace and fret patterns and medial lines of free-hand asymmetrical interlace marked in paint (fig. 1ii).

v. Main lines of fret designs and edges of interlace defined by pocking (fig. 2).

vi. Triangular panels of fret cut out, holes of interlace enlarged and the edges of the strands defined (fig. 3).

vii. Inscription painted and cut.

viii. Surfaces smoothed down with a stone tool.

ix. Composite parts of monument assembled.

The finished monuments were secured in the ground in one of two ways. In the case of the monolithic monuments the base of the cross was left rough and the undressed portion of the stone was inserted in a hole dug in the ground to receive it. Llanarthney 147, Llandewi'r Cwm 47, Llantwit Major 220 and 222 (fig. 4), St Edren's 391 and Pen Y Fai have all yielded evidence of this, and it is likely that this was the most common method. The majority of composite monuments stand on a stone base to which they are joined by means of a mortice and tenon joint.

There is an increasing body of evidence to suggest that the designs of some at least of the finished monuments were once clarified by paint. This would presumably be the last process in the execution of the monument. Whilst no conclusive evidence of paint has been found on any piece of Welsh sculpture, it has been discovered on fragments of architectural
sculpture from Monkwearmouth and Hexham (Cramp 1974, 116). Traces of
dark red and orange paint were recorded on the cross Middleton C from
Yorkshire (Lang 1973, 16-25) and a fragmentary shaft from Newgate, York
bore traces of red paint (Cramp and Lang 1977, No 15). Traces of paint
were also noted on crosses from Burnsall and Lancaster (Collingwood 1915,
289), Stonegrave and Kirklevington (Collingwood 1907, 269) and on monu-
ments from All Hallows (Okasha 1971, 99), St Paul's (Wilson and Klindt-
Jensen 1966, 135-6) and Deerhurst (Talbot Rice 1952, 107). Jessup (1936,
184) and Brown (1937, 214) saw traces of reddish-brown and green paint
respectively on fragments from Reculver. It is notable that a fragment
of the same painted monument at Reculver discovered outside the church
bore no traces of paint, which indicates that preservation from the ele-
ments is a vital factor in the survival of paint. As the majority of Welsh
monuments seem to have spent most of their history outdoors it is not
surprising that evidence for paint is lacking. If the monuments were
painted they must have required regular maintenance. Reference to the
illuminated Hiberno-Saxon manuscripts suggests how the paint would have
been applied. The illuminators of manuscripts employed colour to make a
contrast between the pattern and its background. Interlace was often
divided into blocks of different colours, and key patterns coloured in
alternate squares. An impression of what a painted Welsh monument may
have looked like may be seen at the National Museum of Wales where the
plaster casts of several monuments have been painted in colours resembling
the colours used in the Hiberno-Saxon manuscripts.

It is possible that at least one Welsh monument was the subject of
further embellishment. The cross head Coity 192 has small rectangular
sockets in the centre of each cross arm and on the reverse of the hub there
are six square sockets. It is possible that these were settings for enamel
glass or jewel studs, such as may have been employed on the monument at
Reculver (Peers 1927, 253; Brown 1937, 175). In the upper surface of
the top arm of Coity 192 there is a rounded hole five centimetres deep
which may have been intended to secure an ornamental finial. If these
hypotheses are correct, there are no convincing parallels for Coity 192
which must have been an exceedingly ornate monument.

The following monuments bear inscriptions which seem to record the
name of the person who made the monument (\textit{fecit}): Llanarthney 147,
Llanveynoe 410, Margam 231, 234 and 237 and Llandetty 46. There is no
evidence that any one of these men was responsible for the creation of
more than one monument (as for example the prolific Gaut in the Isle of Man).
The inscription 'Guadan sacerdos fecit crux' of Llandetty 46 raises interesting implications about the identity of the craftsman which are discussed in Chapter 6. It should be noted that more than one man is likely to have been employed in the creation of a monument; the quarrying of the stone would not necessarily have been carried out by the mason, and the designer and executor of the monument were also not necessarily one and the same person. The identity of the craftsmen and their schools receives further discussion in Chapter 6.
Map 1. Group II Monuments.

- Llanwnda (8)
Map 2. Group III Monuments.

Sites with more than six monuments of Group III:

- Llangaffo (● 2 □ 7 ● 1)
- St. Davids (● 2 □ 8)
- Margam (● 7 □ 1)
- Merthyr Mawr (● 4 △ 2 ■ 5 ○ 1)
- Ewenny (● 1 △ 7)
- Llantwit Major (○ 4 △ 2 ● 1)
FIG. 1: MANUFACTURE, PROCESSES iii AND iv
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FIG. 2: MANUFACTURE, PROCESS V
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FIG. 3: MANUFACTURE, PROCESS v1
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FIG. 4: LLANTWIT MAJOR 222, METHOD OF SUPPORT
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CHAPTER FOUR

DATING

This chapter is divided into seven sections:

1. ABSOLUTE DATING
2. DATING BY EPIGRAPHY
3. DATING BY CONTEXT AND MATERIAL
4. DATING BY INDIVIDUAL MOTIFS
5. DATING BY FORM AND STYLE
6. THE DATES OF THE MONUMENTS
7. CHRONOLOGICAL SURVEY
1. **ABSOLUTE DATING**

The only certain method of dating a monument is by the positive identification of a name which occurs on the monument in a primary position with that of a known historical person. Examples of this method of dating may be cited from Anglo-Saxon metalwork, namely the rings of Ethelwulf and Ethelswith (Wilson 1964, 117, 141). To some extent manuscripts may be dated in this way; the colophon of the Lindisfarne Gospels provides an example (Kendrick et al 1960).

It is, however, only in rare cases that one is able to put an absolute date on a piece of stonework. The sundial at Kirkdale is dated by its inscription (Green 1928, 506), but there are no absolutely dated pieces of free-standing Anglo-Saxon sculpture. 'Acca's Cross' at Hexham cannot be proved to have had any connection with the bishop of that name (Swanton 1970, 157). The same situation is found elsewhere. The identification of 'Guriat' on the Manx slab Maughold 48 with Gwriad father of Merfyn Frych (who became king of Gwynedd in 825) is extremely tenuous and is incapable of proof. Similarly Scotland and Cornwall yield no pieces of stonework which may be dated with any certainty on this basis.

The only area to provide one or two fairly firmly dated pieces of stonework is Ireland. The Cross of the Scriptures, Clonmacnoise, is dated prior to 914 by its inscription which states that it was made for a certain king Flann, and a king Flann is known to have died in this year (Macalister 1949, 71; No 849). The 'Cross of Muiredach' at Monasterboice may be that of the abbot Muiredach who died in 923 (Macalister 1949, 31; No 580), but the term 'abbot' is not used on the monument itself, and the name is a common one in Irish history (MacNiocaill 1972, 171). The same name also occurs in inscriptions on a cross at Kells, a slab at Clonmacnoise and an altar cruet at Island Magee (Macalister 1949, 36, 63 and 111; Nos 587, 788 and 941 respectively). Similarly the cross at Bealin which 'Tuathgall ordered to be made' is not indisputably that of the Tuathgall who was abbot of Clonmacnoise 798 to 810 as Henry thought (1930, 111). For the later period, the cross at Inis Cealtra with the inscription 'pray for the Chief Senior of Ireland that is for Cathasach' (Henry 1970, 123) is almost certainly that of Cathasach 'the most pious man in Ireland' whose death in 1111 is recorded in the Annals of Innisfallen (Henry ibid). The two fragmentary crosses at Tuam which both mention as donors king Thurlough O'Connor and Abbot Aed O'Cissin are firmly dated prior to 1156 when Thurlough is known to have died (Henry 1970, 124).
A number of the inscriptions on the Welsh monuments comprise of, or include only a single name:

Baglan 191; 'Brancuf'
Coychurch 193, 194; 'Ebisar'
Llanarth 110; 'Gurhirt'
Llandough 206; 'Irbic'
Llandyfaelog Fach 49; 'Briamail Flou'
Llanfynydd 159; 'Etudon'
Llanhamlach 61; 'Moridic'
Llanwynws 125; 'Carotinn'
Margam 236; 'Ilquici'
Margam 237; 'Ilci'
Penally 365; 'Maeldomnac'
St Davids 376; 'Gurmarc'
Tregaron 133; 'Enever'

It is possible to find these names in contemporary documents ('Irbic' for example appears in the form 'Erbic' in the Book of Llandaff (Evans and Rhys 1893, 197, 198a, 202, 204a, 204b)), but one must resist the temptation of associating what may have been a common name found in isolation on a monument, with one in the historical record which looks about the right date. Similarly, the occurrence of the name 'Ebisar' on two monuments from Coychurch does not necessarily suggest that they were contemporary.

Other inscriptions incorporate two or more names, with no indication of the relationship between them:

Llanarthney 147; 'Moridic', 'Elmon'
Llandetty 46; 'Guadan the sacerdos', 'Ninid', 'Gurhi'
Llangors 59; 'Gurci', 'Bledrus'
Llantwit Major 222; 'Samson', 'Illtut', 'Samson the king', 'Samuel', 'Ebisar'
Llantwit Major 223; 'Abbot Samson', 'King Juthahel', 'Artmail', 'Tecain'

Margam 231; 'Enniaun', 'Guorgoret'
Margam 233; 'Grutne', 'Ahest'
Margam 234; 'Conbelin', 'Sodna'
Merthyr Mawr 239; 'Conbelan', 'St Glywys', 'Nertann', 'Sciloc'
Ogmore 255; 'Artmail', 'Glywys', 'Nertat', 'Fili the Bishop'
Despite the fact that some of these inscriptions include the title of the person named (two bishops, two kings, one abbot and one saint), it is impossible to identify them with any degree of certainty. Samson, for example, seems to have been a very common name.

The names inscribed on the following monuments are accompanied by a patronymic or by the names of other members of the family, and in some cases may almost certainly be identified in the historical record:

**LLANTWIT MAJOR 220**

'... (h)anc (cr)ucem houelt prope(ra)bit pro anima res p(atr)es e(i)us'

The inscription is clearly legible and unambiguous. The letters in brackets reconstruct those lost at the edges of the monument where it has been trimmed.

**Person named:** Houelt son of Res

**Identification:** Hywel ap Rhys, King of Glywising in the late 9th century.

**Historical sources:**

1. Asser's *Life of King Alfred* (1) (Stevenson 1904, Chap 80)
   'Houil quoque filius His, rex Gleguising' is one of the Welsh kings who submits to the protection of Alfred.

2. *Annales Cambriæ* (2) (Phillimore 1888)
   '885 Higuel in Roma defunctus est'

---

(1) The Life of Alfred, according to the work itself, was written by Asser, a Welshman and relative of Bishop Nobis of St Davids (Chap 79), in Alfred's forty-fifth year (Chap 91) - i.e. 893. The life has long been the cause of controversy. Arguments for and against the authenticity of the work have their chief exponents in Whitelock (1968) and Galbraith (1964) respectively. The weight of evidence seems to be with the former, and the burden of proof with the latter. The most reliable version of the text, based on Archbishop Parker's copy of the Cotton Ottonian Ms A xli is that of Stevenson (1904).

(2) Folios 190a-193a of Harleian Ms 3859 are devoted to a series of annals, known as the *Annales Cambriæ*, which record events in Ireland and north Britain, but are mainly concerned with Wales. St Davids has been suggested as the provenance of the annals (Phillimore 1888). No anno domini dates are given in the text, though the beginning of each year is marked. The text was edited by Phillimore (1888, 141-183) and the dates are those which he extrapolated from the annals. The material is the subject of a more recent study by Hughes (1973). The *Annales Cambriæ* are abbreviated in the text of this thesis as AC.
3. The Book of Llandaff(3) 'Evans and Rhys 1893, 212)

'Houel uidelicet regem gluissicg filium Ria'. Grants of land by Hywel or witnessed by him are also recorded in charters 226, 227a, 228, 229a, 229b, 236.

4. Jesus College Ms 20(4) (Bartrum 1966, 45)

'Howel m Rees m Ar(th)uael'

LLANTWIT MAJOR 223

'...pro anima iuthahelo rex :.et artmali et tecain'

The inscription is worn, but it is possible to corroborate this reading with the exception of the final letters (?) 'in' of the name Tecain.

Persons named: King Ithel, Arthfael and Tecain.

Identification: The names Ithel and Arthfael are common in the genealogy of the kings of Glywysing up to the end of the ninth century. The most likely identification is with Ithel ap Arthrwys, who died in 848, and his second cousin Arthfael, as this is the only occasion when an Ithel and an Arthfael were contemporary within one generation. Arthfael son of Hywel ap Rhys has also been suggested (RCAHMW 1976, 31) but he was not contemporary with a king by the name of Ithel.

Historical Sources:

1. Annales Cambriae 848 'gueit finnant iudhail rex guent'

(the titles king of Gwent and king of Glywysing were often interchangeable in this period - Davies 1978, 91).

(3) The bulk of the Book of Llandaff seems to have been compiled in the first quarter of the twelfth century to support the case of Bishop Urban of Llandaff in property disputes between Llandaff, St Davids and Hereford. The book purports to be a collection of charters made to successive bishops of Llandaff from the sixth century. As it stands, the material is incoherent, but recent work has established that it is based on authentic charter material dating from the sixth century which had been collected at a number of religious houses in and around south-east Wales (Davies 1973). The basic text available is that of Evans and Rhys (1893).

(4) This manuscript belongs to the late fourteenth century, but folios 33r-41r which comprise the genealogies may derive from an Old Welsh source compiled in south Wales (Bartrum 1966, 41). The genealogies are listed by Bartrum (1966, 41-50).
2. Harleian MS 3859, (5) genealogy 28 (Bartrum 1966, 12)
'Iudhail map Atroys map Fernmail ...'

3. Jesus College MS 20, genealogy 9 (Bartrum 1966, 45)
'... Howel m. Rees m. Ar(th)uael ...'

LLANRHAIADR YM MOCHNANT 181

'(co)com filiu ed(els)tan'

This reading is supplied by Radford and Hemp (1957, 111). The inscription is very worn and not all the letters are legible. Only 'filiu' is clear.

Person named: Radford and Hemp suggest that Cocom should be reconstructed as Coconi, the final 'n' and 'i' having been run together by the carver; ie. Coconi son of Edelstan.

Identification: Radford and Hemp suggest Cadwgan son of Elstan.

Historical sources:

The name occurs only in a genealogy preserved in Jesus College Oxford Ms 20 (Bartrum 1966, 48; No 30). 'Howel m. Gronwy m. Kadwgan m. Elstan'

The death of Gronwy is recorded in the Brut Y Tywysogyon (Williams ab Ithel 1860) under the year 1075. Working back from this, Radford and Hemp suggest a flourit for Cadwgan of c. 1040-1070.

Given the ambiguous nature of the inscription, this identification must be regarded as tenuous and it is not used here as an absolute date.

LLANTISILIO YN IAL 182

The inscription is very weathered and now largely illegible. In 1846, the antiquary E.Lhuyd found the pillar fractured in two and made a copy of what was then visible (Rhys 1908, 1-62). Since Lhuyd's time, the lower portion of the monument, and with it 16 of the 31 lines of writing Lhuyd saw, has been lost.

(5) The genealogies of various Welsh and British kingdoms which comprise Harleian Ms. 3859 folios 193a-195a seem to have been brought together in the late tenth century, perhaps in the reign of Owain ap Hywel Dda (Bromwich 1954, 93). The genealogies were first edited by Phillimore (1888, 169-183), but are more readily accessible in Bartrum's work (1966, 10-13).
When the monument was visited in June 1976, it was impossible to make out more than the odd letter. The following reading is that of Macalister (1949, 146, No 1000) who claimed to be able to verify much of Lhuyd’s transcript. The letters given in brackets are those given by Lhuyd which Macalister could not confirm. The strokes separate the lines of the inscription:

'Concenn filius Catell. Catell / filius b(rochmail. br) ochma(e)l filius / (eliseg. eliseg filius guillauc. / Concenn itaque pronepos (eliseg) / edificauit (hunc lapid)em pro auo / suo elis(e)g ...' (lines 1-6).

This corresponds to the Powysian genealogy in Harleian Ms 3859 (Bartrum 1966, 12; No 27):

'Cincen m. Catel m. Brocmayl m. Elizet m. Guilauc m. Beli m. Eliud m. Cinan m. Brochmail m. Cincen m. Maucant m. Pascent m. Cattegirn m. Catel m. Selimiaun.'

The dating rests on the identification of Cincenn and Catell with two kings of Powys of these names, whose obits are recorded in the Annales Cambriae (Phillimore 1888): 808 'Catell rex Pouis' 854 'Cinnen rex Pouis in Roma obiit'.

The pillar has been the subject of controversy as the date suggested by its inscription (mid-9th century) has been regarded as incompatible with the date suggested by its form. As there is no positive proof that the inscription is contemporary with the erection of the pillar itself, it may be possible to consider these two aspects of the monument separately. With regard to the form of the pillar this, as Kendrick (1949, 74) pointed out, conforms to the series of round-to-rectangular shafted monuments which are found in the north Mercian area. Kendrick suggested that these monuments belonged to the late tenth and eleventh centuries and that they derived from a more northern group of monuments which have the same form but are decorated. Kendrick believed that the latter evolved in the middle of the tenth century, and he cited Gosforth as one of the earliest examples.

It is possible to argue that the basic form of the round-to-rectangular shafted monument was known by the ninth century. Fragments of round-shafted monuments (which may have had a rectangular-sectioned upper portion) from Dewsbury and Masham in Yorkshire were dated by Kendrick to the ninth century (1949, 73). These shafts are decorated with formally.
designed and executed figure carving. The decorated round-to-rectangular shafted monuments discussed by Kendrick differ in character from these earlier monuments; decoration is usually limited to the rectangular sectioned portion and the moulding between the two sections, and abstract ornament is favoured. As Kendrick pointed out, none of this group can be dated earlier than the middle of the tenth century. Nevertheless neither Kendrick nor Bullock (1960, 51-3) nor Bailey (1980, 187) put forward any convincing arguments to support the hypothesis that the plain north Mercian monuments derived from the decorated group. It is possible that the plain form preceded the decorated form, or that the two groups were contemporary. The close relationship in form between the decorated are undecorated examples suggests that chronologically the two groups are unlikely to have been manufactured at very different dates.

If the pillar and its inscription are contemporary, then it is only possible to reconcile the date suggested by the inscription with that indicated by the form of the monument if the pillar stood at the very beginning of the north Mercian series of monuments and if these preceded the decorated northern group. The geographical isolation of the Welsh monument makes it unlikely that the first hypothesis is correct.

It is also difficult to accept a mid-ninth century date for the Pillar for historical reasons. Lines 6 to 8 of the inscription were read and restored (parentheses) by Lhuyd as '(i)pse(e) es(t eliseg) qui ne/xit her(editatem p)o(u)si po( ) mort/ catem per u( ) e pot(estate) anglo/(rum et cu)m gladio suo parta in igne' (Williams 1846, 32). Nash-Williams (1950, 123) followed Rhys's emendations of the text (1908, 44) and read 'ipse est eliseg qui nexit hereditatem pouisi ... per vii annos e potestate anglorum in gladio suo parta in igne' - which he translated as 'it is Eliseg who annexed the inheritance of Powys throughout eight years from the power of the English which he made into a sword land by fire'. Bu'lock (1960, 53) pointed out that Rhys' reading 'per vii annos' was unsubstantiated and he returned to Lhuyd's text which was largely confirmed by Macalister (1949, 146) as 'ipse est Eliseg qui nexit hereditatem pouisi po(st) mort(em) ca(u)tem per vim et potestate anglo(rum cu)m gladio suo parta in igne'. Bu'lock translated this 'it is Eliseg who annexed the inheritance of Powys, after the death of Cautem, with the might and main of the English and his own sword making it waste'.

If Eliseg's son Cate11, king of Powys, died in 808 then it is reasonable to suppose that Eliseg had ruled and died sometime before this. In the eighth century Offa king of Mercia is known to have made raids on Welsh
territory in 778 and 784 (AC), but there is no evidence to suggest that Powys was in any way subject to the Saxons until 822 when the Annales Cambriae record 'regionem puors in sua potestate taxerunt'. This event most probably took place in the reign of Cincenn. Thus in the middle of the ninth century anti-Anglo-Saxon feeling is likely to have been particularly strong in Powys and it is very unlikely that a Mercian form of monument with an inscription referring to help given by the English and identifying the Powys line with the Saxon king Vortigern (lines 22 and 23) would have been erected at that time.

If it is accepted that both the pillar and its inscription are unlikely to date to the middle of the ninth century, then it follows that either Catell and Cincenn have been wrongly identified and that other men of these names flourished in the period c. 950-1100, or that the inscription is not contemporary with the events it describes.

It is possible that Catell and Cincenn have been wrongly identified. The entries in the Annales Cambriae cited above give no patronymics to these kings and thus it is not necessary to make these identifications. The genealogies of Powys (Bartrum 1966, Nos 16, 27, 29 and 30) indicate that the two names were commonly used in the Powys royal line. The Annales Cambriae records the death of another 'Catell rex' in 909. Lloyd identified this Catell with Cadell son of Rhodri Mawr (1954, 326), but this might equally well be a Catell who was king of Powys. Without the patronymic neither identification can be proven. The death of a 'Cincenn filius Elized' is recorded in 946 (AC). It might be objected that Eliseg's Pillar refers to Cincenn as the grandson of Eliseg - but in fact Macalister could find no trace of the name 'eliseg' in line 4 (1949, 146). Again there is nothing to substantiate this identification.

The second proposition to be examined is that the Pillar and the inscription on it are contemporary and that the monument was set up long after the events it commemorates. The Annales Cambriae record the death of the last known independent king of Powys, Concenn, in Rome in 855. There is no evidence that the kings of any other Welsh dynasty felt the need to set up a public declaration of their origins, which is what the inscription on the Pillar amounts to. Moreover, this would be unnecessary if the dynasty was well established. In 855 Powys came under the rule of the kings of Gwynedd (Lloyd 1948, 324). In 942 (AC) Idwal ap Anarawd, the ruler of north Wales, was killed and Hywel Dda made himself master of Gwynedd. It is usually assumed that he also took over Powys (Lloyd 1912,
In fact there is no concrete evidence for this. The annals are silent about Powys until the middle of the eleventh century when Rhia-wallon, a stepson of Llewellyn ap Seisyll, submitted to Harold of England and received Powys from him. The period c. 950-1050 thus provides the most likely context for such a 'forgery'. It is possible that during this period a local ruler tried to re-establish the kingdom of Powys, perhaps with the help of the Mercians (who may have wished to create a buffer state between themselves and Gwynedd) and who set up the Pillar to serve as a public legitimisation of his rule or, if the Pillar and its inscription are not contemporary, added the inscription to an already standing monument.

As the inscription is now illegible it is improbable that there will ever be a final solution to these problems. The dating of this monument is not, however, crucial to the dating of the Welsh material as a whole since it is unrelated to the majority of Welsh crosses and cross-slabs.

The readings of this inscription have not been consistent because of the cramped nature of the letters in the last line.

'margiteut recett fx' (Nash-Williams 1939, 13). Nash-Williams interpreted this as meaning either 'Margiteut of Recett (= Rheged) made (this cross)', or '(the cross of) Margiteut. Recett made it'. This reading does not conform with the punctuation of the original inscription.

'Margiteut. rex. etg. filius' (Radford 1949, 253-255). This reading is consistent with all the visible strokes of the inscription. Radford reconstructed it as 'Margiteut rex Etguin filius'.

Person named: Margiteut son of king Etguin.

Identification: Maredudd ap Edwin, king of Deheubarth 1033-1035

Historical Sources:

Brut y Tywysogyon (6) (ab Ithel 1860)

(6) The 'Chronicle of the Princes' survives in three independent versions which may be traced back to an original chronicle written in Latin in the thirteenth century and using earlier sources (Jones 1958, 18-25). The text and translation cited throughout this thesis is that of the Red Book of Hergest as it is given by ab Ithel (1860). The Brut y Tywysogyon is abbreviated in the text of the thesis as BYT.
It should be noted that this inscription is crammed into a small panel, whilst there is an adjacent panel of the same size which is left empty. The significance of this is unclear. It could mean that the present inscription is secondary, perhaps to an earlier painted inscription. This hypothesis would also help to explain the cramped nature of the last line of the inscription. It is possible that both panels originally bore painted inscriptions (perhaps one to Hywel and one to Maredudd) and that only one panel was later carved in.

ST DAVID'S 382

The inscription is clearly legible.

'Pontificis abraham filii hic. hed 7 isac quiescunt'

Persons named: Hed and Isaac, sons of Bishop Abraham.

Historical source:

Brut y Twysogyon (ab Ithel 1860).

1080 'Abraham, bishop of Menevia, died'

LLANFIHANGEL Y TRAETHAU 281

'hic est sepvlcrv(m) vlader matis odelev q(u)i p(r)imv(m) edificav(it) hanc ec(c)l(es)i(a)m in te(m)p(o)r(e) edwini reg(is)'

This inscription is unique in Wales in that the lettering comprises mainly plain capitals with the occasional form deriving from the miniscule script (for example the 'h'). The form of the 'W' and the pointed 'O' and the use of enclosed and interlaced letters are features of the late eleventh century and later (Nash-Williams 1950, 169-170).

Nash-Williams suggested that the Edwin referred to in the inscription should be identified with Owain king of Gwynedd 1137-1170 (ibid 170). This identification is entirely hypothetical, its only virtue being that these dates are consistent with those indicated by the epigraphic features.

This monument comprises a roughly squared pillar bearing an initial cross and an inscription, but no other ornament. Its form and epigraphy preclude it from being studied as a member of Group III, but it provides
an example of the type of monument that one would expect to find in Wales immediately after the Norman conquest.

Having thus established a number of fixed points it may be possible to work from the epigraphic and stylistic features of these monuments in order to compose a relative chronology.
2. **DATING BY EPIGRAPHY**

From the seventh century to the coming of the Normans the insular style of half uncial script was the only monumental hand employed in Wales. Monuments of Group II already exhibit it in its fully developed form (Nash-Williams 1950, 27). The lettering employed on Group II and III monuments is closely related to that of the insular manuscripts, being a miniscule script. This is not surprising if, as it has already been suggested, the inscriptions were first painted on the monument, presumably by a scribe.

Lindsay (1912) tried to identify the peculiarities of the Welsh as opposed to the Irish and Northumbrian script. In fact, he was not able to do this, but his studies of a number of manuscripts known to have been written or at least glossed in Wales indicated that the Welsh scribes used several forms of the insular miniscule. The most common form of script seems to have been a rounded form which is represented in Wales especially in manuscripts of the ninth and tenth centuries (Lindsay 1912, plates XI, XII, and XIII).

The relationship between the lettering of insular manuscripts and of Welsh stonework (Group III) is indicated by the following features (only parallels in Welsh manuscripts or in manuscripts known to have been in Wales are cited). The page and plate references in brackets are to Lindsay (1912):

**Abbreviations:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbrev.</th>
<th>Word in Full</th>
<th>Monuments</th>
<th>Manuscripts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>di</td>
<td>dei</td>
<td>Llantwit 220, 223</td>
<td>Chad, fols 13, 49, 51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Margam 233</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Merthyr Mawr 240</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ogmore 255</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>hac</td>
<td>Llanarthney 147</td>
<td>Chad (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Llanwnnws 125</td>
<td>Berne Gospels (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>nomine</td>
<td>Llanwnnws 125</td>
<td>Cambridge Juvencus (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Martianus Capella (20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leyden and Berne (24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ox. Bod. 572 (29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rhigyfarch (34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Berne Gospels (13)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Abbrev | Word in Full | Monuments | Manuscripts
---|---|---|---
eni | eniscopi | Ogmore 255 | Cambridge Juvenecus (17)
7 | et | St David's 376 | Martianus Capella (20)
" | " | 382 | Leyden and Berne (24)
" | " | Ox. Bod. 572 (30)
" | " | Rhigyfarch (34)
" | " | Chad (6)

Compendium:

Several monuments use single dots, namely Llangyfelach 211, Llantwit Major 223, Margam 231, Merthyr Mawr 240, Nevern 360, Bridgend 253 and St David's 379 and 382. This feature is too common to note in manuscripts.

Punctuation:

It is evident therefore that the monuments employing such abbreviations would not be out of place in ninth and tenth century epigraphical contexts, but the similarities are not enough to warrant a firm dating of the monuments on these grounds. It is noteworthy, however, that the two Llantwit monuments employing the contraction 'di' (numbers 220 and 223) may both be dated by the persons mentioned in their inscriptions to the second half of the ninth century (above, Section 1).

Tables 1 and 2 indicate the form of each letter as it occurs on the Welsh monuments. The homogeneous nature of the forms employed (with the exception of Llanfihangel Y Traethau 281 which exhibits continental traits) confirms that the monuments in question belong to the same period. A few features seem to be indicative of more specific dates.

Lindsay identified a flat-topped type of script which he associated with the calligraphy employed at St David's by the family of bishop Sulien in the eleventh century (1912, 40). This is interesting as the flat-topped form of the letter A ( rather than ) is confined to the monuments of the St David's region. Okasha confirms that this form is 'late'
Thus it is reasonable to ascribe the monuments St David's 376, 380, 382 and 383 and St Edren's 392 and Walton West to the eleventh century or later by virtue of their epigraphy. The use of the Greek form of the alpha and omega and the monograms IHS and XPS confirms that these monuments (plus St Edren's 393) form a coherent group which may be contemporary.

The form of the 'M' used in the inscriptions of Llantwit Major 222 and (in one instance) 223 is Saxon rather than insular (Okasha 1968, 323, 327). This form of 'M' occurs in Wales only on these two monuments. The inscriptions on these monuments are not otherwise related and it is not necessary to postulate that they were the work of the same craftsman or scribe. The characteristic punctuation of 223, for example, is absent from 222. Other considerations (below, section 6) suggest that 222 may be much later in date than 223.

The round half-uncial hand remained in vogue in Wales until the Norman conquest when it began to be superceded by Romanesque scripts. This took place over a period of several decades; the inscription on Patrishow 67 for example indicates the use of Hiberno-Saxon miniscules on a font which may be of eleventh or twelfth-century date. The type of script employed on a number of monuments indicates that they belong to the transition period (see Table 2). The script of Llanarthney 147 is consistent with that of the early period, but the inscription includes two Norman-French words 'merci' and 'grace' (Nash-Williams 1950, 111). Its most probable date, therefore, is the late eleventh or twelfth century. Similarly Newcastle-Bridgend 253 has elements from both periods; the debased half uncial letters 'e', 'g', 'm' appear alongside the Romanesque capitals 'V', 'R', 'N', 'T'. St David's 383 employs plain capital letters in the Romanesque style, with the exception of the uncial 'h'. These three monuments should probably be dated to the early stages of the Norman incursions into Wales in the late eleventh or twelfth century.

The true Romanesque script is represented on the monuments Llancarfan 204, Llanfihangel Cwmdu 54a and Llanfihangel Y Traethau 281, none of which can therefore be dated earlier than the twelfth century.

Before turning to the methods of dating which concern the motifs used on the monuments and their form and style, it is necessary to review two other aspects of the monuments which may help to determine the date of their manufacture, namely the context in which they were found and the material of which they were made.
3. DATING BY CONTEXT AND MATERIAL

With regard to context, only Llantwit Major 222 has been the subject of archaeological excavation and only Bangor 80 revealed by controlled excavation. Neither of these monuments, nor the large number of monuments accidentally dug up in churchyards in the process of grave digging, were associated with any clearly datable object.

Many pieces were built into the fabric of churches (see Chapter 3, Section 2). In these cases the date of the church in question obviously provides a terminus ante quem for the monument which was built into it. As most of these churches, particularly in south Wales, cannot be dated prior to the fourteenth century - and many are considerably later and even modern - this method is generally of little use. The exception is Ewenny, where a number of cross-slabs (numbers 977-981) were discovered reused as building material in the fabric of the cruciform east end of the priory church during restoration which took place from 1950 to 1952 (RCAHMW 1976, 66). A letter written c. 1145 by Gilbert Foliot, Abbot of Gloucester, indicates that William de Londres built a church at Ewenny and presented it to the abbey of Gloucester during the episcopate of Urban, bishop of Llandaff from 1107 to 1134 (Radford 1976, 7). In 1141, Maurice de Londres raised the cell to conventual status and Ewenny became a priory (Cowley 1977, 16). The cruciform east end of the church was apparently added to the existing church shortly after the foundation of the priory, in order to provide space for the choir of monks (Radford op cit). The slabs in question must therefore be dated prior to the middle of the twelfth century.

Dating by historical context, like dating by the immediate physical context of the monument, is also generally unsatisfactory, although this method has its exponents in the study of Anglo-Saxon and Viking Age sculpture (eg. Cramp 1978, 1-32). With the exception of monuments dated by their inscriptions, it is impossible to relate a known historical event to the production of a certain monument or monuments. Nash-Williams' dogmatic statement 'the sudden appearance of a developed sculpture in Wales in the ninth century is doubtless an artistic reflection of the rapprochement between the Celtic and Latin churches following the settlement of the Easter controversy in 768' (1950, 29) is not capable of proof. In some cases an historical event may provide some vague indication of date - for example the dates of the Scandinavian raids on the British Isles as recorded in the chronicles may provide a terminus post quem for those monuments whose form or decoration exhibits Scandinavian influence. It may be
more valid to ask whether a monument can be dated to the known historical lifetime of a certain church or monastery, but again this is rather unsatisfactory. In view of the very incomplete nature of the historical record in Wales for this period, it seems desirable largely to avoid this approach as a method of dating. Two exceptions are made to this general rule, namely in the cases of the monuments at Llandeilo Fawr and the panelled cartwheel monuments of south Glamorgan, which both receive more detailed discussion in Section 6 of this Chapter.

What little evidence there is for the material of which the monuments were made has been marshalled above (Chapter 3, Section 3). In most cases it is impossible to say at what date the stone was exploited. In south Glamorgan the use of Sutton stone seems to have a chronological distinction; no monuments of Nash-Williams' Groups I and II are manufactured of this easily recognisable stone. There is some evidence to suggest that the exploitation of Sutton stone did not begin until the eleventh century. No monument made of Sutton stone can be dated (by the other methods described above and below) earlier than this century, and several pieces are obviously later including Llancarfan 204 (above, Section 2) and Merthyr Mawr 243 and 244 (below, Section 6). Sutton stone was most heavily exploited in the Norman period for ecclesiastical buildings including Llandaff Cathedral and Neath Abbey, and for several south Welsh castles (Cundall and Landman 1925, 216). It seems reasonable therefore to suppose that the majority of monuments composed of Sutton stone belong to the eleventh century or later, unless there is strong evidence to the contrary.

In most cases then dating by context and material are not viable methods, although they may help to corroborate dates proposed by other methods.
4. DATING BY INDIVIDUAL MOTIFS

This method involves an examination of the individual patterns with reference to their intrinsic character, the type of monument on which they occur, and their appearance in other more firmly datable media such as manuscripts and metalwork.

The latter must be discredited as a method of dating individual motifs. The relationship between motifs employed in Welsh sculpture and in other media are discussed in Section 8 of Chapter 5. Whilst it is obvious that the same decorative tradition was shared by workers in all media, the dates of the manuscripts and pieces of metalwork which provide parallels to the patterns under consideration are unlikely to be chronologically significant. Copying could take place at any time during the life of the object.

Not all patterns in use on Welsh monuments of Group III are exclusive to the ornament of the British Isles in the post-Roman and pre-Norman period. In particular, simple knots, frets and plaits are commonly represented in Roman mosaic work. In Wales, the pavement of the Roman villa at Llantwit Major incorporates in its design conjoined rings (Knot 4), a ten-cord plait (Interlace 8) and a Z fret (3) (Hogg 1974, 249). One of the monuments from Llantwit Major, 222, uses conjoined rings as a major feature of its ornament, but this is such a common pattern that there is no reason to postulate copying from the villa pavement, which was probably not visible at this time (ibid). To cite another example, the L fret (7) is identical with the classical Greek fret.

An equally large number of patterns most characteristic of the period under consideration survive on monuments which, by their form, seem to be Norman. Conjoined rings (Knot 4) occur on two Anglesey fonts which most probably belong to the twelfth century (below). Similarly, the triquetra knot (8), linked Stafford knotwork, the looped cord, interlinked rings and the ring-twist (Interlace 18, 30, 34 and 35) and the Z, T, double T and L-shaped frets (3, 4, 5, 7) and the square-arrow fret (18) are found on fonts or other pieces of architectural sculpture, indicating that they may be attributable to a late date. Even the single row of figure-of-eight knots (Interlace 22) may sometimes occur in the late eleventh or twelfth centuries - this motif occurs with Romanesque lettering on Llancarfan 204.
The majority of motifs listed in Appendix B are too common to have any chronological significance, and a few are too rare. Where a datable motif occurs on only one Welsh monument it is discussed in Section 6 in the appropriate context. Of the individual patterns which may be given an approximate date and which occur on more than one Welsh monument, the most characteristic are those which exhibit the influence of Scandinavian art styles, discussed in detail in Chapter 5, Section 6. The free-ring which comprises an element of the ring-knot (12 and 13) and the ring-twist (interlace 35) may be traced back to the Borre style which was "at its most influential in Scandinavia c. 900" (Wilson 1976, 506). Thus 900 provides a likely terminus post quern for the adoption of these patterns into the stonework of the British Isles. Both these patterns had a long life; the ring-chain is found on the Irish shrine of the Soiscel Molaise which dates to the early eleventh century (Henry 1967, 120-1) and the ring-knot occurs in the late eleventh century Psalter of Ricemarch and on certain fonts. If pelleting is regarded as the result of influence from the Mammen style and this is by no means certain, then 950 is a likely terminus post quern for monuments which incorporate this feature in their design, as elements characteristic of the Mammen style can be identified at this date (Wilson and Klindt-Jensen 1966, 120; Wilson 1978, 139).

Bifurcated plaits are also Scandinavian in inspiration and there is no evidence of their use in the stonework of the British Isles before the tenth century.

Two patterns, the chevron and the looped square (knot 6) are indicative of a late date for the monuments on which they occur. The true chevron, represented in Wales only by Llowes 408, is very common in English stonework after the conquest; Normandy is the source of the motif (Allen 1888, 172; Bond 1908, Chapter 11). A number of Welsh monuments bear a zig-zag fret (1) which, where it occurs on the Anglesey fonts, should be regarded as an element of the chevron. Other monuments which employ fret 1 are indisputably pre-Conquest in date. Knot 6 is a rare motif, found only on two squareish blocks of stone, Merthyr Mawr 243 and 244, in Wales. Elsewhere the motif occurs on two fonts and one tympanum. The type of monument with which this motif is associated would therefore suggest that it is diagnostic of a date in the Norman period.

These and other motifs regarded as indicative of influence from outside Wales receive more detailed treatment in the appropriate section of Chapter 5.
5. **DATING BY FORM AND STYLE**

This method of dating is dependent upon the assumption that the form and style of the monuments undergo a number of changes in the period encompassed by this study. The interpretation of these changes is largely a matter of subjective hypothesis, and it is bedevilled by unknown quantities.

*A priori* it is not possible to regard changes in form and style as chronologically significant. Different forms and styles may be the work of a number of contemporary schools of craftsmen, rather than of different ages. This situation is more likely to occur over large regions, but it may happen within a very small area. At Clonmacnoise, for example, there are few formal or stylistic links between the 'high' crosses and the cross-slabs, presumably because they differ in purpose (Westropp 1907, 290; Macalister 1909).

Another obvious problem is the chronological direction in which these changes take place - *ie.* are they a matter of evolution or devolution? The process is clearest in the case of individual patterns. The vast majority of these appear in a fully developed form in media such as manuscripts and metalwork at least a century before they appear on Welsh stonework (see Appendix B). Furthermore, the earliest precisely dateable monument, Llantwit Major 220, has each of its patterns in the purest form. It is therefore assumed that the chronological progress is generally one of the debasement of individual patterns - hence the term 'debased' is applied to patterns which are recognisable as adulterations or misunderstandings of a pure form. It would, however, be dangerous to regard the progress of the carving of Welsh stonework as one of continuous devolution; the possibility of local 'renaissances' in different areas and perhaps at different times cannot be discounted.

Fig. 1 illustrates the possible progress of the debasement of individual motifs. It is not intended that these should be regarded as actual sequences of debasement from one monument to another.

In its most obvious form, debased ornament merely comprises a number of miscellaneous lines which are intended to give the impression of complex ornament. This type of debasement is particularly well illustrated by Margam 236 and also by Llanarthney 147. The inscription on the latter indicates that the monument is most probably of late eleventh or early twelfth century date (above, Section 2).
Other considerations highlight the unsatisfactory nature of this method of dating. Even when a relationship between two monuments is proven, it is impossible to determine the length of time which lapsed between the erection of the monument which is considered to be primary and the erection of the monument which is considered to be dependent in some way upon it. Stone monuments, by their very nature, were on show from the time of their manufacture and may have inspired copies at any time after that date. For these reasons dating by comparison with monuments in other areas is particularly unsatisfactory.

Therefore, an attempt is made to date the Welsh sculptured crosses and cross-slabs on their own merit, working from the patterns which occur on the monuments dated by their inscriptions, in order to provide a relative chronology. As the majority of individual patterns are too common to be used with any degree of precision, only groups of patterns were studied.

The stereotyped nature of the motifs in use on Welsh sculpture made it possible to analyse each monument in detail and to compare it with the others. The selection and sorting of information was standardised by means of a punched card sorting system. These cards are punched with a series of holes along each edge. Each hole was taken to represent a feature of decoration; thus 19 knots, 38 forms of interlace and 27 forms of frets were recorded. These are listed in Appendix B. A card was prepared for each monument and each feature occurring on it recorded by cutting out the relevant hole. In this way combinations of patterns occurring on more than one monument were traced. Certain patterns are more important than others in this analysis. Some, for example the plain plaitwork patterns (Interlace 1-7), are too simple and too common to be significant when used in isolation. They may, however, corroborate the evidence of other rarer patterns.

An illustration of the application of this method and its drawbacks is provided by Llantwit Major 220. For reasons of clarity, the form and features of the monument are tabulated and then discussed:

**Form:** Disc-headed, with slab-like shaft and ringed cross of the double-square-hollow form.

Other Welsh monuments of this form: Llanarthney 147, Margam 234, Port Talbot 263

Patterns occurring on Llantwit Major 220, and Welsh monuments exhibiting a combination of three or more of these patterns are shown in Table 3.
Knot 1 and Interlace 1 are common throughout Wales and their occurrence together is unlikely to be significant. The form of Interlace 18 on Llantwit Major 220 is peculiar in that it terminates in loops. This is paralleled only on Llangyfelach 212. Similarly the double version of Fret 11 is very rare, being found only on Llantwit Major 220 and Llangyfelach 212 in Wales. Thus the only significant relationship is between these two monuments; in this the table appears deceptive. The coarser nature of the design and execution of Llangyfelach 212 suggests that it is secondary. It should be noted that the monuments related to Llantwit Major 220 in form are not related in pattern, other than by the simple and common features of Margam 234.

At best then, a comparative study of the individual patterns as they occur on the Welsh monuments of Group III can provide only a nebulous relative chronology.

Having thus outlined the possible methods of dating and drawn attention to their shortcomings, an attempt is made below to put these into practice. In order to provide a coherent framework the monuments are considered in the groups defined in Chapter 2.
6. THE DATES OF THE MONUMENTS

FORM A: THE FREE-STANDING CROSS

A1. The Ringed Cross with Fan-shaped Arms

Dated monument: Carew 303, 1033-1035

Table 2.1 indicates that the monuments of this form have several decorative motifs in common. In particular all except Penally 364 exhibit one or more of the rare frets 10, 20, 21, 23, 24, 25 and 27.

An analysis of the ornament of Carew 303 indicates a close relationship with Nevern 360 and also with the slab-like shafts Llanfynydd 159 and Llantwit Major 222 (Table 4).

The rare nature of the frets in question is enough to suggest a kinship between these four monuments. Llantwit Major 222 and Llanfynydd 159 are so similar in form, dimension (216 x 76 x 25 cms and 208 x 66 x 22 cms respectively) and decoration that it seems reasonable to suppose that they were the work of one man. The coherent nature of the fret-work of these two monuments suggests their priority over those at Carew and Nevern. Carew preserves the slab-like form of the shaft of the two earlier monuments and is closer in design to them. A row of linked rings (Knot 4) beneath a double row of 'T'-shaped frets (Fret 4) occurs on both Carew 303 and Llanfynydd 159. The chamfering of the shaft of Nevern 360 as a means of transition to a slab-like cross head suggests that the sculptor was adopting the slab-like form of the above monuments to his own purpose. The continuous fret pattern (10a), the large fret (23) and the double Stafford knot (3) are distinctive enough not to have been overlooked had the copying been from Nevern to Carew and not vice versa.

Thus the following chronological sequence is proposed for this group:

1000-1030 Llantwit Major 222 and Llanfynydd 159. The terminus post quem is provided by the use of pellets in the design.
1033-1035 Carew 303
1035+ Nevern 360

The occurrence of the rare frets 20 and 21, and 20 and 24 on Merthyr Mawr 240 and Coychurch 194 respectively and the incidence of Knot 15 on the cross head of both these monuments suggests that their relationship with the above amounts to more than a superficial resemblance of form. Nevertheless, neither is a direct copy from the four monuments already
discussed. The ornament is no longer disposed in panels and new motifs are introduced. The debased nature of the frets on Merthyr Mawr 240 and Coychurch 194 indicates that they should be later in date than Llantwit Major 222 and Llanfynydd 159, perhaps belonging to the second half of the eleventh century. The shaft Merthyr Mawr 239 is very similar in character to Merthyr Mawr 240 and should probably be given this date.

Penally 364 lacks the distinctive frets of the other members of the group and cannot be related to them except in form. The monument bears a vine scroll with leaves and fruit. The scooped trefoil leaves are reminiscent of such ninth century west Midland work as Breedon-on-the-Hill, Leicestershire, and Barnack, Northants, but the stylised nature of the fruit on Penally 364 suggests a later date. Nevertheless, the vine scroll, together with the regular and coherent interlace, suggests that this is the earliest monument in the group. A date in the first half of the tenth century would be appropriate.

A2. The Moulded Pillar Cross

Llanynis 65 is well designed and executed. This is the only monument in Wales on which Interlace 21 appears. This is a rare type which is more often seen in metalwork and manuscripts than on stonework. Where it does occur in stone it is upon monuments which exhibit no Scandinavian features. The rare form of moulding (Appendix B, Miscellaneous 2) is best paralleled on the shaft from Codford St Peter, Wiltshire (pl. 203) which is generally dated to the first half of the ninth century (Kendrick 1938, 181). The affinities of Llanynis 65 would thus seem to place it in the ninth century.

In contrast, the ornament on Llandewi'r Cwm 47 is loosely arranged and in some cases it is bungled (for example, the bottom right Stafford knot in the design on Side B is incomplete, and one loop of the interlace on Side A is missing). The zoomorphic termination of the looped knotwork and the use of a free pellet as a space filler are probably to be regarded as Scandinavian features. The craftsman was presumably familiar with the cross at Llanynis as he has used two of the same motifs (Interlace 18 and 23) in the same positions at the bottom of two sides of the cross shaft. He has also attempted a roll-and-bead moulding at the edges of the shaft. For these reasons Llandewi'r Cwm 47 is regarded as being later in date than Llanynis 65.

The form of Llanbadarn Fawr 111 and the treatment of one face of the cross head shows its connection with the two monuments discussed above.
The introduction of frets and figural motifs and the absence of roll-and-bead moulding indicates that it is a local adaptation of the type. No features on this monument are capable of a precise date, but the debased nature of the fret ornament suggests a date in the late tenth or eleventh century.

A3. The Composite-shafted Cross

The ornament on Llandough 206 gives no indication of its date. The heavy, almost architectural, treatment of the mouldings at the edges of the lower shaft and of the central knop is unique. Both Llandough 206 and Llandaff 205 are of Sutton stone, suggesting that the monuments belong to the eleventh century or later (above, Section 3).

A4. The Round-to-Rectangular shafted Cross

The date of Llantisilio Yn Ial 182 is discussed above.

A5. Miscellaneous Cross Heads

a. Round-hollow, ringed. In Ireland this form occurs from c. 750 to 1100. The monuments of western Ossory which provide the closest comparisons to St Fagan's 267 (see Chapter 5, Section 3) are generally held to be amongst the earliest examples of this type in Ireland (Henry 1965, 141; Roe 1969, 9). St Fagan's 267 would thus seem to be attributable to a date in the ninth century, but in the absence of the complete monument, one cannot be dogmatic about this.

b. Anglian, ringed. The plain crucifix on the fragmentary cross head Llanfachraeth 8 may be paralleled by a number of monuments from Yorkshire (eg. North Otterington and Ellerburn) and Cornwall (eg. Lanherne and Sancreed). These monuments are dated to the late tenth and eleventh centuries (Collingwood 1927, 104 and Langdon 1906, 34 respectively). Llanfachraeth has no other distinguishing features which may be used to indicate its date.

The bifurcations in the plaitwork of St David's 378 suggest that this cross cannot have been made before the tenth century and probably not before the middle of this century.

- Key-hole, ringed. The incomplete nature of Llangaffo 14 makes it impossible to put a date on this cross-head.
d. Fan-shaped, free-armed. Coity 192 is made of Sutton stone. The form of the cross head most probably derives from the south Welsh group of ringed crosses with fan-shaped arms. These features suggest that a date in the second half of the eleventh century is likely.

A6. Miscellaneous Free-standing Crosses

Llanbadarn Fawr 112 cannot be dated with any degree of certainty. The crude nature of the cross and the absence of insular ornament of any kind makes it possible that it does not belong to the period under consideration, but to some later time when the insular tradition of stone carving had died out. Similarly, Llanfair Mathafarn Eithaf 11 has no features which can be dated with any precision.

**FORM B: THE DISC-HEADED CROSS**

B1. The Disc-headed Cross with slab-like Shaft

This form is found in the Isle of Man as well as in south Wales. It is often difficult to distinguish between Manx cross-slabs and disc-headed crosses. Conchan 62 (pl.204), for example, should probably be regarded as a cross-slab with a rounded head, whereas Ballaugh 77 (pl.205) is a disc-headed cross. No chronological distinction is apparent here. Both forms may have purely insular decoration, and thus most probably belong to the ninth or early tenth centuries (eg. Maughold 67, pl.201; Lonan 57, pl.206), or they may have Scandinavian decorative features indicating that they most probably should be dated to the tenth or early eleventh centuries (eg. Michael 74, Ballaugh 77).

Apart from their form, the Manx monuments provide no close parallels to the disc-headed crosses of south Wales. The overall impression of the plaitwork ornamenting the cross heads of St Lawrence 398 and Margam 231 and 234 is similar to that of the pre-Scandinavian monuments Lonan 57 and Conchan 61, but here the similarity ends. The characteristic Scandinavian influenced Manx patterns such as the ring-chain and tendril-twist (Kermode 1907, 43 and 45) do not occur on the south Welsh monuments and they must therefore be dated independently of the Manx monuments.

Llantwit Major 220 is dated by its inscription to the late ninth century. The splayed shaft, the overall two-dimensional effect of the ornament and the disposition of the inscription at the foot of the shaft relates it most closely to Margam 231. The latter has a coherent design.
composed of simple patterns which are not in themselves indicative of date. The fact that the frets ornamenting the quadrants of the ring have been misunderstood implies that it is later rather than earlier than Llantwit Major 220. Stylistically these two crosses are not closely related to the other members of the group.

St Lawrence 398 is ornamented solely with interlace comprising both plaitwork and knotwork. In its purest form the double twist (Interlace 2), which appears on the shaft of this monument, does not occur in any context likely to be later than 950, and most of its affinities are ninth century. The intricate and apparently well-executed nature of the design of St Lawrence 398 would be compatible with a date in the second half of the ninth century. It seems to be the earliest member of the group under discussion.

In contrast, Margam 234 employs a greater variety of ornament than any other Welsh monument, and introduces a new structural element, namely a massive base. The figures at either side of the shaft of the cross seem most relevant for a discussion of its date. The same composition, with triquetra knots above the figures, appears on St Vigeans 11 (Allen 1903, 241), a Class III cross-slab without Pictish symbols, which probably belongs to the tenth century. The face of the male figure is similar to that of Luke in the Lichfield Gospels (Henry 1965, pl. F) whilst the drapery may be compared with another figure holding a book in the St Gall Gospels (Henry 1965, pl. M). The line of rosettes on the base of the cross is unique in stonework, but is a common feature in illuminated manuscripts (Appendix B, Miscellaneous 3). The vigorous hunting scene on the base of Margam 234 is closest in character to those which appear on the Pictish cross-slabs, for example Aberlemno No 3 (Allen 1903, 214) which are likely to have been erected prior to the end of the Pictish state in the mid-ninth century (Henderson 1967, 96). Thus no features of Margam 234 need be dated later than 950.

Llanarthney 147 is dated to the late eleventh or early twelfth century by its inscription. Its ornament is very debased and no coherent patterns are recognisable. Port Talbot 263 has the same cross form as Llanarthney 147 and also bears similar ornament, although this is not so incomprehensible as that of the previous monument. The impression is that Port Talbot 263 should be given a similar, probably slightly earlier, date to Llanarthney 147.
Of the other monuments belonging to this group, St Edren's 391 has no features diagnostic of date, and the Irish parallels cited below (232) have not been dated on their own merit. Similarly the unique character of Llangan 207 precludes it being dated by comparisons with other monuments, although the composition of the crucifixion scene and in particular the stance of the sword and spear bearers are reminiscent of such Irish crosses as the West cross and Muiredach's cross, Monasterboice, and the Cross of the Scriptures, Clonmacnoise (Henry 1964, pls, 57, 41 and 47).

Nash-Williams' assumption that Laugharne 145 should be dated to the late ninth or early tenth century because of 'its good proportions and pleasing style' (1950, 111) is invalid. The bifurcating plait indicates that it is probably tenth century or later. The other features of the decoration are inconclusive with regard to date. Margam 235 is so worn and damaged that it is impossible to say more about its date than that the ornament is neither in its purest nor in its most debased form, and that it is thus unlikely to be very early or very late.

B2. The North Welsh Disc-headed Crosses

These belong to the milieu of the Scandinavian (Norwegian-Irish) settlements of the north-west of England which seem to have begun in earnest from the late ninth century onwards (Loyn 1977, 63; Wainwright 1948). Penmon 38 is dated to the middle of the tenth century by the ring chain which appears on the cross shaft. Penmon 38 is related to Penmon 37 by the use of Fret 9 and, in particular, Fret 6 which is used on the heads of both crosses. Penmon 37 has a more coherent design of frets and knots than number 38, and it has no interlace or figure subjects. The frets on Penmon 38 seem incongruous as they merge into interlace. The character of the ornament suggests that Penmon 37 may be earlier than Penmon 38, dating perhaps to the first half of the tenth century.

The ornament on Whitford 190 can only be described as eclectic. The design is loose, with much space filled by simple loops. Certain elements of the design, for example the plain plaitwork and the large ring-knot are bungled. The linked-ring motif appears on other pieces of stonework which are late Saxon or early Norman (Interlace 34). Whitford 190 would be at home in the second half of the eleventh century or the early twelfth century.

Diserth 185 bears ornament which is all of a debased character with the exception of the three-cord plait. At the bottom of the shaft the impression of plaitwork is given merely by a sunken grill of holes.
degree of debasement suggests that this monument is later in date than Whitford 190. Moreover, the trefoil cusps in the arm pits of the cross are not found on any monument securely dated to the pre-Norman period.

B3. The 'Whithorn' type

The absence of any ornament on Margam 233 makes it difficult to date this monument. The geographical difference (south Wales and Scotland) suggests that Margam 233 is an independent development, perhaps evolving from a monument such as Margam 231 which has a splayed shaft and a round-hollow form of cross.

B4. The 'Panelled Cartwheel' form

The developed form and ornament of these monuments implies that they were manufactured at a time when the old sculptural traditions had largely, but not entirely, been abandoned. Such a state of affairs is most likely to have occurred during the Norman infiltration of the area. In distribution, the monuments are concentrated in the lowland of the cantref of Gorfynydd, to the west of the river Thawe (Map 1). In this area, the Norman threat was present from c. 1070, but the conquest and settlement of the south Glamorgan area by the Normans did not begin in earnest until c. 1090 (Lloyd 1954, 400). It was largely completed by 1120. It seems probable, therefore, that the panelled cartwheel monuments were manufactured by Welsh craftsmen in the period c. 1090-1120 when the Normans must have been a disruptive element in the life style of the peoples of Gorfynydd. Before this time, sculpture in the area is likely to have conformed more to the earlier Welsh tradition, and after this time the Normans are unlikely to have patronised the production of monuments entirely foreign to their sculptural ideals. A likely terminus ante quem is 1147, when Robert Earl of Gloucester granted all the land between the rivers Afan and Kenfig (an area in which three panelled cartwheel crosses are to be found) to the monks of Clairvaux (Smith 1971, 31).

FORM A/B: INCOMPLETE CROSSES

The rectangular-sectioned shaft Penally 363 may be given an approximate date by the character of its zoomorphic and foliate elements. In the next chapter, it is argued that the animal on Penally 363 has certain features which are characteristic of the Scandinavian Jellinge style (discussed in Chapter 5, Section 6). Wilson suggested 'a date range for the style of 875 to the second half of the tenth century' in Scandinavia (1978, 139). Furthermore, he argued that these dates may equally be
applicable to the British Isles; 'it is inconceivable to me that the Jellinge tradition in York was introduced after c. 900' (ibid, 142).

Other scholars who flinch at this late-ninth-century date for the first traces of the Jellinge style in the British Isles, nevertheless ascribe these to the early-tenth century (Bailey 1980, 56; Lang 1978, 151). The end of the style is difficult to define but elements characteristic of the later Mammen style are already present on objects from the Skaill hoard which was deposited c. 950 (Graham-Campbell 1975-6, 121; Fuglesang 1978, 207). The animal on Penally 363 is not a pure representative of the Jellinge style (below, Chapter 5, Section 6), but neither does it have any acanthus elements in the interlace which would betoken the Mammen style (Anker 1972, 162; Fuglesang 1978, 206). A date between 925 and 975 would be appropriate for this animal. The foliage on Penally 363 is compatible with this date. The curling lobed tips of the leaves seems to owe more to the influence of the Carolingian acanthus on southern English sculpture than to the pure Northumbrian vine scroll. Acanthus elements co-exist with the vine in southern English sculpture from the ninth century onwards, but their influence is especially apparent in the tenth century (Cramp 1975, 188-195).

Certain other shafts may be given an approximate date by their relationship with other monuments which are dated. The use of the rare Fret 13 links Penally 366 with Penally 363 and suggests that the former could be contemporary with the latter. Penally 365, a fragmentary slab-like shaft, has ornament similar to the cross Penally 364 (above, Chapter 2) and like it would be at home in the tenth century. Ogmore 255 is linked by the names Glywys and Nertat in its inscription to Merthyr Mawr 239 where the inscription incorporates the same names. This may indicate that the monuments were contemporary, in which case Ogmore 255 should be given a date in the second half of the eleventh century.

It has been suggested that Coychurch 193 and Newcastle-Bridgend 252 may have been the work of the same man (above, Chapter 2). The debased ornament on these shafts is reminiscent of that on Merthyr Mawr 239 and 240, again suggesting a date in the second half of the eleventh century. Llantwit Major 223 is dated by its inscription to the mid-ninth century (above, Section 2). This may seem incompatible with the ornament on the side of the shaft which Nash-Williams draws as a ring twist (1950, 145). In fact, close examination of this worn panel of interlace shows that this is incorrect; the ornament comprises a rather bungled two-cord twist, which may be attributed to the mid-ninth century.
Llantwit Major 221 has no clearly datable features but the shaft is well designed and executed and, in the absence of any later features, it may also be ascribed to the ninth century. Turning to Corwen 276, the form of this cross shaft is akin to a medieval churchyard cross, although the ornament is reminiscent of the earlier period. The shaft bears a runic inscription which Moon dated to the twelfth century (1978, 126). Moon gives no convincing arguments for her statement that 'the inscription must be later than the cross'; indeed the form of the monument suggests that the inscription is likely to have been contemporary with the erection of the cross, in the twelfth century.

Bardsey Island 82, Llangaffo 15, Rhuddlan 188 and St David's 379 and Llandewi Aberarth 113 are too fragmentary to be susceptible to dating methods.

With regard to the cross bases, the designs used on Beaumaris 1 cannot be dated with any precision. The patterns on Llangyfelach 212 seem to be copied from the cross Llantwit Major 220 (above, Section 5). If this is the case then it is evident that the base is later in date than the late ninth century which is the date given to the cross.

The conical cross base Diserth 186 has a three-lobed foliate element in its design which is reminiscent of the formal leaf carving in use on medieval monuments in north Wales from the middle of the thirteenth century onwards (Gresham 1968, 19). The insular elements in the design, such as the three-cord plait, are debased. It is likely that this base belongs to the second half of the twelfth century when Norman influence must have been making itself felt in the area through the agency of the Anglo-Norman bishopric at St Asaph which was established in 1143 (Brooke 1969, 211). This date is compatible with that suggested for the cross Diserth 185, of which Diserth 186 may have been the base.

The three unornamented rectangular cross bases Llanguicke 986, Llangynwyd 988 and Merthyr Mawr 987 are ascribed to the pre-Norman period because of their simplicity and because they do not resemble any known medieval or later form of cross base. It is impossible to be more precise about their date.

FORM C: CROSS-SLABS

C1. Angular Line-Cross-Slabs

The simplicity of these slabs makes them impossible to date with any degree of accuracy. The forms of cross used on the northern group are
reminiscent of, but not directly paralleled by, the Irish cross-slabs which Lionard (1961, 135) places in the ninth to twelfth centuries. Of the southern group, Ewenny 977 and 978 are made of Sutton stone, suggesting that these slabs at least belong to the eleventh century or later. The context in which the Ewenny slabs were found suggests a terminus ante quem of the mid-twelfth century (above, Section 3).

C2. Compass-drawn Cross-slabs

The remarks made with regard to the angular line-cross-slabs also apply here. The following compass-drawn cross-slabs are made of Sutton stone: Ewenny 981, Laleston 203 and Merthyr Mawr 967.

C3. Unpatterned Cross-slabs

Again the simplicity of the monuments makes them difficult to date. With regard to the monogram slabs, the use of the alpha and omega as Christian symbols goes back to the earliest period in Britain - they appear for example on the wall plaster from Lullingstone villa, Kent (Thomas 1971, pl. 53). The monograms IHC and XPC are not so old. They occur in their Latin forms (IHS, XPS), together with the alpha and omega, on several Irish slabs which are usually given a ninth-century date (Macalister 1949, Nos 578, 585, 908, 916). In Wales the type is unlikely to be earlier than this. The form of the 'A' on St David's 376, 380, 382 and 383, St Edren's 392 and Walton West is that designated by Okasha (1968, 338) as 'late', and would be compatible with a date in the tenth or eleventh centuries. The ornament edging the slab from Walton West (Interlace 17 and 18) is of no help for dating purposes.

C4. Interlaced Ring Cross-slabs

The simplicity of the decoration on Llanwms 125 precludes close dating of the monument. The monogram 'XPS' on this slab, probably balanced on the adjacent side of the cross with 'IHS' (now flaked away), relate the slab to the unpatterned cross-slabs of Dyfed. Nash-Williams pointed out that the formula of the inscription 'q(u)iunq(ue) explicau(er)it h(oc) nō(men) det benedixionem pro anima ...' may be paralleled on Llantisilio Yn Ial 182 and the Tullyease cross-slab from Ireland. As the former seems likely to belong to the eleventh century (above), and the latter to the early ninth century (Henry 1965), this is of little use for dating purposes. The contraction 'nō' for nominem is particularly common in ninth-century manuscripts (above, Section 2), but also occurs in the Ricemarch Psalter which was produced in the eleventh century at the scriptorium of
Llanbadarn Fawr, which is close to Llanwnnws. The date of Llanwnnws 125, and its chronological relationship with the four west Glamorgan slabs belonging to this group, therefore remains obscure.

The elegant nature of the design and execution of Llangyfelach 211 implies that this is the earliest member of the west Glamorgan group. This is a subjective hypothesis, however, and as the elements of the design are so simple and so common, it is not possible to substantiate this suggestion.

The form of Margam 232 relates it to a number of Manx slabs, including Michael 89 and Bride 97, where the armpits of the cross are cut out. All these Manx slabs have Scandinavian elements in their decoration and are likely to be of the tenth century or later. However, in the absence of any Scandinavian elements in the decoration of Margam 232, it should not be assumed that this monument is necessarily of the same date.

Of the other two cross-slabs in this group, Baglan 191 incorporates in its design Interlace 20, a type which is most common on monuments which may be dated prior to 950 but which is rare thereafter. Port Talbot 261 is less well designed and executed than the monuments discussed above, and for this reason it should probably be regarded as the latest in the group.

Finally, it is notable that none of these interlaced ring cross-slabs bear any decorative feature which need be dated later than the tenth century.

C5. Free-armed Cross-slabs

Llandyfaelog Fach 49 is given a terminus post quem of circa 950 by the incorporation in its design of a number of features which are Scandinavian influenced. These are the ring-twist (above, Interlace 35) and more especially what appears to be a Jellinge-derived ornament to the left of the cross shaft (below, Chapter 5, Section 6). This devolved animal is closely paralleled by similar animals which occur on a cross-slab from Bexhill, Sussex (Allen 1885, 277), and on a number of Cornish crosses including Sancreed No 1 (Henken 1932, fig. 51). The degree of debasement from the pure Jellinge animal suggests that a date in the eleventh century would be appropriate.

The ornament on Llanhamlach 61 and Llanfrynach 56 is cruder than that of Llandyfaelog Fach 49 and may indicate that these two slabs are later in date. Reynoldston 266 is isolated geographically from the rest of the
group and bears the most devolved ornament. It is likely, therefore, to be the latest in date.

C6. Panelled Cross-slabs

Of the three slabs from Gwent, Bulmore 290 seems to have priority. The grape-eating animal carved outside the ring of the cross strongly resembles animals on objects from the Trewhiddle hoard which was deposited c. 872-5 (Wilson and Blunt 1961). Certain features of St Arvan's 292 and Caerleon 291 indicate that they are later in date - for example the free-ring on St Arvan's 292 and the scattered pellets in the interlace of Caerleon 291. There is, however, no evidence to suggest that they are later in date than the tenth century.

The complex knotwork on the slab St David's 377 is comparable to that on the shaft of the cross of Muiredach at Monasterboice which has been dated to the first quarter of the tenth century (Henry 1967, 139), but it is not so perfect.

C7. The Full Length Cross-slab

a. Plain ringed cross. The interpretation of the inscription on Llanrhaiadr Ym Mochnant 181 proposed by Radford and Hemp (above, Section 1) would place this slab in the middle of the eleventh century. Whilst this is not acceptable as an absolute date, the date proposed is not incompatible with the nature of the ornament which occurs upon it. Llandrinio 293 is likely to have been contemporary with this cross slab.

The figure-of-eight knotwork (Interlace 22) which is the sole ornament of St Ishmael's 397 gives no indication of the date of this cross slab.

b. Decorated cross. The decoration of Llowes 408 comprises a chevron-like ornament which has Norman associations (above, Section 4). The suggested date for this slab is therefore in the late eleventh or twelfth century. Nevern 359 is placed in the second half of the tenth century, or later, from the use of a bifurcated plait in its design.

c. Double cross. The ring knots used on Meifod 295 together with haphazardly disposed interlace and zoomorphs suggest that the date of this cross-slab is likely to be post 950. The design of
Newcastle-Bridgend 254 is too simple for it to be dated with any precision.

C8. Fretted Ring Cross-slabs

The latest member of this group (for reasons given above in Section 1), St David's 382, is dated by its inscription to c. 1080. Judging from their Irish parallels, St David's 374, 375 and 376 are likely to be almost a century earlier. (below, p. 232).

C9. Circled Anglesey Cross-slabs

Most of the decorative features of this miscellaneous group are too simple to be susceptible to close dating. The stepped foot and the steps flanking the shaft of the cross on Llangaffo 21, however, are reminiscent of the Norman calvary crosses which have stepped bases. Llangaffo 21 is likely to be a product of the early Norman period.

C10. Miscellaneous Cross-slabs

a. Llandeilo 155 and 156. The lorgnette motif on Llandeilo 156 indicates that these two slabs (which are most probably the work of one man) may be attributable to an early date. The slabs from Hartlepool and Lindisfarne which bear this motif are usually ascribed to the late seventh and eighth centuries (Brown 1919, 196), whilst the Irish parallels are placed in the ninth or tenth centuries (Lionard 1961, 132). The purity of the plaitwork and fretwork on Llandeilo 155 and 156 suggests that a date in the first half of the ninth century would be appropriate. This would accord with the evidence of the Llandaff charters which suggest that the monastery flourished c. 590-890 (Davies 1978, 158). By the late tenth century, however, the community at Llandeilo had dispersed (Richards 1973, 135-146).

b. Nash 250. The Manx parallel Maughold 67 has no Scandinavian features in its design and thus is likely to be earlier than c. 950. There are no features on Nash 250 itself which are capable of proving or disproving this date.

c. Llanwnda 334. The unique nature of this slab and the absence of any diagnostic ornament in its design makes it impossible to date.

d. Llanveynoe 411. The crucifix is in the Saxon rather than the Celtic tradition (Chapter 5, Section 2). The position of the body -
slightly bent and with the head inclined - relates it most nearly to the crucifixes in the 'Winchester Style' of the tenth century, such as that in Harley MS 2904, folio 3b.

e. Llandetty 46. Nash-Williams suggested that the form of this monument (an erect square-sectioned slab with inscription and incised ornament) indicated that it was 'transitional in date between Groups II and III. Ninth century' (1950, 71). The formulae of the inscription, however, are characteristic of true Group III monuments. This slab should probably be regarded as the incompetent work of an amateur craftsman during the period of manufacture of monuments of Group III.

f. Llangors 59. The debased nature of the ornament suggests that this cross-slab should be ascribed to the late-tenth or eleventh century.

g. Tregaron 133. In Wales, the triangular motif (Knot 7) is found only on monuments ascribed to the twelfth century and the chequer motif is best paralleled on Norman stonework. Furthermore, the use of four sunken panels to form the cross motif is reminiscent of the panelled cartwheel group, which has also been ascribed to the twelfth century. Thus it seems more likely that Tregaron 133 is a twelfth-century monument than one of the seventh to ninth centuries as Nash-Williams (1950, 106) suggested.

h. St David's 383. This cross-slab is similar in shape and in the layout of the ornament to St David's 382 which is dated c. 1080. In view of the rather incompetent and haphazard nature of the design and execution of St David's 383 it seems likely that it is later in date than number 382.

FORM D: RELATED MONUMENTS

D1. The Round Pillar

The round-sectioned monument as it occurs outside Wales is capable of a large range of dates. Masham and Priors Barton have been placed in the ninth century (Kendrick 1938, 192-5), Wolverhampton may be tenth century (Cramp 1975, 189) and Melbury Bubb may belong to the early eleventh century (ibid, 198).

The ornament on Llantwit Major 224 is not in itself datable. Nevertheless the panels of rather incoherent interlace on this pillar are
similar in character to those on the cross shaft Llantwit Major 222. It is possible that the pillar is contemporary with the cross shaft which has been dated to the first half of the eleventh century. The vestiges of arrow fret (11) on Llanrhaeadr Ym Mochnant 180 are of no help in dating this fragment.

D2. Figured Slabs

The close parallels between the stylised human and animal figures on Llanrhidian 218 and those which appear on the latest Irish hanging-bowls, and also in the Book of Deer (below, Section 8), strongly suggests a late ninth or tenth-century context for this slab. As none of the stone monuments in the British Isles bearing orantes figures has any features in their ornament suggestive of Scandinavian or later influence, it is reasonable to suppose that both Pontardawe 256 and Seven Sisters 269 were made prior to c. 950.

D3. The Hogback

Lang believed that the hogback monument originated in north Yorkshire in the second quarter of the tenth century, beginning with elaborately decorated monuments such as the Brompton group (1976, 206). He proposed a typology of hogbacks based on their stylistic developments (ibid, 206-233). The hogback from Llandewi Aberarth does not conform to any of these groups. The monument at Mossknow, Dumfries; which is ribbed on one side like the Welsh hogback was dated by its other decorative features to the tenth century (ibid, 219-220). If simplicity of design is taken as a criterion, however, then Llandewi Aberarth 114 is more closely related to Lang's 'Scottish Plain Tegulated Type' which he regarded as belonging to the eleventh or early twelfth centuries.

All that may be said with any degree of certainty is that the simplicity of Llandewi Aberarth 114 indicates that typologically the hogback is considerably removed from the Brompton group. It is therefore likely to be considerably later in date than these.

D4. The Ornamented Slabs

Cribyn 107 and Silian 129 may be dated approximately by the type of interlace (28) which occurs upon them. This type of interlace (single-stranded on Cribyn and Silian) is found elsewhere in Wales only on Penally 364 (dated above to the first half of the tenth century) and on the latter it is triple-stranded. The pattern is common in Hiberno-Saxon manuscripts
of the late seventh and eighth centuries. The thick single-stranded form
of the interlace on the Welsh slabs is particularly reminiscent of the
pattern as it occurs in the Book of Durrow. Thus the single-stranded
pattern is likely to be earlier than the triple-stranded variety on
Penally 364 and so Cribyn and Silian may be dated earlier than Penally
364 — to the ninth century, or earlier. This is confirmed by the dist-
ribution of the pattern elsewhere in the British Isles — in all six cases
the monuments on which this pattern is found exhibit no evidence of
Scandinavian influence in their design.

On the evidence of this pattern alone, Cribyn 107 and Silian 129 may
be dated c. 700-900. It is not possible to be more precise, but it is
evident that these two slabs must stand somewhere at the beginning of the
evolution of Welsh monuments of Group III.

The dense and complex interlace on Llangenydd 209 is very competently
designed and executed. There are no features in the design indicative of
a date later than the tenth century, but in the absence of any directly
comparable monuments it is impossible to be more specific about its date.

D5. **Sundials**

In the Saxon context, sundials are dated as early as the eighth
century by the occurrence of one example on the shaft of the Bewcastle
cross. Saxon dials generally are to be distinguished from Norman dials
by the division of the day into four tides; in the Norman period, the
division of the day into twelve equal hours replaced the earlier conven-
tion (Green 1928, 494). Sundials must have been in use throughout the
period as a means of indicating the canonical hours. Barnack, for example,
is dated to the early tenth century by the acanthus-derived ornament on
the dial (Cramp 1976, 193). One of the latest 'pure' Saxon examples, from
Kirkdale, Yorkshire, has an inscription indicating that it was made c.
1064 (Green 1928, 506).

The Irish examples are not easily datable by their decoration, which
is usually confined to the lines of the dial alone. Sundials at Kilmal-
kedar and Monasterboice bear insular ornament which place them in the
period in question.

Clynnog Fawr 85, like the majority of Irish slab-dials, has no dec-
oration other than the lines of the dial itself. It is reasonable to
suppose that it falls into the period 750-1100, but the simplicity of the
monument makes it impossible to be any more specific.
D6. Fonts

Patrishow 67 is placed in the pre-Norman period by its inscription which is in the miniscule script, but the font is otherwise undecorated. Kinnerley has a Greek inscription which suggests that it may belong to the twelfth century (Summers 1902, 163-74). This font has the arrow fret motif (11) which belongs to the pre-Norman period, and in this context indicates the persistence of the earlier decorative tradition.

The same phenomenon may be seen on the Anglesey fonts. Several of these have arcading and chevron designs which are typical Norman motifs, combined with patterns that have survived from the earlier period. These fonts cannot be dated much before 1100 because of the Norman influence in their designs, but their use of the earlier motifs suggests that they are likely to have been made in the early part of the twelfth century. Fonts at Cerrig Ceinwen 4, Newborough 36 and Trefdraeth, which have no discernable Norman influence in their designs, may be placed in the late eleventh century. Of these, Cerrig Ceinwen is likely to be the earliest by virtue of its competent design and execution.

D7. Architectural Sculpture

The motif on Merthyr Mawr 243 and 244 is found only on stone monuments of the Norman period. It is unlikely, therefore, that these two slabs belong to the pre-Norman period. Similarly, the Romanesque capitals on the pieces from Devynock and Llancarfan 204 place them within the sphere of Norman influence in the late eleventh or twelfth centuries.

The decorated tympanum at Penmon must also be dated to the Norman period, but the interlace designs on this piece of sculpture belong to the insular tradition, and the tympanum most probably belongs to the first half of the twelfth century.
Nash-Williams placed the following dates on his Groups of sculpture:
Group I, 5th to 7th century; Group II, 7th to 9th century; Group III, 9th to 11th century; Group IV, 11th to 13th century.

The dating of Group I is established by its epigraphic characteristics (Nash-Williams 1950, 3-16), but the dates placed on the later Groups are more arbitrary. The majority of the monuments of Group II are uninscribed and the form and cross-incised decoration of these slabs is so simple as to render this group incapable of being placed in a fixed chronological setting. Nash-Williams stated that the 'true cross' did not appear in Wales until the seventh century (1950, 16), but cross forms comparable with those which occur on Group II are found stamped on the bases of imported 'A' ware in the fifth and sixth centuries and thus could have reached Wales at this date. Alcock (1965, 203) and Lewis (1976, 151) argued for an earlier date for this group than the one suggested by Nash-Williams. Equally there is no compelling reason why the group may not have extended chronologically beyond the ninth century.

Nash-Williams' dating of Group III is dependent upon the assumption that the 'sudden appearance of developed sculpture' in Wales was 'doubtless an artistic reflection of the rapprochement between the Celtic and Latin churches following the settlement of the Easter Controversy in 768' (1950, 29). The first part of the statement concerning the 'sudden appearance' of sculpture is acceptable. As in Northumbria, there are no pieces which can be assigned to the hesitant beginnings of the genre. This implies that the impulse for Welsh stone carving was either received from outside Wales in some way, or that it grew out of an indigenous tradition expressed in some media now lost, for example wood. Wooden sculpture in the round was evidently practised in Wales in the Roman period (Boon 1978, 619-624) and certain features of the Welsh angular line cross slabs suggest that they are skeuomorphic of wooden grave markers (above, Chapter 2). The evidence for wooden crosses has already been assembled (in Chapter 1), but in the absence of any decorated fragments the existence of carved and ornamented free-standing crosses in wood must remain hypothetical.

Cramp (1970, 55) suggested that in Northumbria the art of sculpture had to be re-introduced after the Roman period by foreign craftsmen. It is valid to ask whether the beginnings of Welsh sculpture can be explained in this way. Only two Welsh monuments of Group III, Llantisilio Yn Ial 182 and St Edren's 291, may be ascribed with any certainty to the hand of a
foreign craftsman (English and Irish respectively) - but these two monuments do not stand at the beginning of the Welsh series.

In this context it is necessary to examine the second part of Nash-Williams' statement that the appearance of Welsh sculpture was 'doubtless an artistic reflection of the rapprochement between the Celtic and Latin churches following the settlement of the Easter Controversy in 768.' If this is correct then one would expect that the earliest datable monuments in Group III would exhibit English influence - either from the north (in which case the Northumbrian vine scroll would be a likely diagnostic motif in this period), or across the border from contemporary Mercian work. Influence from the south of England is less likely because of the distance involved for communication. It would also follow that his influence would appear first on the monuments of north Wales as Elfodd, the bishop responsible for the Easter change was associated with Gwynedd. In fact, the earliest dated pieces of Welsh sculpture are from south Wales and exhibit influence from the insular manuscripts and the stonework of Ireland rather than from English sculpture. The connections between Wales and other areas of the British Isles which are indicated by the patterns on the sculptural material are elucidated in the next chapter.

The figured slab Pontardawe 256 is the earliest of these and is the only piece of Welsh sculpture that may convincingly be placed in the eighth century. It is an isolated example, however, and bears little resemblance in form or style to the crosses and cross-slabs which comprise the majority of the monuments of Group III. The slabs Llandeilo 155 and 156, the cross head St Fagan's 267 and the disc-headed cross St Lawrence 298 have been ascribed to the ninth century. The Llandeilo slabs are unique, but Irish influence is again apparent here. St Fagan's 267 also has Irish affinities (Chapter 5, Section 3). A motif on St Lawrence 298 is ascribed to the influence of Hiberno-Saxon manuscript illumination, but the form of the monument is peculiarly Welsh. The first firmly dated monument, Llantwit Major 220 (c. 880, above, Section 1) has no features which need to be explained by influence from outside Wales.

Thus it would seem that in south Wales at least the impulses for the ornamental carving of stone crosses and cross-slabs came from Ireland. The early Irish form of free-standing cross of which St Fagan's 267 is the only extant representative, was soon modified in south Wales into the characteristic disc-headed cross with slab-like shaft of which Llantwit Major 220 is a late ninth-century example. This form continued to be
manufactured for at least two centuries; the latest datable example, Llanarthney 147 is ascribed to the late eleventh or twelfth century. The inception of the free-standing cross with ringed fan-shaped arms is probably to be dated rather later than the disc-headed cross — this form flourished in the first half of the eleventh century. The panelled cartwheels were the last distinctive south Welsh form of cross, having a short period of manufacture in the late eleventh/early twelfth century.

In central and eastern Wales, Llanynis 65, a moulded pillar cross, is the earliest extant example of post-Roman and pre-Norman sculpture and it may be dated to the ninth century. Certain features of this monument may be paralleled on Irish and English pieces of sculpture (discussed in Chapter 5), but the moulded pillar cross is a form of monument which is peculiar to this part of Wales. In Gwent, English influence was exerted on the design of the late ninth-century monument from Bulmore (Chapter 5, Section 2) and may thus ultimately have been responsible for the group of panelled cross-slabs from Gwent. Sculpture in Gwent seems to have come to a premature end as no pre-Norman sculpture later than the tenth century is known from this area. In mid Wales, the emphasis seems to have been upon the local development of cross-slabs rather than free-standing or disc-headed crosses. The form of the free-armed cross-slab Llandyfaelog Fach 49, dated to the late tenth century, has two later imitators, Llanfrynach 56 and Llanhamlach 61, but the other monuments in this area are highly individual pieces, dating for the most part to the late tenth and eleventh centuries — eg. Meifod 295, Llanrhæadr Ym Mochnant 181. The last vestiges of the pre-Norman period in east Wales are exhibited on the unrelated monuments Corwen, Llowes 408 and the font from Kinnerley.

Group III monuments are evident in north Wales at a later date than in the south. Only two native forms are created; the angular line cross-slabs and the fonts from Anglesey. The former group is difficult to date, but the latter are almost certainly late, most belonging to the first half of the twelfth century. The earliest crosses in this area are Pennon 37 and 38 which seem to derive from the north-western English disc-headed crosses. Both monuments at Pennon may be ascribed to the middle of the tenth century. The form of the north Welsh disc-headed cross is revived in the immediate pre-Norman period in the monuments Whitford 190 and Diserth 185 (above).

The implications of these chronological groupings are discussed in Chapters 5 to 8.
### Table 1. Forms of Letters in use on Monuments of Group III: Key

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>Baglan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Bardsey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td>Carew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>Coychurch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
<td>Coychurch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>Llanarthney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Llandetty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Llandewi Aberarth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>Llandough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Llandyfaelog Fach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WW</td>
<td>Walton West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>Llanfynydd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Llangors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>Llangyfelach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Llanhamlach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>Llanrhlaedr Yn Mochnant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>Llantisilio Yn Ial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>Llantwit Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222</td>
<td>Llantwit Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223</td>
<td>Llantwit Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410</td>
<td>Llanveynoe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>Llanwunws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231</td>
<td>Margam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233</td>
<td>Margam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234</td>
<td>Margam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236</td>
<td>Margam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237</td>
<td>Margam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239</td>
<td>Merthyr Mawr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>Merthyr Mawr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>360</td>
<td>Nevern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253</td>
<td>Newcastle-Bridgend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255</td>
<td>Ogmore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>365</td>
<td>Resolven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>376</td>
<td>St. Davids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>379</td>
<td>St. Davids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>380</td>
<td>St. Davids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>382</td>
<td>St. Davids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Llanarth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>392</td>
<td>St. Edrens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>Tregaron</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2. Forms of Letters in use on Transitional Monuments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>383</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter</th>
<th>47</th>
<th>54a</th>
<th>204</th>
<th>281</th>
<th>383</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Patrishow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54a</td>
<td>Llanfihangel Cwmdu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>Llancarfan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281</td>
<td>Llanfihangel Y Traethau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>383</td>
<td>St. Davids</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. Analysis of Ornament on Llantwit Major

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>220</th>
<th>234</th>
<th>364</th>
<th>206</th>
<th>212</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interlace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

220: Llantwit Major
234: Margam
364: Penally
206: Llandough
212: Llangyfelach
Table 4. Analysis of Ornament of Carew 303

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>303</th>
<th>360</th>
<th>222</th>
<th>159</th>
<th>Ex.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

303: Carew
360: Nevern
222: Llantwit Major
159: Llanfynydd
Ex.: Exeter
Map 1. The Panelled Cartwheel Monuments of Glamorgan.
Fig. 1. The Possible Progress of Debasement of Individual Motifs.
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CHAPTER FIVE

ANALYSIS OF FORM AND STYLE IN THE HISTORICAL CONTEXT

In this chapter an attempt is made to examine the contemporary relations between Wales and England, Ireland, Scotland and the Isle of Man, and the Scandinavian and Norman settlers in the British Isles, as they are represented by the carved stonework of each area. The results are discussed in the light of the nature of the contacts between Wales and each of these areas as they are revealed in the historical sources.

Sections 2 to 7 are concerned mainly with carved stonework. It has already been suggested (in Chapter 3, Section 3) that in the majority of cases the monuments were manufactured on or near to the sites where they were to be erected. In this way carved stonework is more likely to reflect the artistic conditions prevalent in each area than objects in more easily portable media. Nevertheless it should be remembered that whilst the finished product is unlikely to have been transported far from its place of manufacture, the designs used on it may have been affected by the designs on portable objects. Moreover the craftsman himself may have been itinerant. The possible ways in which stylistic influence was exerted by one area upon another, and in this context the relevance of other contemporary media such as manuscripts and metalwork, are discussed in Section 8.
1. **THE INSULAR CONTEXT**

Before examining the relationship between the stonework of Wales and each individual area referred to above, it is necessary to place Wales in its wider context with regard to the patterns which occur on the monuments.

The monumental forms of Welsh sculpture are often peculiar to Wales, but the majority of the patterns which are to be found on these monuments may be paralleled on the stonework from different areas of Britain and Ireland. In this context 'insular' is used as a blanket term covering present day England, Wales, Scotland, the Isle of Man and the whole of Ireland. Any pattern represented by more than one example in each of three or more of these areas will be regarded as 'insular'. Motifs which conform to these specifications but which have a discernable Scandinavian element are dealt with in Section 6.

Of the monumental forms, the only one which can be regarded as truly insular is the round hollow cross head in both its free-armed and ringed forms (Appendix B, Cross Form 10). In both cases the distribution is predominantly northern and western; the type does not seem to have been used in the south and east of England (Maps 1 and 2).

In contrast, a large number of individual motifs may be regarded as insular. Of the knots, the triquetra is the most common, being found in all areas and in all media (Appendix B, Knot 1; Map 3). Its popularity may be explained partly by its usefulness as a filling motif, and partly because it may have had a deeper significance as a symbol of the Holy Trinity. The Stafford Knot (2) is almost as common as the triquetra, but occurs less frequently in Scotland and Ireland than the former (Map 4). This useful ornamental device was often used to terminate interlace patterns. Conjoined rings (Knot 4) have an equally scattered distribution (Map 5), but they are especially common on Welsh, Cornish and Manx stonework. The looped square (Knot 5) is a rare insular motif which has a northern distribution and is not found on Irish monuments. Welsh stonework provides most of the examples of the triangular knot (8), but it is also found in stone in the Isle of Man and Scotland, and in a number of insular manuscripts. In stone the quadruple Stafford knot (10) and the quadruple triquetra knot (14) are predominantly Irish, although there are isolated examples from elsewhere in the British Isles. The use of the quadruple Stafford knot (15) as the motif filling the head of the cross is confined to south Wales and the north and east of England, with an outlier in Cornwall (Map 6).
Turning to interlace, the simple two-cord twist (1) is the most numerous motif in stonework and in other media, but it is remarkable that there are no known examples from the stonework of north Wales, Cornwall and the south of England (Map 7). The three-cord plait (3) is similarly absent from Cornwall and the south of England, but is well represented elsewhere. Four-, six- and eight-cord plaits (4, 6 and 7) are found in all insular contexts. The single row of figure-of-eight knotwork (22) is also represented in all areas and in all media (Map 8).

A large number of interlace motifs have a predominantly northern and western distribution, being found in the north and west of England, Ireland, Scotland and the Isle of Man. Into this category fall the double twist (2), the single row of Stafford knots (16) and the double row of C-shaped loops pointing up and down (28). A number of motifs with an otherwise north-westerly distribution are absent from the Isle of Man - for example linked Stafford knotwork (18; Map 9), the two forms of knotwork derived from the six-cord plait (14 and 15), the double row of M-shaped loops (20), the single row of horizontal figure-of-eight knots (24), Z-bend knotwork (25) and the double row of double C-shaped loops (29). Figure-of-eight knots in a double row (23) and the two-cord looped plait (32) are confined in stonework to the north and west of England and Scotland.

With regard to frets, the 'Z' fret (3) and the 'T' fret (4) are most widespread (Maps 10 and 11). These patterns are found in all media and in the stonework of all areas except southern England. The arrow fret (11) has a similar distribution, but the only English examples of the motif come from Cornwall. In common with the interlace, several fret motifs are found in all insular contexts except Manx stonework. Of these, the square arrow fret (18) and the square 'Z' fret (20) are also absent from southern England, but the square arrow and forked 'T' fret (24) is represented in this area. The battlement pattern (2) and the 'Z' fret with ticks and spirals (14) are found in stonework only in Wales, England and Scotland. The 'T' and 'H' bar fret (6) and the 'L'-shaped fret (7) are also limited in distribution, this time to the stonework of Wales, Ireland and Scotland.

Three other ornamental devices may be considered in the insular context. Cable moulding occurs on the monuments of all areas; only examples in stone are listed in Appendix B (Miscellaneous 1), but the same impression is often achieved in metalwork by the use of twisted wires. Complex spirals which are very common on Irish and Scottish stonework and in
'Hiberno-Saxon' manuscripts, do not occur in Welsh stonework. A number of Welsh monuments have simple spirals, however, and these can be paralleled on monuments from England and the Isle of Man and to a lesser extent Scotland and Ireland (Miscellaneous 4). The rosette motif occurs in stone in Wales, England, Scotland and Ireland, and it is common in the manuscripts of the period (Miscellaneous 3). It is debatable how far the rosette should be regarded as insular as the motif is classical in origin, perhaps deriving ultimately from Syrian art (Aberg 1945, 33), and in the period under consideration, rosette centerings were common in Carolingian stucco and ivories (Cramp 1975, 188).

Several scenes which are employed on Welsh sculpture may be regarded as insular. The crucifixion scene is the most common example, but different aspects of this scene may be ascribed to different areas, and these are dealt with in the following sections. Hunting scenes appear on monuments from all areas, but are particularly common in Ireland and Scotland (Figures and Scenes 7). Such scenes were common in late Roman art (Rodewaldt 1933, 202). In the post-Roman period the scene appears on a number of sarcophagi from Spain and Merovingian Gaul (Coutil 1930, 23-26). In the British Isles, the scene occurs from the eighth century - several examples are from Pictish Class II stones. The virtual monopoly of the hunting scene by Ireland and Scotland has led a number of scholars to suggest that formal aspects of the design were adapted from pagan Celtic mythology - an interpretation which Henry (1965, 155) pointed out is corroborated by the occurrence of the scene in a pagan context on the engraved bone from Lough Crew (ibid, plate 7). The Christian interpretation of the scene is obscure. Henry (ibid, 153) suggested that it might represent Christ pursuing a soul, but this cannot be substantiated. The significance of the triquetra knot which may be seen behind the horsemen on the crosses Margam 234 and Bealin is obscure. This type of knot is common in both pagan and Christian contexts and although it is often assumed that in Christian contexts it may be a symbol of the Trinity, it is equally possible that it was regarded as little more than a convenient space-filler.

The figure of a horseman is here treated as a separate motif (Appendix B, Figures and Scenes 8), but it may not be valid to separate this from the hunting scene in which the horseman often appears. On Pictish monuments of Class II (Allen 1903), horsemen are often presented as warriors with a sword and shield. The subject may again be pagan in origin and the full significance of the figure is obscure. A possible
Christian interpretation is provided by a passage in Revelation (19 v. 11) 'then I saw heaven opened and behold a white horse! He who sat upon it is called Faithful and True, and in righteousness he judges and makes war'.

The figure of a man holding a horn also seems to belong to an insular context, and again it is uncertain how these figures should be interpreted. Drinking horns made of wood, or more likely the horns of cattle must have been articles of everyday use. The 'heroic' literature of the British Isles and Scandinavia yields many references to their use. Perhaps the best known example concerns the legend of the god Thor who was challenged to drain a drinking horn, the end of which, without his knowledge, was in the sea (Foote and Wilson 1973, 167). The most likely Christian interpretation of this figure is provided by many references in the Old and New Testaments to a drinking horn, often used in a figurative sense to refer to the Messiah. Luke (1 v. 69) for example states that 'the lord has raised up a horn of salvation for us in the house of his servant David'. This interpretation is particularly appropriate to Llangan 207, Glamorgan, where the figure holding a horn is directly below a scene showing Christ 'raised up' - ie. crucified. The reference to David in the passage in Luke is interesting because in the two manuscript examples cites (Appendix B, Figures and Scenes 11), the horn appears in a scene illustrating the anointing of David by Samuel.

The representation of a man's head between two beasts differs from the above in distribution as it is not found in England (Figures and Scenes 10). Henry (1965, 156) suggested that this motif owes something to the old Celtic renderings of devouring monsters. A possible Christian interpretation is provided by Psalm 22: 'save me from the mouth of the lion, my afflicted soul from the horns of the wild oxen' (v. 21). It is possible that this motif is related to, and should be interpreted in the same way as, the scene of a man between two beast-men - which is discussed in the section on Hiberno-Welsh relations (3).

Map 13 indicates that the vast majority of Welsh monuments of Group III exhibit one or more of the insular features mentioned above. Thus it may be concluded that Wales participated fully in the insular repertoire of ornament.
2. ANGLO-WELSH RELATIONS

It is necessary to outline the general trends of Anglo-Welsh relations from the ninth century to the coming of the Normans in order to provide a context for this section.

The Anglo-Saxons do not seem to have constituted any serious threat to Wales until the end of the sixth century. The Book of Llandaff records a number of kings of Gwent and Ergyng fighting the Anglo-Saxons c. 600 (Charters 123, 141, 161). In the first half of the seventh century, Cadwallon king of Gwynedd entered into an alliance with Penda of Mercia and in 633, according to the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle (1) they fought and defeated Edwin of Deira. Throughout the eighth century there were border skirmishes between the Welsh and the Anglo-Saxons. In 760 the Annales Cambriae records the battle of Hereford. Offa is known to have made raids on Welsh territory in 778 and 784 (both Annales Cambriae). A consensus of scholarly opinion is that the Dyke which bears his name should be ascribed to his reign (Fox, 1955, 757-796). In 798 (AC), Caradog King of Gwynedd was killed by the Anglo-Saxons. In 816, according to the Brut Y Tywysogyon, Rhufoniog was overrun by the Anglo-Saxons, and in 822 (AC) the same fate overtook Powys and Degannwy was destroyed.

Similarly, ninth-century Anglo-Welsh relations were characterised by mutual hostility which frequently found expression in border warfare. Acts of aggression were most often initiated by the Anglo-Saxons, and in particular by the Mercians, who evidently still hoped to subject the Welsh. For 853, the Parker Chronicle states 'Burghred, king of Mercia, and his councillors besought king Ethelwulf that he would help them to subject the Welsh' (Garmonsway 1972, 64).

By the late ninth century, there is some evidence of change in the nature of the Anglo-Welsh relations. According to Asser's Life of Alfred (Chapter 80), their 'oppression' by the sons of Rhodri, king of Gwynedd and Powys, led the kings of Dyfed, Brycheiniog, Gwent and Glywysing to seek the protection of the English king Alfred. Asser states that shortly after this (in the late ninth century), Rhodri's son Anarawd, king of Gwynedd, sought Alfred's protection. In 893 'a section of the Welsh'

(1) The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle is now represented by four distinct vernacular chronicles preserved in seven manuscripts. The relationship between these manuscripts was studied by Plummer (1892-1899). The material is collated in translation by Garmonsway (1972), which is used throughout this thesis. The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle is abbreviated as ASC in the text of the thesis.
presumably from south Wales, aided Alfred in a battle against the Danes which was fought at Buttington on the river Severn (ASC s.a. 894). In the following year Anarawd used English help to devastate Ceredigion and Ystrad Yywi (AC). After the reign of Alfred these arrangements do not seem to have been honoured. In 916, for example, Ethelflaed Lady of the Mercians invaded Brycheiniog and captured its queen and a number of her followers (ASC).

The tenth century also saw the submission of kings of Wales to the English kings. Hywel Dda, his brother Clydog of Seisyllwg, and Idwal, the ruler of north Wales, gave allegiance to king Edward at Tamworth in 921 (ASC 'A'). In 926, Hywel together with Owain of Gwent submitted to Athelstan (ibid). William of Malmesbury records the events of this meeting at Hereford; tribute was exacted from the Welsh kings and the Wye was appointed as the boundary between the two peoples (Stubbs 1887, 148). A document known as the Ordinance of the Dunsæte belongs to this time, or shortly after. This document defines the relations between the English and Welsh peoples constituting the Dunsæte - a people living in the Monmouth region on two sides of a river, presumably the Wye (Stenton 1970, 198). This document indicates that access from one side of this river to the other was restricted. The conditions under which the English and the Welsh might pass into each other's territory are strictly defined (Stenton 1970, Chapter 20). From this time onwards, Hywel, Owain and a number of other Welsh kings seem to have made regular visits to the court of the English king as their names appear as witnesses to a number of charters which were made at these courts (Lloyd 1954, 353).

Yet this was an uneasy truce and one which was not supported whole-heartedly by the Welsh. The poem Armes Prydein (2) reflects anti-English feeling at this time (Bromwich 1972). In the second half of the tenth century, the annals record numerous Anglo-Saxon raids on Wales, with Welsh kings being killed in the raids of 943 and 950. In 983 the Anglo-Saxons penetrated Deheubarth and later king Edwin 'ravaged all the kingdoms of Maredudd, that is Dyfed and Ceredigion and Gower and Cydweli' (BNT 990-992). St David's was the victim of Anglo-Saxon raids in 992 and 1010.

(2) Armes Prydein is one of a number of poems collected together in the late thirteenth century in the Book of Taliesin (Bromwich 1972, xii). Internal evidence makes it fairly certain that the poem was composed between 927 and 937 (Bromwich 1972, xix - xxiv).
A similar situation is apparent in the eleventh century. During his reign, Gruffydd ap Llewellyn undertook a number of campaigns against the English, sometimes with the help of Aelfgar, the exiled earl of Mercia (ASC 1055). In 1063 (ASC), the English earls Harold and Tostig led an expedition against Gruffydd, and the latter was deserted and killed by the men of Deheubarth. In the same year, Gruffydd's half brothers Bleddyn and Rhiawallon submitted to the English king Edward, and were granted the kingdoms of Gwynedd and Powys by him (ASC). During their reigns they allied with Edwin of Mercia and Morcar of Northumbria, and later with Eadric the Wild, to inflict damage on the Normans settling in the Shropshire area (Orderic Vitalis, book 4: Chibnall 1969, 229).

It is evident that throughout the pre-Norman period Anglo-Welsh relations were generally limited to acts of aggression. The two peoples apparently regarded each other with hostility, even when the official policy was conciliatory.

The course of Anglo-Welsh relations receives little illumination from archaeology or the evidence of place-names. To date, with the exception of Offa's Dyke, there is little archaeological evidence for the Saxons in Wales. Alcock drew attention to the finds of scrap Teutonic glass and bronzes at Dinas Powys in Phase 4. These must imply the existence of trading contacts between Dinas Powys and some Teutonic source in the late fifth and sixth centuries, but, as Alcock indicates, this source cannot precisely be located: 'Gaul would seem as likely as England' (1963, 56; 1971, 233). Trading connections between Wales and Anglo-Saxon England are rarely indicated by archaeological material. A sword with Trewhiddle-style ornament was discovered in Radnorshire, but this is an isolated find which need not be treated as evidence of trade. As pre-Norman Wales did not have a monetary economy, most of the six hoards and eleven single-finds of Anglo-Saxon coins in Wales (catalogued by Dykes 1972, 27-8), which were all found within five miles of the coast and which were deposited between 850 and 1066, are probably to be linked with Scandinavian activities in and around Wales. Caerwent, however, has yielded three

(3) Paris Bibliothèque Nationale Ms. Lat. 5506 vol ii, folios 1-100v preserves the 'Ecclesiastical History' of Orderic Vitalis, apparently in his own hand of the early twelfth century (Chibnall 1969, xliii). The text and translation here cited is that of Chibnall (1969).

(4) A silver-mounted sword hilt with fragmentary iron blade, the silver mounts inlaid with niello in the Trewhiddle style. Found in Radnorshire, Wales, probably in the Builth Wells area, but precise provenance unknown. British Museum Registration No. 1969 7-32.
single-finds of coins (op cit) - a 'concentration' which may indicate some degree of Anglo-Saxon influence in south-east Gwent from the mid-tenth century, which may have emanated from Bristol. Dykes has gone as far as to suggest that Newport was the Anglo-Saxon mint responsible for the pennies of Ethelred II with the mint name NIWAN (op cit, 21), but corroborative evidence is lacking.

With regard to the evidence of place-names, the majority of English place-names in the modern Principality are found in the border country to the east of Offa's Dyke (Map 13; Charles 1938, xxi). The distribution of the English place-names found to the west of the Dyke suggests that there was some English penetration, and presumably settlement, along the river valleys, particularly the Severn valley, at some period. Domesday Book indicates that by 1086, the effective boundary between England and Wales was further east than Offa's Dyke, conforming more to the modern boundary (Charles 1938, xxiv). It seems more likely, therefore, that these English place-names were coined in the period of Mercian aggression and expansion in the pre-Norman period, than after c. 1086. Elsewhere, the evidence for English settlement in Wales in the pre-Norman period is very slight. Most of the English place-names in Dyfed and Glamorgan cannot be dated to the pre-Norman period with any degree of certainty. It is thus to the sculptural material that one must turn for confirmation or refutation of the picture drawn from the historical sources.

The three monumental forms pertinent to the question of Anglo-Saxon influence on Wales have received detailed discussion above and only the main points are outlined here. The north-Welsh disc heads seem to represent contacts between the coastal regions of north Wales and north-west England within a Scandinavian-influenced cultural milieu (Chapter 2, Form B2). Of these monuments, the form, if not the decoration of Penmon 38 is best paralleled in Cumbria, whereas Whitford 190 is so closely comparable in design to certain crosses from St John's, Chester, that it may be the product of the same school, in this case working on a larger scale (Chapter 2, Table 4). The cross at Diserth probably owes the projections on the neck of the monument to influence from the St John's school, rather than from Cornwall where this feature is also common (Appendix B, Cross Form 17). It is probably significant in this connection that both Diserth and Whitford are in the region of Rhufoniog which seems to have been under English control from the ninth to the twelfth century (Lloyd 1954, 242).
The second monumental form is that represented by the hogback tombstone from Llandewi Aberarth, Dyfed. This is indicative of influence from the Scandinavian settlements of the north of England, and in particular from Northumbria, and as such it is discussed in Section 6. The third monumental form to be mentioned here is the undecorated round-to-rectangular-shafted cross, represented in Wales by Eliseg's Pillar (Llantisilio Yn Ial 181, Clwyd). Eliseg's Pillar finds its closest parallels in north-west Mercia, and it is likely that the influence was exerted from the Derbyshire region, along the Vale of Llangollen. This monument seems to be a product of the mid-tenth century or later (discussed in Chapter 4).

The ringed fan-shaped cross head which is the most common form in south Wales may be derived from the stonework of southern England, where the majority of the examples of this form occur (Appendix B, Cross Form B4; Map 14). Nevertheless, the Welsh monuments which have this form of cross head constitute a distinctive group, most of which have slab-like shafts (Form A1), and it is perhaps better to regard them as a peculiarly Welsh type.

Three Welsh cross-heads, Llandaff 205, Glamorgan, Llanfachraith 8, Anglesey, and St David's 378, Dyfed, are linked to the English series by their form, which is of the ringed Anglian type. The free-armed Anglian cross-head is almost exclusively a Northumbrian type concentrated in, and apparently emanating from, the Yorkshire region (Appendix B, Cross Form A1; Map 15). The ringed form has a more scattered distribution, but is still a predominantly northern fashion (Form B1; Map 15). The hypothesis that this type of cross-head represents monumental influence from the north of England receives support from the occurrence of a simple crucifix on the cross head from Llanfachraith. This feature is found on a number of Yorkshire crosses which have the Anglian form of cross head (Collingwood 1927, figs 129, 130). The simple crucifix, however, is paralleled equally well on certain Cornish crosses (Appendix B, Figures and Scenes 5; Map 16). The three Welsh cross heads under discussion are incomplete and although northern English influence upon Wales is likely, in this instance the connection cannot be proven.

Certain Welsh monuments exhibit structural features which may be the result of contact between England and Wales in this period. It has already been suggested that the shape of the composite-shafted cross Llandough 206, Glamorgan, may owe something to English crosses where the shaft has a central swelling (Chapter 2, Form A3). This feature has a widely scattered
distribution within England (Appendix B, Monumental Form 1). The shafts of the two Powysian moulded pillar crosses - Llanynis 65 and Llandewi'r Cwm 47 are defined by a rare form of segmented column moulding. In the British Isles only two other examples are known, one from Sockburn, Durham, and the other from Codford St Peter, Wiltshire (pl. 203). One possible source for this type of moulding is the sculpture of Lombard Italy where segmented moulding is frequently used as a frame around different types of ornament (Haseloff 1930, 132). The moulding on Llandewi'r Cwm appears to be a debased copy of that of Llanynis, but there is little evidence from either of these two monuments to throw more light on the problem. It can only be said that the complex, well designed and executed knotwork of Llanynis 65 makes it a likely contemporary of Codford St Peter (above, Chapter 4). In this connection, one more monument is to be noted, namely Coychurch 194, Glamorgan, which is distinctive in having a band of bosses around the neck of the cross. This is paralleled in sculpture by only one other example, from Nunnykirk, Northumberland; but there are no other similarities between the two monuments and the connection cannot be pressed.

Before turning to the decorative elements of the monuments, it is necessary to note an epigraphic peculiarity exhibited by the inscriptions of two Welsh crosses. The lettering employed on the Welsh monuments conforms to the insular type with the sole exception of the M in the inscriptions of Llantwit Major 222 and 223. Following Okasha (1968, 323, 327), these seem to be in the Anglo-Saxon rather than the insular tradition, and would thus seem to represent some form of Anglo-Saxon influence. These two monuments are dated to the early eleventh century (above, Chapter 4).

Elements of the crucifixion scene on three Welsh monuments seem to owe something to English influence. On Margam 234 and Nash 250, both Glamorgan, the crucifixion scene is represented solely by the figures of John and Mary flanking the cross. St John and the Virgin Mary do not occur on any Irish or Manx monuments, but are frequently represented in crucifixion scenes on English crosses. Thus it is likely that the idea of portraying these two figures came from England. The figures alone as representatives of the crucifixion are paralleled only on two other monuments, one from Yorkshire and the other from Scotland (Appendix B, Figures and Scenes 4). The whole face of the cross-slab Llanveynoe 411 is filled with a representation of Christ crucified upon a cross of free-armed Latin type. The body of Christ is represented after death; the body is bent and the head inclined. In the pre-Conquest period, representations of the crucif-
ied Christ after death are rarer than representations of Christ whilst still alive on the cross. The dead Christ is illustrated in several late tenth-century and later manuscripts and ivories which have a southern English provenance (Appendix B, Figures and Scenes 6). In stone, the most comparable pieces are rood figures, designed as integral parts of the church buildings in which they were set. Most of these pieces come from southern England and are usually given a date in the late eleventh or twelfth century (Talbot Rice 1952, 99; Kendrick 1949, 47; Taylor and Taylor 1966, 4-18). Although Llanveynoe lies to the west of Offa's Dyke, there is nothing specifically Welsh about this slab which must belong to a late Saxon or early Norman milieu and which is probably best associated with the roods of Gloucestershire and Herefordshire.

Of the motifs indicative of Anglo-Saxon influence, priority must be given to the vine scroll. Brøndsted indicated that the motif can be traced back to the classical vine, but that it most closely resembled the classical motif as it was modified by Syrian influence (1924, 7-23). Several scholars, including Brøndsted, have cited mosaics from the Dome of the Rock at Jerusalem, and ornament on the ivory chair of Maximian as the closest Eastern Mediterranean parallels (Strzygowski 1923, Chapter 6; Kitzinger 1936; Cramp 1976). Whilst it is impossible to assert that any piece of sculpture from Northumbria incorporating the vine scroll in its design was the work of a foreign immigrant craftsman, one must agree with Cramp that 'these early oriental parallels must imply a direct contact with oriental artifacts, or even craftsmen, since nowhere in Western Europe is there anything remotely similar' (1976, 268). Though the stimulus may have come from the Eastern Mediterranean, from the first the vine scroll in the British Isles is modified by insular taste.

The vine scroll occurs in two main forms in insular sculpture, namely as a plain vine scroll with a single or double stem with leaves and sometimes grapes, and as a scroll inhabited by birds and/or animals which eat the fruit. Collingwood regarded the former as an illustration of the parable 'I am the True Vine' (John 15 v. 1-11) and thus as a statement of belief rather than merely as a decorative element (1927, Chapter 6). The latter he regarded as a representation of the 'Tree of Life' (Matthew 13, v. 31-33). The plain vine and the inhabited vine scroll seem to be associated with two different centres in northern England at the outset of the adoption of the motif into insular ornament, namely Hexham and Jarrow respectively, but the two motifs soon combined and may appear together on one monument (Cramp 1976, 267). In its initial stages, as seen for example
on the Ruthwell cross, the vine motif is realistically treated. As time progresses it becomes increasingly stylised (eg. Bakewell, Derbyshire). Ultimately, the vine disintegrates and the animals of the vine scroll are released from the enmeshing foliage and become decorative elements in their own rights, as 'Anglian' beasts (Brändig dated 1924, 51).

The true vine scroll is found on only one monument from Wales, namely Penally 364, Dyfed (pl.4; fig. 11). Whilst still recognisable as the Northumbrian motif, the single scroll on Penally 364 exhibits considerable evidence of stylisation - in the knotting of the branches and in the stiffness of the leaves and fruit. No close parallels can be given. The scooped-out trefoil leaves are reminiscent of ninth-century west midland work such as that found at Breedon-on-the-hill, Leicestershire (pl.207, fig.1iii); but the degree of stylisation suggests a later date. It is notable that the vine on Penally 364 (and Penally 363) rises out of interlace, a rare feature paralleled at Sandbach, Cheshire (pl.208, fig.1ii), and in the manuscript Royal I E vi, folio 4r, where a triquetra knot is also incorporated in the design. Other details of the design are not, however, closely comparable. The treatment of the stem and branches of the vine scroll as interlace seems to be unique. All that may be said is that the sculptor of Penally 364 was in some way aware of the Northumbrian tradition. A date in the first half of the tenth century would not be incompatible with the other designs on the monument (above, Chapter 4).

Also at Penally is to be found the only other pure foliage design in Wales - on Penally 363. Here the leaves are disposed in two different ways, both typical of the Northumbrian vine scroll; in a side-linked scroll and in a simple scroll (fig. 2i, ii). Superficially, the leaves of the scroll, which are of the half-moon rounded palmette type (see Appendix B, Foliage), have parallels with the leaves used on a group of crosses from north-west England, centred on Lancaster and Lowther, which Cramp ascribes to the ninth century (1976, 269). Yet the disposition of the leaves on Penally 363 is entirely different from these pieces. Furthermore, the shape of the leaves, which have curling lobed tips, seems to owe more to the Carolingian acanthus as it influenced southern English sculpture, than to the pure Northumbrian vine. According to Cramp (1975, 187), the Carolingian acanthus co-existed with the vine scroll in southern England from the ninth century. In the late ninth and tenth century it influenced southern English art in all media through the Winchester and Canterbury schools (ibid). Pure acanthus ornament is not found on the stonework of
any other area in the pre-Norman period, but acanthus elements do occur, for example at Barnack, Northants (fig. 2, iii) and on the Wolverhampton Pillar, Staffordshire. Acanthus also comprises one element in the Scandinavian Mammen and Ringerike art styles which are found on a number of monuments throughout the British Isles. In fact one of the closest parallels to the single tendril on Penally 363 is to be found on the mounts of the Bamberg casket (fig. 2iv) which is decorated in the Mammen style and dated to c. 1000 (Wilson and Klindt-Jensen 1966, 124-126; Anker 1970, 167). It is, however, possible to find geographically closer comparisons. The leaves of Penally 363 are best regarded as being borrowed from the Carolingian acanthus as it appears in southern English sculpture, whilst the disposition of the leaves is in the old Northumbrian tradition. A date in the second half of the tenth century is supported by the occurrence on the same monument of an animal which shows the influence of the Scandinavian Jellinge style.

It is perhaps surprising to find on Penally 363 a pair of animals that at first-sight would appear to be more at home with the vine scroll of Penally 364 (fig. 3i). These animals are akin to the 'Twin Beasts' which Kendrick (1938, 198) interpreted as animals deriving from the inhabited vine scroll, and preserving part of this background (Map 17). Indeed, the curious band issuing from the mouths and heads of these creatures is difficult to explain in any other way. However, the posture of the animals on Penally 363 recalls the heraldic disposition of the pairs of animals in Mercian sculpture, such as those at Breedon-on-the-Hill, Leicestershire. These Mercian models influenced the sculpture of the south and west of England and the style is likely to have reached Wales from these regions. Closest in feeling to the animals of Penally 363 are those on a shaft from St Oswald's, Gloucestershire (fig. 3ii) and from Elstow, Bedfordshire (fig. 3iv). On the latter the animals are double-contoured, but this feature is also to be found on the northern Twin Beasts such as Collingham (fig. 3iii) which show Jellinge influence (Appendix B, Zoomorphs 1). The conclusion must be that the sculptor of Penally 363 was drawing on elements from both traditions which he made into something peculiarly his own.

The shape and stance of the animal on Bulmore 290, Gwent (fig. 4i.), is strikingly similar to certain animals on objects found in the Trewhiddle hoard from Cornwall (fig. 4ii). The deposition of this hoard is dated numismatically to c. 872-5 (Wilson and Blunt 1961, 75). The hoard gives its name to a style of ornament of which one element comprises animals with speckled sub-triangular bodies with a square snout, a shaped hip and
an eye with a bump over it (ibid). The only known metalwork example of this style in Wales occurs on the silver-mounted sword hilt from Radnorshire (Chapter 2, Note 4). The animal on Bulmore 290 conforms to the characteristics of this style with the exception that the body of the animal is not speckled. This may be explained by the fact that the Trewhiddle style is predominantly a metalwork style, most commonly found on small objects from the south of England (Appendix B, Zoomorphs 2). It does occur in stonework as far apart as York and Crophthorne, Worcestershire, and thus it is not surprising to find its influence reaching south-west Wales.

Several other decorative motifs which occur on Welsh stonework are most commonly found on English stonework and thus could be derived from this area. Of these, the double Stafford knot (3) and the double row of figure-of-eight knots (Interlace 23) have a scattered distribution throughout England (Map 18). The provenance of certain other patterns may be defined more precisely. The convention of using a quadruple Stafford knot to fill the cross head (Appendix B, Knot 18) most probably reached Baglan 191, Glamorgan, and Nevern 360, Dyfed, from Yorkshire. The ten-cord looped knotwork (Interlace 21) found on Llanynis 65, Powys, is paralleled in stonework only in the north of Britain. Similarly, the most likely source for the single row of horizontal figure-of-eight knots and double 'S' bend knotwork (Interlace 24 and 26), and for the one and two-cord looped plaits of Whitford 190, Clwyd, and Llandewi'r Cwm 47, Powys (Interlace 31 and 32) is the stonework of the north of England. Penally 364 and 365 provide rare examples of the use of the double S-bend knotwork (Interlace 26) on stonework outside of the north of England (Map 19), but the frequent occurrence of this pattern in metalwork and manuscripts may indicate a different source.

Few fret patterns can be used to indicate the existence of contacts between England and Wales. The double square and arrow fret (19) found in Wales on Whitford 190, Clwyd, is confined to the stonework of a very small area to the north west and north west of Chester (Map 20). In two cases the existence of contacts across the Bristol Channel may be illustrated.

The cross shaft Penally 363, Dyfed, is related to the hogbacked monument at Lanivet, Cornwall (fig. 511; pl. 190), by the use of cable moulding and, in particular, by the use of frets 12 and 13 in the design of both monuments. These frets are extremely rare and each type occurs in
stonework only on these monuments from Penally and Lanivet. As the two types of fret occur in conjunction on these two monuments it is reasonable to suppose either that the sculptor of one monument copied the designs of another, or that both monuments were the work of one craftsman. The latter seems more probable than the former as if one were a copy of the other, one would expect the monuments to be of the same form. As the shaft Penally 363 is related by its ornamental motifs to the other monument from this site (below, Chapter 6), whilst the Lanivet hogback bears no resemblance to the other monuments from Lanivet, it seems likely that the craftsman in question was Welsh rather than Cornish. The same conclusion must be drawn if the similarity between the two monuments is alternatively explained by the use of common templates or pattern books.

A tenth-century date has been suggested for Penally 363 (above, Chapter 4) and it is remarkable that the poem Armes Prydein written c. 930 shows that the Welsh regarded 'the men of Cornwall' as their natural allies at this time. In this context it is not surprising that the sculptural material should attest connections between Wales and Cornwall, but it is striking that the strongest link with Cornwall should be exhibited by a monument from Anglesey. Contact between the two areas must have been made via established sea-routes.

Equally striking is the relationship between a cross shaft at Exeter (pl. 211) and the crosses from Nevern 360, Carew 303, and to a lesser extent, Llanfynydd 159 and Llantwit Major 222 in south Wales. The patterns comprising the decoration of the Exeter shaft are all common on Welsh monuments, and are found together on these south Welsh crosses. Fret 25 is peculiar to these and to the Exeter shaft. The patterns which occur on the Exeter shaft and the south Welsh crosses are tabulated below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Knot 4</th>
<th>Fret 20</th>
<th>Fret 24</th>
<th>Fret 25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exeter</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevern 360</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carew 303</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Llantwit Major 222</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Llanfynydd 159</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reference to these patterns as they are listed in the Appendix B indicates that in this case the patterns emanated from Wales. The Exeter shaft most probably was the work of a Welsh craftsman.
Remarkably little sculptural influence was exerted by England upon Wales in view of the proximity of the two countries, and little discernible influence was exerted in the opposite direction. English crosses which are geographically closest to Wales such as Sandbach, Cheshire, and Eyam and Bakewell, Derbyshire, are almost totally unrelated to the Welsh series. The monumental forms and stylistic elements dealt with above are represented in Wales only by isolated examples. Map 21 shows their distribution in Wales.

If the Welsh monuments on which English influence has been suggested solely on the basis of an individual motif are discarded, together with the disc-headed crosses and the hog-back which belong to an Anglo-Scandinavian milieu, then only the following monuments may be taken as exhibiting contacts between Wales and Anglo-Saxon England:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Llanynis 65</td>
<td>Powys</td>
<td>c. 850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulmore 290</td>
<td>Gwent</td>
<td>c. 900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penally 364</td>
<td>Dyfed</td>
<td>c. 900-950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Llantisilio-Yn-Ial</td>
<td>Clwyd</td>
<td>c. 950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penally 363</td>
<td>Dyfed</td>
<td>c. 950-1000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Llanynis 65 would thus belong to the phase of attempted Mercian expansion in Wales, and the other monuments to the period 880-1035 when it is known that many Welsh kings gave allegiance to the English kings.

With regard to the question of how this influence was exerted, a distinction must be drawn between the evidence from monumental forms and that from individual motifs. The latter may be explained by copying from portable objects such as metalwork and manuscripts, but the former may not. Thus Eliseg's Pillar must be explained in terms of an individual craftsman; either a Welsh craftsman aware of English developments or, more likely, an English (Mercian) craftsman working in Wales. Anglo-Saxon stylistic influence on the monuments at Llanynis and Bulmore is explained by the proximity of these two monuments to the Welsh border. They indicate that Offa's Dyke and the river Wye did not mark impenetrable cultural boundaries. Less easily explained is the Anglo-Saxon influence evidently exerted on the monuments at Penally. The fact that motifs resembling the distinctively Anglo-Saxon vine scroll and twin beasts occur in Wales only on Penally 363 and 364 suggests that an English craftsman was working at this monastery, who, unlike his Welsh contemporaries, was not bound by the Welsh sculptural tradition.
Finally, it is remarkable that what little contact there was between the sculptural traditions of England and Wales took place mainly in the tenth century when, as Bishop has shown, the revived Latin learning of Anglo-Saxon England is known to have made use of Welsh as well as Continental manuscript tradition (1964-8). For the most part, however, the sculptural evidence confirms the overall impression from the historical sources; namely that contact between England and Wales was more often concerned with acts of aggression than with cultural exchange.
Wales and Ireland

In this section only the connections between Wales and Ireland (apart from the Scandinavian settlers) are discussed.

The withdrawal of the Roman military force left Wales exposed to the raids of the peoples who inhabited the borders of the Roman Empire. A number of historical and archaeological sources show that Irish settlements were undertaken in the west of Britain during this period, and it is clear that these affected Wales. A passage in Nennius (Chapter 62) implies that Irish settlements in Wales had begun in the Roman period and that a northern British chieftain, Cunedda, had migrated to north Wales under the instigation of the Romans, to deal with the Irish settlements there. The 'Expulsion of the Deisi' (5) tells of an Irish tribe forced to migrate to south Wales in the immediate post-Roman period. The correspondence between the names of the leaders of the Deisi recorded in this source and the names in the Harleian genealogy of the kingdom of Dyfed (Bartrum 1966, 9, No 2) indicates that this tale is not entirely apochryphal. The most convincing archaeological evidence for Irish settlement is provided by the numerous stones bearing inscriptions in ogam letters which are found in this area (Nash-Williams 1950, 4). Thomas (1972, 257-272) cites Irish elements in place-names, grass-marked pottery and rath-like sites as further evidence for Irish influence in this area at this time, but both the place-names and the pottery in question are rare and the 'raths' which are found in central Dyfed, especially around Haverfordwest, do not form a homogeneous group in size or in date and they do not necessarily derive from the Irish enclosures of this name (Grimes 1964; Wainwright 1971).

It is likely that these settlers maintained contact with the Irish homeland for some time after the initial settlements were made. In the sixth century there was evidently interaction between the monasteries of Wales and Ireland in the form of visits of individual 'saints'. These visits are recorded in a number of late saints lives and, although these lives cannot be regarded as historically accurate, these episodes are recorded with such frequency that they must reflect a valid tradition. To give one example, St. Cadog is presented by his eleventh-century biographer, Lifris, as having spent several years at the monastery of Lismore in Ireland. When he returned to Wales he brought with him several of his Irish disciples (Evans 1944, 47-50).

(5) One of the main versions of the tale occurs in Bodleian Ms. Rawlin-son B. 502 (twelfth century) which was edited by Meyer (1901, 104-135).
There then follows a hiatus in the historical evidence for Hiberno-Welsh contact, but this does not necessarily mean that none took place. At the end of the eighth century a chronicle was begun at St David's, and this used Irish annals to fill in earlier events. This chronicle is preserved as Harley Ms. 3859, the best known text of the *Annales Cambriae* (Hughes 1973, 5-6).

There is considerable evidence for cultural contact between the two countries in the ninth century. The court of Merfyn Frych of Gwynedd was frequented by Irish scholars en route to the Continent and Rome (Chadwick 1958, 96). Merfyn went to the trouble of presenting these men with a cryptogram to solve, and the solution to this cryptogram was noted by an Irish scholar for the benefit of future travellers (Kenney 1966, 55). The correspondence between Irish and Welsh scholarship at this time is indicated by the appearance of ninth-century Welsh glosses in a copy of Juvencus' Poetical Version of the Gospels, which was written by an Irish scribe called Nuadu (Jackson 1953, 49).

Entries in the *Brut Y Twysogyon* which refer to Irish events indicate that the connection was maintained throughout the tenth and eleventh centuries, despite the presence of the Scandinavians. This is attested by the poem *Armes Prydein*, written c. 930 (Bromwich 1972, xx) which looks to the support of the 'Irish of Ireland' for the Cymry against the English.

In 1022 'a certain Irishman falsely pretended that he was son to king Maredudd and he desired to have himself called king' (*BYT*). This man, Rhain, was received by the men of south Wales, but he was soon defeated by Llewelyn ap Seisyll of Gwynedd at the battle of Abergwili (*ibid*). The fact that the south Welsh accepted this Irish pretender as their king testifies to the strength of the Hiberno-Welsh connection. This is corroborated by a number of other entries in the *Brut Y Twysogyon*, but it is not always clear whether the reference is to the native Irish or to the Scandinavian settlers in Ireland. In 1044, for example, Hywel ab Edwin of Deheubarth helped by the 'folk of Ireland' fought Gruffydd ap Llewelyn at the mouth of the Tywi, and were defeated by him. In 1052 it is recorded that a fleet coming from Ireland to Deheubarth foundered; it is interesting to speculate on the number of ships that took this route and arrived safely and so perhaps were not thought worthy of record.

At the end of the eleventh century strong Irish influence was exerted upon and within the clerical family of Sulien, and presumably upon their monastic home at Llanbadarn Fawr. Sulien himself was twice 'archbishop'
of St David's (1073-78, 1080-85: BYT). A Latin poem composed by Sulien's son Ieuan between 1085 and 1091 records that Sulien spent thirteen years in Ireland before settling down in Ceredigion (Lloyd 1954, 465). Another son, Rhigyfarch, wrote a Latin life of St David, which Chadwick (1958, 134) showed to owe much to Irish sources and traditions. Ieuan and Rhigyfarch were responsible for the production of the Psalter Trinity College Dublin A 4,20 which exhibits strong Irish traits in both its script and ornamentation (Henry 1960). The strength of the Irish tradition at Llanbadarn Fawr at this time must have been the result of frequent visits made to and from Ireland.

In comparison with the evidence from other areas of the British Isles there is a relative wealth of documentary evidence for cultural exchange between Wales and Ireland. Archaeological evidence pertaining to the ninth to eleventh centuries is scant. Single-finds of Irish artifacts have been made at Llanfair, Anglesey (Fox 1940, 248), Lesser Garth Cave, Kenfig Burrows and Dinas Powis, Glamorgan, Gateholm, Dyfed, Castlemartin and Caerwent, Gwent (Alcock 1960, 221-7).

Several Welsh monuments of Group III corroborate the evidence of contact between Wales and Ireland in this period. The sundial Clynnog Fawr 85, Gwynedd, belongs to the Irish series of erect free-standing slab dials, rather than to the English block dials which were built into the walls of churches (Appendix B, Monumental Form 5). Clynnog Fawr 85 also conforms to the Irish type by having branches at the end of the radial arms; these were probably used to mark the hours as well as the tides (Way 1868, 212). It would seem that this is a definite example of an Irish monumental form being adopted in Wales.

The majority of Irish free-standing crosses have a cross head of the round-hollow ringed form (Appendix B, Cross Form B10). Outside of Ireland this form of cross head is rare on free-standing monuments. In Wales, the round-hollow ringed cross occurs on twelve cross-slabs and two disc-headed crosses, but only on St Fagan's 267, Glamorgan, is it of the free-standing form. The ornament of this cross head comprises double stranded six-cord plaitwork around a central boss. The filling of this form of cross head with plaitwork is best paralleled on the high crosses of southwest Ossory, and in particular on the north and south crosses at Ahenny and the west cross at Kilkieran (pls. 212, 213 and 210 respectively). The interlace on the Irish crosses is finer and more complex than that on the St Fagan's cross head however. Furthermore, the Irish examples all have bosses in the arms of the cross as well as in the centre and this feature
does not occur on the Welsh example. Whilst it seems likely that St Fagan's 267 was in some way subject to, and perhaps even the product of, Irish influence, it is not possible to pursue this hypothesis as only the head of the monument now survives.

The disc-headed cross St Edren's 291, Dyfed is a complete monument. This is related by its design and mode of execution to a group of erect cross-slabs from Dublin (O'h Eailidhe 1973, 51-3, Group A). The cross is in relief surrounded by a double moulded ring, and is represented by examples from St Patrick's Cathedral (2), St Audoen's, Mount Street, and Rathcoole in Dublin (fig. 6). Although the form of St Edren's 291 distinguishes it from the Dublin cross-slabs, the relationship is close enough to testify to a direct link between the two areas. The fact that St Edren's 291 is unique in Wales suggests that it was inspired by the Dublin group and not vice versa. The connection may have been made in the Hiberno-Scandinavian context (below, Section 6).

Turning to the cross-slabs, the fretted ring cross-slabs of St David's, Dyfed, and in particular the simple forms of 374, 375 and 376 (fig. 7, iv, i, v), are related to the Irish series of cross-slabs which bear encircled crosses (eg. Killeeney 537, Gallen Priory 855, Clonmacnoise 78 and 79). Clonmacnoise 81 has a circle of T-shaped frets enclosing a complex cross formed of interlace, but the closest resemblance is between St David's 376 and a slab from Cloonburren, (figs. 7, i, v). Both of these slabs bear a round-hollow cross in outline enclosed by a circle of Z-shaped frets. Another slab from Cloonburren, now lost, had a similar form (fig. 7ii).

The designs of St David's 374 and 375 may be compared with the central panels of Irish cross slabs of the lorgnette type. Encircled frets occur on Clonmacnoise 142 (fig. 8ii), 134, 180 and a slab now lost (fig. 8iii; Macalister 1909, 98), and on Fuerty 549; the encircled knot 10 on Clonmacnoise 145 (fig. 8i), 162 and Glendalough 881. It is not possible, however, to find convincing parallels for the whole monuments, and it seems best to regard the fretted ring cross-slabs as the products of craftsmen working at St David's who were in touch with the Irish traditions, but who converted them into something peculiarly Welsh.

The cross on one side of the erect cross-slab Llandeilo 156, Dyfed, is formed by a lorgnette motif (Appendix B, Cross Form 19; Map 22). The motif is found on small tombstones from the north-east of England, particularly from the Irish foundations of Hartlepool and Lindisfarne. The motif also occurs on a large number of Irish slabs, many of which are from Clon-
macnoise, and also on certain free-standing crosses from the north of England. On the latter monuments, the lorgnette motif often accompanies degenerate ornament. The slab form of Llandeilo 156 and the tight and coherent nature of the interlace on the reverse of the stone, suggests that it is in some way related to the slabs rather than to the free-standing crosses, and in particular to the Irish slabs. No exact parallels can be cited. The undecorated lorgnette occurs on certain Irish slabs (such as Clonmacnoise 133 and 165), but the encircling of the motif on the Welsh slab is unique. Like the fretted ring cross-slabs, Llandeilo 156 belongs to a milieu where Irish motifs were familiar and could be adopted and adapted into the native Welsh repertoire.

In the ninth and tenth centuries the decoration of the Irish high crosses was concerned mainly with narrative sculpture - i.e. with the representation of scenes, especially religious scenes from the Old and New Testaments and popular non-canonical sources such as the Life of St Paul and St Anthony. Religious scenes occur in great abundance on the monuments of Ireland and Scotland, but are less common on those of Anglo-Saxon England. Only two Welsh monuments bear religious scenes which are comparable with those of the Irish high crosses. This paucity of material might be thought to reflect a lack of contact between Wales and Ireland in the late ninth and tenth centuries, but the evidence marshalled above indicates that this was not the case. The virtual absence of narrative sculpture in Wales must be explained by the provincial nature of the majority of Welsh monuments, the apparent predilection for two-dimensional abstract forms of decoration, and perhaps the inability of Welsh craftsmen to sculpt rounded naturalistic forms.

The crucifixion scene on Llangan 207, Glamorgan (fig. 9i), is the only scriptural scene from Wales which may be regarded as exhibiting Irish influence. The scene as defined in Appendix B (Figures and Scenes 3) is not limited to Irish monuments (Map 23), but Llangan 207 conforms to the Irish type in several of its details. Firstly, the scene is represented on the cross head rather than on the shaft, where it most often occurs on English monuments. Secondly, the cross upon which Christ is crucified is represented by the cross-head itself rather than by any linear device. The position of the lance and sword bearers varies, but in Ireland the lance bearer is most usually on Christ's left, and this convention is followed by the sculptor of Llangan 207. The general composition of this scene and the posture of the attendants link it to such Irish representations as the cross of Saints Patrick and Columba and the Market cross at Kells (fig. 9ii, iii; pls. 214; 215), the West cross and Muiredach's cross.
A scene found predominantly on Irish crosses, but also on several Scottish monuments, is the meeting of St Paul and St Anthony (Appendix B, Figures and Scenes 13). Brown (1916) suggested that the veneration for these two African monks was introduced into England in the 670s by the African Hadrian who accompanied Archbishop Theodore to England. The scene also appears on the Ruthwell cross where it is identified by the inscription 'scs pavls et antonivs ermitae fregervnt panem in deserto' (Dinwiddie 1975, 17). This incident is recounted in Jerome's Life of St Paul where it is stated that bread was brought to the saints by a raven. The bird appears on several monuments which illustrate this scene. The popularity of the scene was probably due to the fact that it may have been regarded as a symbolic prefiguration of the Christian Eucharist. It has been suggested that the two figures facing each other in a panel on Nash 250, Glamorgan, represent the figures of St Paul and St Anthony (Nash-Williams 1950, 157). RCAHMW (1976, 45) even claimed to see traces of the bread and the bird. When the worn figures of Nash 250 are compared with the well defined scene as for example it occurs on the Market cross, Kells (fig. 10), it is obvious that this identification must be tenuous. If, however, the identification is correct, then Nash 250 provides the only example of the scene outside of Ireland and Scotland, and may therefore be the result of contact with one of these two countries.

A slightly less tenuous connection is indicated by the occurrence of orant figures on Welsh cross-slabs at Llanfrynach 56 and Llanhamlach 61, Powys, and Pontardawe 256 and Seven Sisters 269, Glamorgan (fig. 11). From the earliest times the orant position was an attitude of prayer and devotion 'Let my prayer be counted as incense before thee, and the lifting up of my hands as an evening sacrifice' (Psalm 141, v. 2). Illustrations of persons in the orant position were common in both eastern and western art from the fourth century onwards (Roe 1970, 215). Roe gave a number of coherent reasons to support her suggestion that Irish orant figures should be dated to the late seventh and early eighth centuries (ibid, 219-220). Whilst the two Glamorgan monuments might be contemporary with these Irish examples, the Powysian slabs, by virtue of their degenerate decoration, must be given a later date (above, Chapter 4). These are likely to be a local development uninfluenced by the Irish situation.

A scene on Penmon 38, Anglesey (fig. 121) is the last to be considered as evidence for Irish influence upon Wales. Roe (1945) identified this scene on Irish monuments as having a symbolic content separate from
the iconography of Daniel in the lions' den. The scene on the Market
cross, Kells (fig. 12iii; pl. 215), clearly shows that the flanking figures
are intended to represent human figures wearing some sort of animal dis-
guise. Single figures having both human and animal attributes occur on a
large number of monuments from northern England, Scotland, Ireland and the
Isle of Man (listed by Roe 1945, 13-16). Roe sites the Liber Penitentialis
of Archbishop Theodore of Canterbury as a possible explanation of the
scene; the archbishop condemns anyone 'dressing in the skin of a herd
animal and putting on the heads of beasts' (Thorpe, Monumenta Ecclesiastica
II, 32-4). From this, Roe infers that the scene harks back to a time when
pagan priests used animal skins as part of their rites. In the Christian
period men wearing animal skins thus became representations of evil or of
demons. Whilst this is a reasonable explanation for the flanking figures,
Roe does not attempt to explain the significance of the central figure.
Porter (1931, 81-5) suggested that this represented a scene from the life
of St Anthony, namely the temptation of the saint by demons. It seems
less obscure to suggest that this represents Christ casting out demons —
an act which is frequently referred to in all four gospels. This would
explain the ring around the head of the central figure on Penmon 38 as a
halo. The scene is peculiar to the stonework of the British Isles (Append-
dix B, Figures and Scenes 9). As most examples of this scene are Irish,
it is probable that it reached Wales from this source.

Only three motifs which are employed in Welsh sculpture can be as-
ccribed to Irish influence with any certainty. The L-shaped fret (7) on
Penmon 37, Anglesey is likely to have come from Ireland (Map 24) as is
the spiralled T fret (9) on the same monument (Map 25). In stonework,
the swastica fret (10; Map 26) belongs primarily to the group of south
Welsh ringed crosses with fan-shaped arms (Form A1). Only three examples
of this motif in stonework exist outside Wales, and two of these are from
Ireland. The motif is more common in Irish metalwork and it is likely
that this was the source of the design. The inspiration for the continu-
ous swastika pattern on Nevern 360, Dyfed (10a), may have been provided
by the open-work designs on such Irish pieces as the shrine of St Pat-
rick's bell and the shrine of St Móedoc.

The sculptural evidence for Hiberno-Welsh relations is at first sight
disappointingly small in comparison with the amount of documentary evidence
for such contacts (Map 27). It should be remembered, however, that it is
difficult to isolate specifically Irish patterns in sculpture; both Ireland
and Wales participated in the common insular artistic tradition and thus
shared a large number of patterns. Reasons for the absence of scriptural scenes on Welsh monuments have already been advanced. The relative absence of Irish monumental forms in Wales must also be ascribed to the strength of the Welsh tradition. The conclusion to be drawn is that whilst sculptural influence from one country to another must be taken as evidence for cultural interaction, intellectual contacts between two countries are not necessarily reflected in sculpture.
There is little historical evidence concerning relations between Wales and the people inhabiting the area now known as Scotland in the period c. 900-1100. By the middle of the ninth century, the Pictish and Dalriadic (Irish) people in Scotland were united under the rule of one king (Chadwick 1949, xii). Strathclyde, the only northern British kingdom to retain its independence from the Picts, Scots and northern English beyond the seventh century, maintained a separate line of kings to 1018 (Jackson 1955, 87).

The Welsh annals exhibit some knowledge of Strathclyde events, which are recorded for the years 870 (AC), 946 (AC) and 975 (BYT). Other than these references, only the poem Armes Prydein indicates the possible existence of contacts between the two areas; in this, the 'Irish of Scotland' and the 'men of Strathclyde' are regarded as natural allies of the Cymry against the English (Bromwich 1972, 2).

With regard to the sculptural material, the evidence taken from the distribution of monumental and cross forms can sometimes be misleading. In distribution, the Latin cross (Appendix B, Cross Form 6) is almost exclusively confined to the cross-slabs of Wales and Scotland in this period. Upon examination, however, these slabs appear to be entirely different in character; the cross on the Welsh slabs is often devoid of ornament whilst the Scottish examples are frequently highly ornamented. Thus the overall distribution of the type would seem to be coincidental and does not necessarily signify any sculptural contact between the two areas.

Similarly, the sculpture of Wales and Scotland is at first sight linked by the use of the double-square hollow form of cross (Appendix B, Cross Form 14). In Scotland, however, this form is found only on the cross-slabs, whereas in Wales it occurs as a free-standing form associated with the group of disc-headed crosses with slab-like shafts (B1). This group is local to central south Wales and, in the absence of any distinctive motifs linking them to the Scottish slabs, it is best to regard the Welsh and Scottish monuments which exhibit this form of cross as being independent of each other.

Margam 233, Glamorgan, conforms to what Collingwood called the Whithorn type of monument (Form B3). The keyhole cross which comprises the head of these monuments is most common in northern England and southern Scotland (Appendix B, Cross Form 5). As four out of eight examples of the
disc-headed form of the keyhole cross are found at Whithorn, it is reasonable to suppose that this was the centre from which the type penetrated the surrounding area. Margam 233 is the only known example of this type of cross on a disc-headed monument outside the vicinity of Whithorn. It does not, however, have the type of interlace incorporating free rings which is so characteristic of the northern monuments, and as such it cannot be regarded as a direct copy of the northern group. Nevertheless, the form of the monument indicates that its sculptor was most probably familiar with the northern group and, as there are no other monuments like it in Wales, the influence presumably emanated from southern Scotland.

Connections between Wales and Scotland indicated by individual patterns are as tenuous as the evidence derived from the monumental forms. Only one interlace pattern, the double row of Stafford knots (17), seems to be specifically Scottish (Map 28), but it is debatable whether or not this may be regarded as a distinct motif separate from the single row of Stafford knots (16) which has a normal insular distribution. In stonework the spiral fret (15) is virtually confined to Wales and Scotland (Map 29), but its appearance in manuscripts places it in the general insular repertoire. The Welsh monument most reminiscent of Scottish work is Margam 234, Glamorgan. This disc-headed cross has a similar design to the slab St Vigean's 11. Both monuments have figures flanking the cross shaft with triquetra knots above them (fig. 13, i and ii). In both cases the cross is of the double-square hollow form, ringed. In detail, however, the treatment differs, and it is unlikely that one monument acted as the exemplar of the other. The similarity is likely to have been coincidental - for example if one places figures to either side of a cross shaft, an obvious motif to fill the space left between the edge of the monument and the ring of the cross is the triquetra knot.

It would seem that little if any sculptural influence was exerted by any area of Scotland upon Wales (Map 30). This is not surprising as it is likely that the best sculpture in Scotland came to an end at the same period as the Pictish state in the mid-ninth century. The later monuments in Scotland are derived from those of Northumbria and have few reminiscences of the Pictish tradition (Stevenson 1955, 125-8; Henderson 1978, 47-74). With regard to Strathclyde, which is the only area referred to in the Welsh historical sources, Stevenson has indicated that no monuments in the area need to be dated earlier than the tenth century and that most should be dated considerably later (Stevenson 1958, 49). Whilst there are
no close parallels between the sculpture of Wales and Strathclyde, it is notable that the Strathclyde monuments incorporate in their designs a number of motifs which would not be out of place in Wales. These include the square Z-fret (20) on the cross at Barochan, and the square quadruple-spiral fret (17) on the fragment from Cambusnethan. Although there is not enough evidence to substantiate the hypothesis, it seems likely that in this case sculptural influence was exerted by, rather than upon, Wales.
5. WALES AND THE ISLE OF MAN

The known historical connection between Wales and the Isle of Man is restricted to one rather ambiguous event. In 825, Merfyn Frych, the son of Gwriad, introduced a new royal line into Gwynedd. According to bardic tradition, Merfyn and his father came from the land of Manaw. There is some confusion whether this place should be identified with the Isle of Man or with Manaw Goddodin in Scotland (Lloyd 1954, 323). The discovery of an erect cross-slab at Maughold in the Isle of Man (Kermode No 48; pl.217), inscribed crux Guriat - 'the cross of Gwriad' - has led some scholars to suggest that this is the cross of Merfyn's father and therefore that Manaw should be identified with the Isle of Man. As there is no means of knowing how common the name Gwriad was or of proving that the use of the name was confined to the Isle of Man, it is impossible to substantiate this identification.

Sculptural evidence, however, does indicate the existence of contact between Wales and the Isle of Man. One would perhaps expect to find links between the two countries in the sculpture of north Wales, but in fact it is in south Wales that these connections occur. Margam 231, Glamorgan, and St Lawrence 398, Dyfed, are disc-headed monuments where the cross is of the round-hollow, ringed, form. This is a common Manx form of cross, represented for example by Ballaugh 77, Braddan 69, Conchan 61 and Lonan 40, 42 and 57 (above,44). The resemblance ends with the form of the monument, for in their decoration, the Welsh and Manx crosses of this form are not closely comparable.

The shape of the cross on certain Welsh unpatterned cross-slabs (C3) may be paralleled in the Isle of Man. For example, Maughold 29 has a free-armed round-hollow cross similar to that on St Ishmael's 396, Dyfed; whilst Maughold 31, 32 and 35 are comparable to Steynton 404, St Edren's 393 and Walton West (all Dyfed) in having the ringed form of this type of cross. The Welsh monuments differ from the Manx in being inscribed with the alpha and omega and monograms. In view of this, and the simplicity of the form, it would be unwise to suggest in this case that one country was exerting sculptural influence upon the other.

Closer comparisons may be made between individual monuments. The cross-slab Margam 232, Glamorgan (fig. 141) is reminiscent of Michael 89 (fig. 14ii; pl.200), Bride 97 and other Manx slabs where the armpits of the cross are cut out. Margam 232 differs from these Manx slabs in the fact that its decoration is confined to the cross alone and does not en-
croach on the surrounding area. It is likely that Margam 232 was the work of a Welsh sculptor who knew of the Manx form, but was not bound by its decorative conventions.

In its overall impression, Nash 250, Glamorgan, resembles the Manx slab Maughold 67 (fig. 15i, ii; pl. 201). Both slabs are a narrow rectangle in shape, and bear a cross of the round-hollow, ringed, form, the shaft of which is flanked by two figures. In detail, however, the two monuments are entirely different; Nash 250 has a cross which is only a third of the length of the slab, whereas Maughold 67 has a full length cross. The figures flanking the cross shaft are standing on Nash 250, whereas on Maughold 67 they are seated. Nevertheless the impression is that Nash 250 would be more appropriate to a Manx than to a Welsh context (it is entirely unrelated to any other Welsh monument), and it may be that this slab was the work of a Manx craftsman.

With regard to individual patterns, the sculpture of the Isle of Man and Wales are linked by the use of a number of motifs which exhibit Scandinavian influence. These are discussed in the following section, but it should be noted here that the evidence suggests that the Scandinavian element reached Wales through sources other than the Isle of Man. Other motifs common to the sculpture of Wales and the Isle of Man are found elsewhere in the insular context. No one motif may be ascribed to the influence of one country upon the other.

In conclusion, all that may be said with any degree of certainty is that a number of sculptors working in south Wales were apparently familiar with the monuments of the Isle of Man (Map 31).
Wales, because of its geographical position, was most affected by the Scandinavian movements in the west of the British Isles. The Welsh coast was subject to Scandinavian raids from the mid-ninth century onward. In 855 (AC s.a. 853), Anglesey was raided, but in the same year Rhodri Mawr defeated the Danish leader Gorm (Annals of Ulster) and this seems to have given north Wales a temporary respite. Instead there is evidence of Scandinavian activity in south Wales. In 864 (AC) the Danes devastated Gwylyang, and c. 877 (Asser Chap. 54) a fleet of twenty-three ships wintered off Dyfed. Rhodri's death in 878 ended what organised opposition there may have been to the Scandinavians. In 894 (ASC s.a. 895) a host from the Wirral plundered in north Wales, and in 895 (AC) there was widespread devastation throughout Brycheiniog, Gwent and Gwynllwg. In 902 (AC) Ingimund and a host of Norsemen expelled from Dublin by another faction there, arrived in Anglesey, but were beaten off from this island and eventually settled in the Wirral (Wainwright 1948).

There may have been some respite from Scandinavian activity in the first half of the tenth century, perhaps accompanied by peaceful contact between the Welsh and the Scandinavians of Dublin, already suggested by the affinities of St Edren's 291 to certain monuments from Dublin (above). The author of Armes Prydein contemplates an alliance between the Cymry and the 'foreigners of Dublin' against the Anglo-Saxons (Bromwich 1972, 11). In the late tenth century, Scandinavian raids upon Wales were renewed. Religious foundations were frequently the targets of these raids. Penmon (971), St David's (982, 988, 999), Llanbadarn Fawr (988), Llantwit Major (988) and Llandudo (St Dogmael's, 988, all references BYT) were all ravaged 'by the gentiles'. Less specifically, Anglesey was the subject of Scandinavian depredations in 918, 972, 987 and 993 (all BYT). Gwent and Dyfed received the attentions of the host from Brittany in 915 (ASC), and Dyfed was raided in 982, 1001 and 1022 (all BYT). In 989 (ibid) Maredudd of Deheubarth paid a tribute to the Scandinavians of 'a penny for every person', and in 992 (BYT) he was able to ravage Glamorgan with the help of these men.

Scandinavian raids continued unabated in the eleventh century. In 1039 (BYT) Meurig son of Hywel was taken captive, and Gruffydd ap Llewelyn met the same fate in 1042 (ibid). By the mid-eleventh century, a new element is evident in Cambro-Scandinavian relations; namely the use of Scandinavian mercenaries by the Welsh princes against each other and against the English and the Normans. This policy was foreshadowed by...
Maredudd’s use of mercenaries in 922, but it found its greatest exponent in Gruffydd ap Llewelyn. In 1050 (recte 1049) the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle records that ‘thirty six Scandinavian ships came from Ireland up the Welsh Usk and did evil thereabout, aided by Gruffydd, the Welsh king’. In 1055 (ASC) Gruffydd and a fleet of Norse ships aided the exiled earl Aelfgar of Mercia in an attack against Hereford. Three years later Gruffydd joined with a certain Magnus son of Harold, identified by Charles (1934, 38) as Magnus Barefoot son of Harold Hardrada, against the Saxons. In the same year (ASC) Aelfgar was exiled for a second time, but was restored with the help of Gruffydd and a 'pirate host from Norway'.

It is evident, however, that Gruffydd did not altogether trust his Scandinavian allies. In a charter recorded in Liber Landavensis (Evans and Rhys 1893, 269), Gruffydd confirmed the territories of the church of Llandaff to Bishop Herewald, and promised to protect them against the English, the western Irish (perhaps the Norse-Irish of the Dublin region), the Danish sailors and the inhabitants of the Orkneys, all of whom 'have always turned their backs in flight and after making peace have remained peaceful only if it pleased them' (translation - Charles 1934, 49). That Gruffydd was justified in his suspicions is confirmed by the spate of raids on St David's in 1073, 1080 and 1091 (BYT).

It is at the very end of the period dealt with in this thesis that one finds the most intimate Cambro-Scandinavian relations, namely between Gruffydd ap Cynan, a descendant of Rhodri Mawr and sometime king of Gwynedd and the Norse of Ireland. According to his biographer, Gruffydd was the son of Cynan, king of Gwynedd, and Ragnaillt, daughter of the Norse king Olaf of Dublin (Jones 1910, 43). Gruffydd used Norse allies in his attempts to establish himself in Gwynedd and, whenever he suffered any setbacks, it was to the Norse colony in Ireland that he turned for refuge. At one stage he seems to have enlisted help from the Scandinavians in the Isle of Man and the Hebrides (Charles 1934, 69). Gruffydd’s close relationship with the Scandinavians is confirmed by a passage in the twelfth-century Life of St Gwynllyw which tells how, in the reign of William I, he led a Scandinavian expedition from the northern Isles and attacked the church of St Gwynllyw at Newport (Rees 1854, 458-60). Gruffydd died in 1137, but his sons Owain and Cadwaladr continued his policy of using Norse mercenaries. It was not until the middle of the twelfth century that the Norman invasion of Ireland brought to an end free intercourse between Wales and the Norse of Ireland.
The evidence of the annals is supplemented by the less reliable material contained in a number of Icelandic sagas. In their present form, these belong to the thirteenth century and later, but they preserve oral tradition current in Iceland several centuries earlier. The evidence of the Icelandic sagas pertaining to Wales has been assembled by Charles (1934, Chapter 4). A few of the more salient extracts are mentioned here.

Heimskringla records the raiding activities of a number of Norse kings and their relations. Eric Bloodaxe, a son of Harold Fairhair, frequently raided in Scotland, Wales, Ireland and Norway 'and so gat wealth to him' (Magnusson and Morris 1893, 153). His brothers Thorgils and Fodi were given warships by their father and they used these to harry in Scotland, Wales and Ireland (ibid 132). Olaf Tryggvason is said to have harried in Northumberland, Scotland, the Hebrides, the Isle of Man and Wales (ibid 261), and Earl Einar of Orkney spent his summers pursuing a similar activity (Magnusson and Morris 1894, 174). Guthorm, the nephew of Harald Hardrada, accompanied Margarth, the king of Dublin, on a raiding expedition to Wales (Magnusson and Morris 1895, 123).

The Orkneyinga Saga refers to the raiding expeditions in the Irish sea made by Thorfinn the Mighty, ruler of Orkney and Shetland, and Magnus Barefoot, the son of the Norwegian king (Dascent 1894, 249). It was this Magnus who defeated the Norman earls of Chester and Shrewsbury at the battle of Anglesey Sound (BYT 1096). Heimskringla suggests that Magnus' intention was to conquer the island for himself (Magnusson and Morris 1895, 224), but he made a hasty retreat and it is unlikely that he achieved his objective.

Two Icelandic sagas imply that the Scandinavian interest in Wales was not limited to raiding activities. Njal's Saga records how raids were made from Iceland as far south as Wales. A certain Kol, an enemy of Njal's sons had spent some time in Wales - he 'had been keeping close company with a rich lady, and it was all but arranged that he should marry her and settle in Wales' (Magnusson and Pálsson 1971, 353). This was not to be; the sons of Njal caught up with him and Kol was murdered and buried in Wales (ibid). The Saga of the Jomsvikings tells how Palnatoki, a Dane, went harrying in Wales. Somewhere in Wales he found a Scandinavian colony, and he married the daughter of Earl Stephnir, the ruler of this colony (Blake 1962, 11). Thereafter, Palnatoki made frequent journeys between Denmark and the colony in Wales - which he ruled after the death of Stephnir (ibid 13). On his deathbed, Palnatoki handed the colony over to the rule of his kinsman Vagn, and a Welshman named Bjorn (ibid 25).
Not all the references to Wales ('Bretland' in the sagas) can be regarded as authentic. The problem is stated succinctly by Loyn: 'the possibility exists, strong and not to be avoided, that to the saga-writer Bretland was a convenient device, a distant land about which not too much was known, and from which could be garnered the essential ingredients of wife, treasure, prospects, inheritance ...' (1976, 12). There seems no reason to doubt the authenticity of the incidental references to raids on the Welsh coast which occur in Heimskringla and Orkneyinga-saga, but the passages pertaining to settlement are more dubious. The Saga of the Jomsvikings in particular has been the subject of critical study and much of its material is now regarded as mythical (Blake 1962, vii). Nevertheless, the fact remains that Scandinavian saga writers in the twelfth-century postulated the existence of an established colony of Scandinavians in Wales in the period under discussion, and the existence of such a settlement most easily accounts for the literature on the subject.

The literary evidence gives the overall impression that Scandinavian relations with Wales were for the most part limited to plunder and destruction. Yet it is precisely these dramatic events that would attract a chronicler's attention; peaceful settlement for trading and/or agricultural purposes (such as that hinted at in the Jomsviking's Saga) may not have been considered worthy of record. Other classes of evidence must be used in order to gain a fuller picture.

Place-names have long been studied as evidence for the Scandinavian impact on Wales, but often uncritically. This type of evidence is often ambiguous as early forms of the place-name have first to be recovered from manuscript material and then identified with the modern equivalent - if there is one. If is often impossible to be dogmatic about the origin of the elements comprising the place-name; in the Pembroke region, for example, it is difficult to distinguish between Scandinavian and Flemish elements (Richards 1962, 54). It is also impossible to say precisely at what date the place-name came into use.

The studies of Charles (1934 and 1938) and Richards (1962), indicate that Scandinavian place-names in Wales are mostly confined to coastal features - headlands, rocks and small islands (Map 32). The Scandinavian nomenclature of these navigation points indicates that the Welsh coast was at some time familiar to Scandinavian seafarers. The fact that certain towns on the coast have Scandinavian names would suggest that this familiarity with coastal features was due to more than raiding activities. Certainly the adoption of these place-names in Wales can only be explained
by settlement in Wales and not merely by passing coastal traffic. The most likely explanation is that these place-names reflect the existence of Scandinavian trading settlements along the coasts of Wales.

Scandinavian place-names are rare in the hinterland. The group of place-names in the north-east may represent penetration and settlement from the Scandinavian settlements known to have been made in the Wirral (Richards 1962, 57). The rash of Scandinavian place-names in south Pembrokeshire (ibid, 58) and in south Glamorgan (Paterson 1922) may indicate that there was some agricultural settlement in these areas, perhaps associated with the ports of Milford Haven, Swansea and Cardiff. It is interesting that Scandinavian settlement in the Milford Haven region is corroborated by the study of blood groups. Watkins has indicated that south Pembrokeshire shares with the western fjords of Norway a preponderance of the relatively rare blood group A (1952, 83-6). This implies that there was a high density of Scandinavian settlers in this area and that inter-marriage took place between these settlers and the native population. There is no evidence to suggest that this dense settlement extended beyond the Milford Haven region, however.

The distribution of coin hoards and single-finds of Anglo-Saxon coins in Wales confirms that the Scandinavian impact on Wales was predominantly coastal (Map 33; Dolley 1959; Dolley and Knight 1970; Dykes 1976). All were found within five miles of the sea (Dolley 1959, 257). These coins are associated with Scandinavian activity rather than Welsh, as the weight of evidence supports the hypothesis that throughout this period Wales had a non-monetary economy. It is interesting to note that of the eleven find spots, four were monastic; Bangor, Caerwent, Caer Cybi, St David’s) while two others were close to contemporary religious sites; Laugharne and Llanedyfrydog. Dykes refers to the phenomenon of Scandinavian marauders making church offerings in the form of coin at shrines that they had previously pillaged, and he suggested that some of the Welsh deposits might be interpreted as an ‘expression of remorse’ (1976, 21). This hypothesis is unsubstantiated, however. Of the six coin hoards from Wales belonging to the period c. 850-1066, the Bangor ‘Midland Bank’ hoard is a typical ‘Viking’ hoard of the tenth century, comprising eight Anglo-Saxon coins, four Arabic dirhems and one imitation of a dirhem ascribed to the Bulgars of the Volga, a slice of an ingot and a fragment of a stamped silver pennannular arm-ring of Hiberno-Viking type; deposited c. 927 (Dykes 1976, 27).

Few Scandinavian artifacts have been discovered in Wales. A leaden tablet mounted on one face with an inset of bronze embossed with the figure
of an animal was found on the sea shore at Freshwater West, Dyfed (Grimes 1930, 416-7). Grimes stated that this animal was 'Scandinavian'. The ribbon shape of the body of the animal, the well-defined hip and the hint of double contouring are reminiscent of the Jellinge style animal (discussed below); but the shape of the head, the bulge in the centre of the body and the rather angular stance of the animal are uncharacteristic of this style. Neither does it conform to the later Scandinavian zoomorphic styles as they are defined by Wilson (Wilson and Klindt-Jensen 1966). The piece is entirely unlike zoomorphic representations in these art-styles as they occur in the metalwork of Scandinavia (compare for example the Jelling e cup, the Bamberg Casket and the Källunge vane). If the ornament on this tablet does owe anything to Scandinavian influence - and this is by no means certain - then it is to these styles as they were modified and simplified in the British Isles.

More definitely Scandinavian in character is a bronze 'ball-type' brooch found at Culver Hole, Glamorgan. This is one of only two insular examples yet known of a type of brooch which is represented in Norway by over fifty examples (Graham-Campbell, forthcoming). Some of the Norwegian examples were found in burials with datable grave goods indicating that in Norway this type of brooch belonged to the tenth century, and in particular to the first half of the tenth century (Graham-Campbell 1976). A pair of stirrups of Viking Age type found at St Mary Hill, Glamorgan may represent the existence of a Scandinavian grave here (Cardiff Museum Report 1893-4, 19). In north Wales, five silver penannular armlets dated to the late ninth and tenth centuries were discovered during limestone quarrying at Red Wharf Bay, Anglesey (Baynes 1928, 359-60). Graham-Campbell (forthcoming) recognises these as a Hiberno-Viking type.

In 1878, during excavation for the Alexander Dock at Newport, Gwent, a boat was discovered twelve feet below the surface, placed between the mouths of the rivers Usk and Ebbw. It was described as about seventy feet long and seventeen to twenty feet wide, clinker built of Danzig, not English, oak and 'constructed more for speed than strength'. It was suggested that this was one of the ships of the Danish fleet, perhaps deliberately sunk to make a dam (Morgan 1882, 23-6). Shetelig was inclined to regard this as a boat burial (1940, 14). Morgan's hypothesis has more to recommend it than Shetelig's as there were apparently no traces of associated grave-goods. It is unfortunate that the excavation of the boat was badly documented and nothing of it now remains. There is no conclusive evidence that this was a Scandinavian vessel, but as Loyn remarked 'the place was right' (1976, 13).
Whilst there was obviously some Scandinavian settlement along the coasts of Wales in this period, there is evidence to suggest that the Scandinavian element in Wales can never have been very large. The Scandinavian language and institutions made no impact in Wales as they did, for example, in the Danelaw area of England. These factors led Loyn to suggest that Scandinavian contact with Wales as the incidental result of Wales' position on the trade routes that must have existed between Dublin and the Isle of Man and at Chester and Bristol (1977, 148). This would account for the Scandinavian nomenclature of navigation points, and would explain the Scandinavian settlement in south Wales as being associated with staging posts and harbours on these trade routes from Dublin to Bristol, particularly in the late tenth and eleventh centuries (ibid, 151).

The geographical position of Wales, and the evidence of the historical and archaeological sources so far discussed, indicates that Wales was affected more by the predominantly Norse Scandinavian movements in the west of the British Isles than by the Danish incursions into the east of England. The Norse settlements of the British Isles were easily accessible to Wales by sea. Orkney, the Hebrides and the Isle of Man had been subject to Scandinavian raids and settlement from the late eighth century (Loyn 1977, 45), and by the tenth century it is probable that the kingdom of Man and the Isles was a recognisable political unit (Wilson 1974). From the middle of the ninth century, the Norse had established several settlements in Ireland (O'Corrslain 1972, 105), and in the early tenth century there was an Hiberno-Norse settlement of north-west England, now reflected in the place nomenclature of Cumberland, Westmoreland and, to a lesser extent, Lancashire (Ekwall 1918). The account of Ingimund's invasion indicates the existence of a Norse-Irish community in the Chester area by the early tenth century (Wainwright 1948).

In this connection, it is notable that the only runic inscription from Wales, which occurs on the cross shaft Corwen 276, has been transcribed as the Old Norse personal name 'Idfuss' (Moon 1978, 126). Moon dated this inscription to the late-eleventh or twelfth century and suggested that it was a graffito carved by 'a wandering Viking who wrote his name on a cross he passed for luck' (op. cit.). The date of the inscription, however, is compatible with that suggested by the form of the shaft and may be contemporary with it (above, Chapter 4). It is not impossible that Idfuss commissioned this monument. In either case, the most likely domicile of Idfuss is the Chester area.
The existence of contact between Wales and the Norse settlements of
the British Isles is confirmed by the appearance on certain Welsh monu-
ments of two patterns which seem to belong to this cultural milieu —
namely the ring-chain (Interlace 36) and the ring knot (12 and 13).

The ring-chain is a motif of the Scandinavian Borre style which finds
its main expression in the ornament of the British Isles (Shetelig 1948,
108; Wilson and Klindt-Jensen 1966, 108). Wilson suggested that the
English version of the Borre style could have developed in York in the
medium of metalwork (1976, 509). The true ring-chain motif is more common
in carved stonework than in other media; it is especially common on
monuments from the Isle of Man and the north of England (Map 34). It seems
likely that the motif was first adopted by sculptors in the Hiberno/Anglo-
Norse settlements in these areas. The ring-chain may have been adopted
independently in these areas. Bailey indicated that the motif may be dis-
posed in two main ways, either with a Y-shaped central spine, or with an
inverted Y (Λ). The former is represented on monuments from the Isle of
Man and Yorkshire, the latter on Cumbrian monuments (1974, Vol. 1, Appen-
dix 4). Thus the Y-shaped form of the ring-chain on Penmon 38, Anglesey,
is likely to be the result of influence from the Isle of Man or Yorkshire.
The Isle of Man is the more likely source, owing to Penmon's prominent
position on the sea routes to and from the island.

The ring-knot, like the ring-chain, seems from its distribution to
be a product of the Norse settlements of the west of Britain (Map 35).
It too seems to owe something to the Borre style - in the use of a free-
ring as an element in its design (Shetelig 1948, 91; Wilson and Klindt-
Jensen 1966, 88). It is remarkable, however, that the motif does not
occur in the Isle of Man. The three Welsh examples of the motif are scatt-
ered at Whitford, Clwyd, Meifod, Powys and Bridgend, Glamorgan. The
Scandinavian settlement in Cumbria is perhaps the most likely source of
the pattern on Whitford 190, as this cross belongs to the north-western
group of disc-headed crosses (Form B2). The source of the pattern on
Meifod 295 and Bridgend 252 cannot be determined more precisely.

Certain Scandinavian motifs were adopted in the Danish as well as
the Norse settlements of the British Isles. As the historical sources
yield no evidence to suggest that the Danes from the Danelaw had any con-
tact with Wales, it is reasonable to suppose that when these motifs occur
in Wales they reflect Norse rather than Danish influence, unless there is
strong evidence to the contrary. These motifs include patterns which in-
corporate one or more free-rings, and those which use split bands and scattered pellets.

The element of the free-ring, already mentioned in connection with the ring-knot, is a common element in Scandinavian art from the Borre style onwards. When the free-ring occurs in the British Isles it is usually ascribed to Scandinavian influence (Brøndsted 1924, 26; Shetelig 1948, 91; Wilson and Klindt-Jensen 1966, 103). In the British Isles, the free-ring element occurs in the ring-knot, the ring-twist (Interlace 35), and as an independent element in interlace (36). The ring-twist is found on monuments from both the Danelaw and Cumbria. It is also common in Scotland, the Isle of Man and Cornwall, but it is not found in England south of the Thames, and it is rare in Ireland (Map 36). In Wales it occurs on Llandyfaellog Fach 49, Powys; Llantwit Major 223, Glamorgan and Penally 365, Dyfed. The distribution of free-rings in other types of interlace is similar, but in Wales is confined to four crosses from Dyfed: Carew 303, Nevern 360, Penally 364 and St David's 383 (Map 37).

The split or bifurcated plait is similarly derived from Scandinavian art where it first appears in the Vendel Styles - for example on a brooch from Gudhjelm, Bornholm, Denmark (Wilson and Klindt-Jensen 1966, 41). The ring-chain is in effect a split band pattern, and is the most common aspect of this phenomenon in the British Isles. In other contexts the bifurcated plait is rare. Where it does occur, for example on Nevern 359, Dyfed, it may be regarded as indicative of Scandinavian influence.

Pelleting forms a major element of the Scandinavian Mammen style (Wilson and Klindt-Jensen 1966, 119). Pellets used as space fillers are well represented in this style - for example by the Cammin and Bamberg caskets (Anker 1970, figs. 40, 41). This may be another motif to be ascribed to Scandinavian influence, but in view of the usefulness of pellets as space-fillers, it would be dangerous a priori to ascribe all instances of their use to Scandinavian influence. In the British Isles, the phenomenon of pelleting in stone carving is widespread, but most examples are from the north and west (Map 38). Scandinavian influence can only be postulated where pelleting forms a major feature of the ornament of the monument - as, for example, on the Welsh monuments Carew 303, Diserth 185, Llangyfelach 212, Merthyr Mawr 239 and Bridgend 252 - but even in these cases it remains incapable of proof.

In the case of Llandewi Aberarth 113, Dyfed, Scandinavian influence is indicated by the form of the monument rather than by the patterns which
occur on it. This hogback is unique in Wales, and is one of the few examples of the type to be found outside of northern England and Scotland (Appendix B, Monumental Form 4). The occurrence of Scandinavian motifs on several of the northern hogbacks, and the fact that most examples are found in the Scandinavian settled areas of the north of England, but not in the Danish areas of the east of England, suggests that the form is a product of the Hiberno-Norse settlements. Llandewi Aberarth 113 is peculiar in that its decoration is limited to a simple ribbed design, whereas its northern relatives have architectural features and are often elaborately decorated. The closest parallel to the Welsh hogback is provided by one from Mossknow, Dumfries; which is ribbed on one side of the roof, but has ornament on the other. Llandewi Aberarth 113 is stylistically and geographically isolated from the main stream of the development of the hogback as it is defined by Lang (1976, 206-233), and thus it must be regarded as a local adaptation of the type.

Only one, possibly two, Welsh monuments indicate that there was any contact between the Welsh and the Danish settlers in England. Penally 363, Dyfed, and Llandyfaelog Fach 49, Powys, each bear a zoomorphic motif which is in some way related to the Scandinavian Jellinge style. The characteristics of the typical animal of this style have been defined by Wilson: 'the body of the animal is ribbon-like, defined by a double contour enclosing a billeted central panel. The head is in profile, and the upper jaw is embellished with a curlicue, known as a lip-lappet; it nearly always has a pigtail, and often has a well defined spiral hip. Jellinge animals are often surrounded by, or involved with ribbon interlace ...' (Foote and Wilson 1973, 299). In addition, in almost all instances, the mouth of the animal is open and, in most cases, the head of the animal is small in relation to its body.

In Scandinavia, the style is represented in the media of wood and metal, but it seems that it was first employed in stonework in the British Isles, where it is especially common on monuments from the north of England and the Isle of Man (Map 39). The animal on Penally 363 (fig. 161) conforms to the Jellinge style in having a ribbon-like double-contoured body, with a relatively small head which is shown in profile with an open mouth. There is no lip-lappet or pigtail, but the interlace around the animal passes close behind the head and has much the same effect as, for example, interlace around the animal on the cross from Otley, Yorkshire (fig. 161i). The front leg of the animal is rather amorphous, but the overall effect is not displeasing.
Considered as a motif comprising a single animal enmeshed in interlace, Penally 363 finds its closest parallels with the Jellinge-derived animals from the northern Danelaw. Compare, for example, the shape of the head of the Penally animal with those of the animals on stonework from Clifford Street and St Denis, York (fig. 16iv, v and vi), Otley and Collingham, Yorkshire (fig. 16ii and 17i) and Hickling, Nottinghamshire (fig. 16i). The well-defined back leg of Penally 363 is also paralleled on monuments from this area (figs. 16i, 17i, 18i-iv). The marked 'S' curve of the body and the elongated neck recalls the true Jellinge rhythmic frieze of animals, illustrated by the Jelling cup (fig. 19i). In the British Isles, this feature is most clearly seen on the Manx slabs which exhibit Jellinge influence (Michael 89 (fig. 19ii), 101, Andreas 95, (fig. 19ii) and Malew 94) but it is equally well paralleled in the Danelaw on the cross shaft from Aycliffe, Durham (fig. 19iv).

Thus the weight of the evidence would seem to support the hypothesis that the Scandinavian influence exerted on the cross at Penally came from the stonework of the Danish settlements of the north-east of England. This hypothesis receives some support from the occurrence on the same monument of a pair of beasts which have been shown to be related to the northern English twin beasts (above, Section 2).

The simple zoomorphic motif on Llandyfaelog Fach 49 (fig. 20i) is encircled by a free-ring which indicates that Scandinavian influence of some kind is involved. This is corroborated by the occurrence on the same monument of a ring-twist design. The ribbon shape of the animal and the angular bends used in conjunction with the free-ring are reminiscent of certain non-zoomorphic pieces which are usually ascribed to the Jellinge style, such as the wooden ornament from Jelling (fig. 20ii; Brûndsted 1924, 226). The crude and unsophisticated design of the Llandyfaelog Fach animal may be compared with that on a grave slab from Bexhill, Sussex (fig. 20iii), which has been described as 'Jellinge-derived' (Wilson and Klindt-Jensen 1966, 106), and similar animals on Cornish crosses at Sancreed and Waterpit Down (fig. 20iv and v). The only feature of the animal truly diagnostic of Scandinavian influence, however, is the free-ring. Interlace entwining a ribbon-shape zoomorphic design is a feature of a number of monuments from the Isle of Man (eg. Andreas 95, Jurby 93, Malew 94, Michael 101). In view of the simple nature of the design, and the fact that the lower part of the original motif is missing, it is impossible to be dogmatic about the Llandyfaelog Fach animal. It may have been a local derivative of the Jellinge-style animals of the Danelaw area, or, equally, a simplification of the Manx design.
Thus there are sixteen monuments in Wales which exhibit Scandinavian influence, one by its form and the rest by the occurrence in their design of Scandinavian-inspired motifs. These monuments are found in the areas where Scandinavian settlement has been postulated from other sources, notably from the evidence of place-names (Map 40). The adoption of Scandinavian motifs into the Welsh repertoire is most easily explained in the context of Scandinavian settlement. These sixteen monuments comprise only a small percentage of Welsh stone carving as a whole and they do not necessarily imply the settlement of a large number of Scandinavians in these parts of Wales. A single craftsman versed in a number of Scandinavian motifs who came to settle in Wales and whose work was emulated by native craftsmen, could account for all sixteen monuments in the country which exhibit Scandinavian influence. It is best to review these monuments on their own merits.

The interpretation of the two Powysian monuments which incorporate Scandinavian-inspired motifs in their design is more difficult. Meifod 295 is related to the north-western monuments in the motifs it employs, but not in the form of the monument. It is more probable that this represents the artistic ideas of an individual craftsman, than that it is the product of a Scandinavian settlement. Llandyfaelog Fach 49 should probably be interpreted in the same way, but in this case the Scandinavian motif is so devolved that the source of inspiration cannot have been immediate.

In the north of Wales the coastal or near coastal distribution of the monuments at Penmon, Whitford and Diserth complements the evidence of coins, hoards and place-names. Like the other classes of evidence, they must be seen in the context of the trade route that must have existed between the Scandinavian settlements of Dublin, the Isle of Man and Chester. Loyn suggested that this had been established as a permanent trading route by the first half of the tenth century, coincident with a period of great activity in the Chester mint (Loyn 1976, 19). The cross at Penmon (38), situated on high land overlooking the Scandinavian-named island of Priestholm, is dated to this early phase of activity (above, Chapter 4). The crosses at Diserth and Whitford may indicate the existence of other ports of call along this trade route and it is notable that they are close to the three Scandinavian influenced Flintshire place-names of Kelston, Axton and Linacre. In this context the evidence of Diserth 185 is not particularly strong as the Scandinavian elements in the design of this cross are pellets and free-rings. Whitford 190, however, is so closely
linked by form and decorative motifs to the monuments of the Chester region as to suggest that the Scandinavian settlement of this area may have extended across the Welsh border.

In the south, the distribution of Scandinavian-inspired motifs is again predominantly coastal. The strongest Scandinavian influence on Welsh stone carving seems to have been exerted in Dyfed, and to a lesser extent in south Glamorgan; a conclusion which complements the place-name evidence. It is notable, however, that with the exception of Llangyfelach 212 which is near Swansea, there are no Scandinavian-influenced monuments in the vicinity of the Scandinavian settled ports postulated from the other classes of evidence (eg. Milford Haven and Cardiff). Loyn (1976, 19) attributed these Scandinavian trading-posts and harbours to the existence of a trade-route between Dublin and Bristol which, he argues, became especially important during the reign of the Danish king Cnut (1016-1042). It is remarkable that the monuments Llantwit Major 223, Nevern 360 and Carew 303 are likely to be contemporary with Cnut's reign (above, Chapter 4).

The Scandinavian-inspired motifs in question seem to have been adopted into the Welsh repertoire in the tenth century; Penmon 38, Llantwit Major 223, Nevern 359, Llangyfelach 212 and Penally 363 are all dated to this century (see Chapter 4, Section 6). Some motifs, for example pelleting, ring-knots and free-rings continue to be used on monuments dated to the eleventh and twelfth centuries, such as Whitford, Diserth, Nevern and Carew. It is remarkable that there is no evidence for the adoption of Scandinavian zoomorphic motifs in Welsh sculpture after the tenth century. Welsh sculpture exhibits no influence from the later Scandinavian art styles Ringerike and Urnes, dated by Wilson to the eleventh and twelfth centuries (Wilson and Klindt-Jensen 1966, 146, 160). This is particularly surprising as these two art styles are represented in stonework elsewhere in Great Britain and Ireland and the historical sources indicate the existence of Cambro-Scandinavian contact in this period, especially with the Hiberno-Norse of Ireland. Moreover, there are hints of Ringerike and Urnes elements in the Psalter of Ricemarch which is known to have been produced, under strong Irish influence, at Llanbadarn Fawr in the late eleventh century (Henry 1962, 104), and in the Welsh manuscript of Bede's de natura rerum which was probably a product of the same scriptorium (Huws, 1978). A possible explanation of this absence concerns the nature of these elegant zoomorphic styles, which are less susceptible to being broken down into small motifs than the preceding Jellinge and Mammen styles. Welsh sculptors seem to have favoured individual abstract motifs rather than anything even vaguely
naturalistic. This preference, in a conservative sculptural tradition, coupled with a general decline in the standards of Welsh sculpture in this period, may explain what otherwise seems to be an anomaly.
Connections between Wales and the continent in the late fifth and sixth centuries are exhibited by Welsh monuments of Class I which bear Latin inscriptions and formulae which seem to have been influenced by the epigraphic traditions of southern Gaul (Nash-Williams 1950, 8; Bullock 1956, 136). Similarly, the Chi-Rho motif which occurs on some Group II stones is likely to have been adopted from continental sources (Nash-Williams 1950, 16; Alcock 1965, 203). This evidence of direct contact between Wales and the continent may be corroborated by the discovery of sherds of imported pottery (albeit in very small quantities) at a number of coastal sites in Wales (Alcock 1963, 297-300; Thomas 1976). In view of the small amount of 'A' and 'B' ware yet found in Wales and the relatively large quantities of this pottery from south-west England it is possible that these sherds represent nothing more than a secondary distribution from south-west England (Maps 41 and 42). The fragments of 'E' ware discovered at Dinas Emrys, Longbury Bank Cave and Dinas Powis seem more likely to reflect direct contact between Wales and the coastal plain of south-west France in the late-fifth, sixth or seventh century (Map 43; Peacock and Thomas 1967; Thomas 1976).

After this date, there is very little material evidence for the existence of direct contacts between Wales and the continent until the coming of the Normans in the eleventh century. Prominent Welshmen such as kings Cincen of Powys and Hywel Dda may have made trips to Rome (in 850 and 920 respectively, according to the Annales Cambriae), but there was insufficient cultural contact to make itself felt upon sculptural traditions. This is in marked contrast with England where Anglo-Saxon sculpture displays close contacts with continental developments throughout the pre-Conquest period - illustrated for example by the employment of Mediterranean masons in the seventh century, the adoption of the Carolingian acanthus motif into sculpture (from the ninth century) and the continental influence exerted through the medium of the reform of the church in the tenth century. In comparison, Welsh sculpture exhibits a remarkable conservatism in decorative motifs. In this context the rare roll and bead moulding of Llanynis 65 and the acanthus element of Penally 363 are best explained as the result of secondary influence from Anglo-Saxon England rather than of direct contact with the continent.

With the advent of the Normans, direct contact between Wales and the continent may once again be illustrated in the historical and archaeological record.
The Normans came to Wales as individual adventurers and not as part of a royal policy of controlled conquest and settlement; consequently different areas were affected at different times. Domesday Book indicates that by 1086 a large part of north Wales had been taken by the Normans (Terrett 1962, 383). Robert of Rhuddlan, the tenant of Earl Hugh of Chester, held Rhos and Rhufeniog and also 'north Wales' of the king (Tait 1916, 242-3). When he died in 1088, Earl Hugh took over his lands and built castles at Caernarvon and Bangor (Jones 1910). In 1094, the north Welsh revolted; Anglesey was recovered, and all the castles which Earl Hugh had built to the west of the Conway were taken (Lloyd 1954, 403). Earl Hugh recovered Anglesey briefly in 1098, but it was regained by the Welsh in the following year (ibid, 409-10). During the civil war that followed the reign of Henry I, Gruffydd ap Cynan, the ruler of Gwynedd, was able to drive the Normans back almost to the Cheshire border.

In south Wales, the Norman threat was present from c. 1070 when William Fitzosbern was Earl of Hereford. Domesday Book shows that by 1086 a large part of Gwent had been taken by the Normans (Atkin 1971, 112; Darby 1971, 53), but Morgannwg was apparently untouched. In 1093, the Normans invaded Brycheiniog, Dyfed and Ceredigion (Smith 1971, 10), and the conquest of Glamorgan was probably begun at this time. The river Ogmore marks the western limit of the area appropriated by Robert Fitzharmon (d. 1107), but c. 1130 Richard de Granville was granted lands as far west as the river Tawe (Smith 1971, 14). The revolts on the death of Henry I led to the re-establishment of the Kingdom of Deheubarth under Gruffydd ap Rhys (Lloyd 1954, 471) and Madog ap Maredudd and his brother Owain Cyfeiliog were able to extend the boundaries of Powys (ibid, 494). Only Glamorgan was apparently unaffected by these uprisings.

Throughout this period, Norman interests were confined to the lowland areas; the uplands remained in Welsh hands. It was not until the reign of Henry II that the Normans were able to re-establish their hold on Wales and begin to consolidate their conquest.

The Norman conquests of Wales, and the rest of the British Isles, brought to an end the tradition of free-standing sculpture in the form of crosses and cross-slabs decorated with insular motifs. New churches were built, based on Norman models and erected by Norman masons, and sculpture was confined to the decoration of these churches and their fittings (Zarnecki 1951, Chap. 2). Insular motifs lingered on a few pieces of architectural sculpture, notably on fonts and tympani (Kendrick 1940), but were gradually ousted by Romanesque conventions.
A more detailed consideration of the reasons for the cessation of production of monuments of Group III is given at the end of Chapter 7. In this context, the Norman incursions into Wales are discussed with regard to several pieces of free-standing and architectural sculpture which seem to combine both insular and Norman features in their design (Map 44).

It is apparent that the Normans were active early in north Wales, but that they were unable to consolidate their position here. The sculpture of the region reflects this situation. Radford (1963, 358) indicated that Romanesque influence is evident in the church architecture of north Wales from the early twelfth century. The tympanum at Penmon is Norman in form, but incorporates in its design motifs characteristic of the earlier period. Similarly, fonts at Heneglwys, Llanbeulan, Llangristiolus, Llaniestyn Rural and Trefdraeth (all in Gwynedd) show Norman influence in the form of arcading and chevron designs, but also have patterns in the insular tradition. It seems likely that these pieces were sculpted by Welsh craftsmen working to the specifications of Norman patrons. The strength of the earlier sculptural tradition, as it is represented by the use of insular motifs on these monuments, suggests that they belong to the earliest period of Norman activity in the late eleventh century. Certain of the angular-line cross-slabs (C1) and Anglesey circled slabs (C9) may also have been produced in this period. In particular, Llangaffo 21 has certain decorative features which seem to be indicative of Norman influence (above, Chapter 4).

In south Wales, the cross-slab Llowes 408 belongs to the Welsh tradition in the form of the cross, but its diaper ornament is a Norman motif best paralleled on a capital in the Durham castle chapel, the tympanum at Barton Seagrave, Northants, and the font at Finham, Norfolk, all of which Zarnecki dated to the late eleventh and early twelfth centuries (1951, figs. 5, 19 and 22). The competent nature of the diaper ornament suggests that the slab was the work of a Norman craftsman influenced by the Welsh form of monument. Finally, as it has already been argued above (in Chapter 4, Section 6), the panelled-cartwheel monuments from Glamorgan seem to belong to this transition period.

The Norman conquests of the British Isles ultimately brought to an end the tradition of free-standing sculpture in the form of crosses and cross-slabs decorated with insular motifs. The reasons for the cessation of Welsh sculpture are examined in more detail in Chapters 7 and 8. Here it is sufficient to state that new churches were built, based on Norman
models, and erected by Norman masons. Sculpture became confined to the decoration of these churches and their fittings (Zarnecki 1951, Chapter 2). Insular motifs lingered throughout the British Isles on a few pieces of architectural sculpture, notably on fonts and tympani (Kendrick 1940). By the end of the twelfth century, however, Romanesque conventions had completely ousted the earlier insular sculptural tradition.
In the following discussion of the ways in which stylistic influence can be exerted by one country upon another, it is assumed that the stone monuments in question were made at or near the place where they now survive, and that they cannot be regarded as portable objects in the sense that manuscripts and metalwork, for example, are portable. The validity of this assumption has been established in Chapter 3, Section 3.

A number of models are postulated to explain non-Welsh monumental forms and motifs which occur in Welsh sculpture:

1. A non-Welsh craftsman working in Wales. This can be postulated with any certainty only if both the form and the decoration of the monument in question are foreign to Welsh conventions of sculpture as they are exhibited by the majority of Welsh monuments. Only two, possibly three, pieces of sculpture in Wales may be explained in this way - namely Eliseg's Pillar (Llantisilio Yn Ial 181) as the work of a Mercian craftsman, and St Edren's 291 as the work of a craftsman from the Dublin area (above, Sections 2 and 3). Penmon 38 is so closely comparable in form and in some aspects of its decoration to the north-western disc-headed crosses, that it may have been the work of a craftsman from Cumbria (above, Chapter 2).

2. A Welsh craftsman trying to emulate the sculptural traditions of another area, either because he himself is familiar with these, or because he is working to the specifications of a patron from that area. The former is likely to have been the case if two or more motifs on one monument show influence from a single area outside Wales - Whitford 190, which is closely but not exactly paralleled by the work of craftsmen from St John's, Chester, and Penally 364, which incorporates vine scroll and animals akin to the northern twin beasts in its design, may be explained in this way. The latter would explain the form of the hog-back, Llandewi Aberarth 113, and also the various Scandinavian-inspired motifs which occur on monuments which are otherwise in the Welsh tradition.

3. The transportation of patterns from other areas by means of easily portable objects such as manuscripts and metalwork and other pieces in bone, ivory and wood. In this context, it is necessary to examine the stylistic relationship between contemporary objects in different media.
The Relevance of Contemporary Media

Collingwood (1927) treated Northumbrian sculpture without reference to any other media - manuscript illumination, for example, he regarded as a completely independent art. Reference to the appendix, however, will indicate that the vast majority of patterns occur in other media as well as stone, and that masons, metal and ivory workers and manuscript illuminators must have shared the same repertoire of ornament. It is valid to look for a style relationship between different contemporary media, starting with the relationship between stonework and manuscripts.

It is not possible to discern whether or not the design and/or the execution of stone monuments was the work of men, such as scribes, who had access to manuscript material. Nevertheless, a number of Welsh monuments have inscriptions in the insular miniscule script closely related by the form of the letters to the script of insular manuscripts (Chapter 4, Section 2). This must indicate that a scribe was at some time employed to work on these monuments, and would thus provide a possible channel for manuscript patterns to spread to stonework.

Only three surviving illuminated manuscripts are known to have been in Wales in the period under consideration. The Lichfield Gospels, a manuscript which is often compared with the Lindisfarne Gospels and the Book of Kells and which is assigned by various scholars to a Northumbrian scriptorium of the early eighth century (Kendrick et al 1960; Wilson 1972, 170), spent part of its life in Wales. According to a marginal text, the Gospels were acquired as the result of a deal: 'Ostenditur hic quod emit Gelli filius Arihtiud evangelium Deo Sancto Teliaui super altar' (Lindsay 1912, 1). Other marginal texts in Old Welsh record land granted to St Teilo and his church (Jones 1972, 308-320). Richards (1973) showed that these texts are likely to have been inserted in the manuscript at various times between the late eighth and the mid-ninth centuries, whilst it was at Llandeilo Fawr in Dyfed, the chief centre of the cult of Teilo. Other entries in the manuscript indicate that it had left Wales and was in the possession of Lichfield by the second half of the tenth century. Although the manuscript is usually regarded as Northumbrian work, its original provenance is uncertain, and it is just possible that the Lichfield Gospels were the product of a Welsh scriptorium (Lindsay 1912, 1-6).

The second manuscript, a psalter, is known to have been written in Wales at the end of the eleventh century. At this time, the sons of
Bishop Sulien of St David's produced various literary works, including the Psalter now in the library of Trinity College Dublin (Aiv. 20), which is usually known as Ricemarch's Psalter (Lindsay 1912, 33). This psalter is characterised by the decoration of a number of its initials with zoomorphic interlace in the manner of Irish manuscripts of this period (Henry 1962, 104). The provenance of this work is almost certainly Llanbadarn Fawr (Lapidge 1973-4, 69).

The third manuscript, a recently discovered Welsh manuscript of Bede's *de natura rerum*; Peniarth Ms. 540 (Huws 1978), belongs to the same tradition as Ricemarch's Psalter. Huws considers that the script of the Bede has more Norman traits than that of the Psalter and the decoration of the initials is more stylised (ibid. 493, 496). He therefore suggests that the manuscript was another product of the scriptorium at Llanbadarn Fawr, this time of the first half of the twelfth century.

It is remarkable that Welsh stonework exhibits no discernable influence from the illumination of these three manuscripts even in the immediate vicinity of Llandeilo and Llanbadarn Fawr. The complex spirals, zoomorphs and interlacings of the Lichfield Gospels cannot be paralleled in stonework, and the simple square arrow and T fret (23) which is frequently used as an ornamental border in the manuscript is found in stone in Wales only on Nevern 360, Dyfed. It is just possible that the square ringed form of the double square hollow cross on the slab Llandeilo 156 owes something to the same form of cross which comprises the carpet page of the Lichfield Gospels, folio 220, but that is all. Whilst at Llandeilo, the Lichfield Gospels do not seem to have acted as a source of inspiration for the sculptor. Similarly, the complex zoomorphs of Ricemarch's Psalter and the Bede have no apparent relationship with any motif employed on Welsh sculpture. This could be thought to imply either that the media of vellum and stone were regarded as separate art forms employing insular motifs in a distinctive manner, or that the sculptor did not have access to the illuminated manuscripts - perhaps because he was not a member of the monastery. In fact, it is fruitless to speculate along these lines owing to the incomplete nature of the sculptural and manuscript material, and also because the three manuscripts under consideration are not directly contemporary with the main body of the sculptural material - the Lichfield Gospels having been illuminated a little too early and the Psalter and the Bede a little too late. Nevertheless, it is notable that stone is not a suitable medium for the delicacy, intricacy and extreme complexity of ornament which is found in the illuminated manuscripts.
It has already been indicated, in Section 1, that a large number of the patterns which occur on Welsh monuments are paralleled in insular manuscripts as well as in stonework. As well as the script, there must have been a visual resemblance between some pieces of Welsh sculpture and manuscript work. If the shallow, two dimensionally carved, monuments were originally painted, then the overall impression must have been comparable to the carpet page of an illuminated manuscript. In the majority of cases, however, it is impossible to say whether or not stylistic motifs in manuscripts exerted any influence on Welsh stonework. The six-cord looped knotwork (19) on Llanbadarn Fawr 111, Dyfed, is an extremely rare motif known elsewhere only from the St Gall Gospels - but it is difficult to see how, if at all, the two are connected. The spiralled T fret (9) on Penmon 37 may owe more to the motif as it appears in manuscripts than as it is found on stonework, but again this cannot be proven.

Although in overall impression a piece of sculpture may superficially resemble a page of manuscript illumination, in detail the ornament on Welsh monuments is entirely different from the complex and delicate work of the late seventh to early ninth-century Hiberno-Saxon manuscripts. Only Pontardawe 256, Glamorgan, is reminiscent of these manuscripts - the geometrical treatment of the figure recalls the symbol of the man for Matthew in the Book of Durrow (fig. 21). Similarly, Welsh sculpture is entirely divorced from the acanthus-ornamented manuscripts of the tenth and eleventh centuries in southern England.

The manuscripts closest in feeling to Welsh sculpture, by virtue of their simple, solid and clearly defined motifs, are the Book of Deer and Harley Ms. 1802. The former is a tenth-century Scottish work (Henry 1962, 104) which makes use of a variety of frets as borders to its evangelist portraits (Stuart 1869, pls. vi, vii, viii, xii). These comprise frets 9, 18, 19 and 23 which were all in use in Wales. It is also remarkable that the figures in this manuscript are reminiscent of those of Llanrhydian 218, Glamorgan (fig. 22). Although it is not possible to postulate the existence of any direct contact between the two, the Welsh sculptor must have had access to the same stylistic traditions as the illuminator of the Book of Deer. Harley 1802 uses knot 8 and frets 18 and 19 as a border to the evangelist symbols of folios 60b and 86b. In this case, however, the manuscript has been ascribed to the Armagh scriptorium, and dated c. 1138 (Henry 1962, 148-9); the motifs must be survivals from the earlier period, and any similarity between this manuscript and the earlier Welsh monuments must be coincidental.
Turning now to other media, the evidence is even more ambiguous. With the possible exception of the tablet from Freshwater West (above, Section 6), no ornamental metal, bone, ivory or wooden objects manufactured in Wales contemporary with the stone monuments have yet been found. This does not necessarily mean that they did not exist; in the earlier period metal and bone working are evidenced - for example at Dinas Powis (Alcock 1963, 104, 150). These crafts are likely to have continued to be practised throughout the period under consideration.

A close relationship between stonework and metalwork is exhibited by two monuments, Penally 363, Dyfed, and Lanivet hogback, Cornwall (which were probably the work of one man), and a bronze sword pommel guard found at Exeter, which is inscribed '(1)eofri me f' (= Leofric me fecit). These three pieces are the only works where the rare frets 12 and 13 occur in conjunction (Appendix B) and it is valid to ask whether all three could be the work of one craftsman working in two different media. The patterns on the sword hilt are not as competently designed and executed as those on the stone monuments, for example, the conclusion of the fret patterns towards the central panel on either side of the sword hilt is rather confused (fig. 5). This could be argued to be the result of the same craftsman working in an unfamiliar medium, but certain features suggest that the sword hilt was the work of another man. The patterns seem to have been copied from the hogback at Lanivet. The frets 12 and 13 are used on separate faces of the sword hilt - as they are on the hogback - they do not merge together as on Penally 363. The central panel on Side A of the sword hilt is best explained as rather a blundered attempt to copy the triquetra knot which occurs in the triangular field at either end of the hogback. The central panel on Side B may be a stylised and misunderstood attempt at representing one of the animals on the hogback, the copier looking down upon it. Furthermore, the craftsman responsible for Penally 363 and the hogback at Lanivet is likely to have been Welsh (above, Section 2), whilst the name of the craftsman who made the sword hilt is English. The sword hilt made by Leofric is best regarded as a copy from the hogback at Lanivet which must have commanded a good deal of public interest as both its form and the majority of the patterns used on it are unique in Cornwall.

Certain designs used on Welsh sculpture seem to be more appropriate to metalwork than to any other medium. The swastika fret (10) closely resembles the effect achieved by cell work or openwork on numerous pieces of Irish metalwork including the Ardagh Chalice and the Shrine of St Pat-
rick's Bell (fig. 23). The T-shaped fret (4) is also commonly found on Irish metalwork. The triple Stafford knot (9) is known only from the cross Llanynis 65, Powys, and upon the Kells Crosier. Finally, the figures on Llanrhidian 218 provide a link between stone, vellum and metal. As well as resembling the figures in the Book of Deer, they are reminiscent of certain figures on Irish metalwork, for example the figure on the hanging bowl found at Micklebostad, Norway (Henry 1965, pl. B).

Although it is not possible to point to any metalwork exemplar for any piece of Welsh sculpture, it would seem that there was an affinity between the designs used on Welsh monuments and those which were employed by Irish metalworkers. The same designs were most probably used to ornament objects in other media - for example recent excavations at York have yielded evidence of woodwork decorated with insular designs. Ivories incorporating these designs were present in the insular context, and may have been known in Wales. The Welsh monasteries would have been concerned to collect books and these books may have been bound in leather which was ornamented with insular designs (Buckley 1915, 300-309).

The third model best explains the occurrence on Welsh monuments of motifs which are most commonly found in other areas and in other media. In this manner Wales participated fully in the insular tradition of ornament.
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Map 44. Insular monuments exhibiting Norman features.
FIG. 1: COMPARATIVE VINE SCROLL

i. Penally 364
ii. Sandbach
iii. Breedon-on-the-hill
i. Penally 363
ii. Penally 363
iii. Bambergh Casket
iv. Camuston
FIG. 3: PAIRS OF ANIMALS

i. Penalyl 364
ii. St. Oswald's, Gloucester
iii. Collingham
iv. Elstow
FIG. 4: TREWHIDDLE-STYLE ANIMALS

a. The ornament of the large mount, fields 1-11.

ii

d. The ornament of the strap-ends.

i

i. Bulmore 290
ii. Ornament of certain objects from the Trewhiddle hoard (after Wilson and Blunt 1961)
iii. Trewhiddle-style sword from Radnorshire
FIG. 5: THE ORNAMENT OF PENALLY 363, LANIVET HOG-BACK
AND THE SWORD-HILT OF LEOPRIC.

i. Penally 363
ii. Lanivet Hog-back
iii. Sword-hilt of Leofric, from Exeter
FIG. 6: ST. EDREN'S 391 AND THE DUBLIN CROSS-SLABS.

After O'Nialaide (1973)

i. St. Edren's 391
ii. St. Audoens
iii. Mount Street
iv. St. Patricks
v. St. Patricks
vi. Rathcoole
FIG 7: FRETTED RING CROSS-SLABS

i St. David's 375

ii Cloonburren (now lost)

iii Cloonburren 556

iv St. David's 374

v St. David's 376
FIG. 8: ENCIRCLED PRETS ON IRISH CROSS-SLABS.

i. Clonmacnoise 145
ii. Clonmacnoise 142
iii. Clonmacnoise, now lost
FIG. 9: CRUCIFIXION SCENE

i. Llangan 207
ii. Kells, cross of SS. Patrick and Columba
iii. Kells, Market cross
iv. Monasterboice, west cross
FIG. 10: ST. PAUL AND ST. ANTHONY

i. Nash 250
ii. Kells, Market cross
iii. Moone cross
iv. Armagh cross
FIG. 11: ORANT FIGURES

i. Llanfrynach 56
ii. Llanhamlach 61
iii. Seven Sisters 269
iv. Pontardawe 256
v. Clonca, Ireland
vi. Gallen, Ireland
FIG. 12: MAN BETWEEN TWO BEAST MEN

i. Penmon 38
ii. Kells, Market cross
iii. Moone
iv. Castledermot, south cross
FIG. 13: MARGAM 234 AND ST. VIGEANS 11.

i Margam 234

ii St. Vigean's 11
FIG. 14: MARGAM 232 AND MICHAEL 89.

i. Margam 232
ii. Michael 89
FIG. 15: NASH 250 AND MAUGHOLD 67.

i. Nash 250
ii. Maughold 67
i. Penally 363
ii. Otley
iii. Hickling
iv. York, Clifford Street
v. York, Clifford Street
vi. York, St. Denis
FIG. 17: JELLINGE INSPIRED ANIMALS CONT.

i. Middleton A
ii. Middleton B
iii. Collingham
iv. Ellerburn
v. Gilling
vi. Pickering
FIG. 18: JELLINGE INSPIRED ANIMALS CONT.

i. Cross Canonby
ii. Folkton
iii. Aspatria
iv. Pickhill
v. Levisham
FIG. 19: JELLINGE ANIMALS CONT.

i. Jelling cup
ii. Andreas 95
iii. Michael 89
iv. Aycliffe
v. Sockburn
vi. Derby, St. Alkmund's
FIG. 20: JELLINGE INSPIRED MOTIFS

i. Llandyfaeolg Fach 49
ii. Jelling, wooden ornament
iii. Bexhill
iv. Sancreed
v. Waterpit Down
i. Pontardawe 256

ii. Symbol of Matthew in the Book of Durrow
FIG. 22: LLANRHIDIAN 218 AND FIGURES IN THE BOOK OF DEER

i. Llanrhidian 218
ii. Book of Deer, fol. 16b
iii. Book of Deer, fol. 1b
FIG. 23: SHRINE OF ST. PATRICK'S BELL

Showing fret 10 in metalwork.
CHAPTER SIX

THE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC IMPLICATIONS OF THE MONUMENTS

The purpose of this chapter is to outline the implications which can be drawn from the monuments in conjunction with the known historical and archaeological evidence, concerning the basic organisation of the people and the land. Where these implications impinge on the political and ecclesiastical spheres they are mentioned only briefly and reserved for discussion in the appropriate sections.

The historical sources provide evidence for the existence of a variety of ranks in lay and ecclesiastical society in the pre-Norman period. The Llandaff charters, for example bear witness to kings, 'elders' and landowners (Davies 1978, 108-9), managing tenants (hereditarii), occupying hereditary tenants (heredes) and slaves (op. cit. 44-6), and to a variety of clerical and monastic officials including abbots, 'principes', 'sacerdotes' and bishops (op. cit. 124-8). The inscriptions on monuments of Group III cannot match this range of status revealed in the historical sources, recording only the status of kings, one abbot, one 'sacerdos', one bishop and, by implication, one landowner. These are discussed below. The monuments can, however, be made to yield information which is not found in any other context, concerning the craftsmen responsible for them and their patrons.

The inscriptions of monuments of Group III, unlike those of Groups I and II, sometimes refer to the making and preparation of the monument. The hypothesis that this indicates the emergence of a class of professional craftsmen proud enough of their work to put their name to it, perhaps even as an advertisement for their trade, is examined below.

Certain inscriptions record the name of the man responsible for the manufacture of the monument. Merthyr Mawr 239, for example, states '(Co)mbelani (p)ossuit hanc crucem ... a me preparatus. Scilic' (missing letters supplied by sketch of Lhuyd 1697, Stowe Ms. 1024). In the majority of cases, however, the identity of the craftsman is indicated by the verb facio. Margam 234 draws a distinction between the patron and the craftsman: 'Conbelin (p)osuit h(a)nec crucem. Sodna crucem fecit' (Nash-Williams 1950, 148). The name of the craftsman is recorded on the following monuments:

Llanarthney 147 'Elmon (f)ecit h'c crucem'
Llanveynoe 410 'Haesdur fecit crucem istam'
Very little concerning the status of the craftsmen can be gleaned from this list of bare names. The fact that Guadan, a sacerdos, is acting as a craftsman is interesting; sacerdotes were officials of the church who seem to have held a position intermediate between that of priest and bishop (below, Chapter 7). Llandetty 46 is an erect slab with decoration comprising simple incised lines which are very imprecisely cut. The character of the piece suggests that it may be regarded as an amateur production as distinct from the majority of monuments which look more professional.

More evidence concerning the status of the craftsmen may be gleaned from the nature of the monuments. In a number of cases it is possible to identify more than one monument as the work of one craftsman or school. Occasionally it is difficult to distinguish between monuments to be ascribed to the work of one craftsman or school and independent copies of a certain monument made at a later date. For example, the patterns used on Llangyfelach 212 are identical with those on Llantwit Major 220. The very coarse nature of Llangyfelach 212 compared with the precise and delicate carving of Llantwit Major 220 suggests that the former is a copy of the latter. For the same reasons, Llandewi'r Cwm 47 would appear to be a later copy of the type of monument represented by Llanynis 65. Monuments regarded as the work of one craftsman or school must usually be of a uniform standard of design and execution, although allowance must sometimes be made for differences at the beginning and/or the end of the school.

The monuments ascribed to the work of one craftsman or school have already been mentioned in different contexts above, but for convenience they are summarised below.

The monuments Carew 303, Nevern 360, Llantwit Major 222, Llanfynydd 159 and Exeter comprise one of the most coherent groups (Fig.1, Map 1). The almost identical dimensions of, and patterns used on, Llantwit Major 222 and Llanfynydd 159 indicate that these two monuments must have been the work of one man. Carew 303 may be a later work by the same craftsman; the dimensions of the monument are larger and additional patterns are used, but the character of the monument is consistent with the earlier works. Nevern 360 introduces a squareish shaft and more patterns. This monument is best regarded as the work of another craftsman versed in the same
traditions as the man who made 159, 222 and 303. The monument at Exeter, where the shaft is squareish, is most closely linked by form and decoration to Nevern 360. The absence of the more complicated motifs in use on Nevern 360 is easily explained by the intractable nature of the stone of the Exeter shaft, which is granite. It is not necessary to postulate the existence of a school of sculpture to explain the surviving material; one man and his son could have been responsible for all five of these monuments. The monuments comprising this group have been identified as being manufactured from locally available stone. The material of Nevern 360 was described as 'local diorite', Llanfynydd 159 as 'local felspathic sandstone' and Llantwit Major 222 as 'local grit'. The shaft from Exeter was made from Devonish granite. It is clear therefore that the craftsmen involved in the production of this group must have been itinerant.

The panelled-cartwheel monuments may be regarded as the products of a school of craftsmen. These twelve monuments, confined to a small area of south-west Glamorgan, seem to have been produced within a period of forty years 1090-1120 (Chapter 4, Section 6). It is possible to divide these further. Kenfig 200 and Tythegston 270 both comprise a squared slab bearing a panel for an inscription beneath a cross formed of four panels around a central boss, with circles spaced between the panels. The resemblance is close enough for these to be regarded as the work of one man. The use of eight panels to form the cross is a feature on monuments from Margam (236, 237), Merthyr Mawr (241, 242) and Pen Y Fai. Of these, the two Margam monuments have similar dimensions and ornament and were probably produced by a single craftsman. There is a close resemblance between Ewenny 196 and Llangan 208. Further north, the outlying monuments Port Talbot 262, Neath 251a and Resolven 265 represent more individual interpretations of this form.

The school of craftsmen whose activities are represented by these monuments must have been based somewhere in the area, most probably in the region of the Ogmore estuary where the type is concentrated. Whilst the school may have been sedentary, taking commissions from the immediate area, at least one of its craftsmen must have been peripatetic over a region of ten miles to the north-west to account for the occurrence of the monuments at Margam. The monuments at Port Talbot and Resolven are likely to have been independent works based on the products of this south-eastern school.

Of the cross-slabs, Llandeilo 155 and 156 were the work of one man (Chapter 2, Form C10a), and also Caerleon 291 and St Arvans 292 (Chapter 2, Form C6). Unless more monuments are discovered in the style of these
slabs, there is no need to postulate the existence of a school of craftsmen in these two places. At St David's, the fretted ring cross-slabs 374, 375, 376 and 382 may be explained as the work of craftsmen of the same school, confined to St David's, perhaps over several generations. There are hints of the existence of a more extensive school in western Dyfed; the slabs St Edren's 393, St David's 391 and Walton West may have been the work of one man (Chapter 2, Form C3c) and these are closely related to St Edren's 392, St David's 380, Steynton 404 and St Ishmael's 396. Again it would seem that these were the work of peripatetic craftsmen.

The angular line-cross-slabs (C1) form a northern and southern group associated primarily with Anglesey (C1a) and south-west Glamorgan (C1b) respectively. In the north, these simple slabs bearing Latin crosses seem to have been produced at Llangaffo and/or Llangeinwen; there is nothing to distinguish between the slabs found at these sites. These slabs are so simple that it is impossible to pick out slabs characteristic of the work of one man unless the use of simple spirals may be regarded as distinctive. It is also impossible to suggest the length of time this school was in production. The school must have been sedentary at Llangaffo or Llangeinwen, or at a centre between the two; the only example of the type to be found outside these two sites, namely Llanfihangel Esgeifiog 11a, is larger than the Llangaffo and Llangeinwen slabs and is likely to be an independent copy.

In the south, the angular line cross-slabs bearing equal-armed crosses with expansions at the ends of the arms are found on slabs from Merthyr Mawr (245/6 and 247) and Ewenny (978). These are presumably manufactured at Merthyr Mawr and/or Ewenny, with interaction between the two sites.

The compass drawn cross-slabs (C2) are too simple and too diverse in character to be ascribed to the work of one school. Most are found in south-west Glamorgan at Ewenny (979, 980, 981) and Merthyr Mawr (247, 967, 969) and thus it is possible that they were produced alongside the angular line-cross-slabs.

Finally, in this connection, there must be mentioned the seven Anglesey fonts which have been ascribed to the work of one school (Chapter 2, Form D6). Of these, the cylindrical font at Heneglwys and the rectangular stoup at Llanbeulan have been regarded as the work of one man. These fonts are confined to southern Anglesey; as two examples come from Heneglwys this is perhaps the most likely centre of production.
It is evident, therefore, that some craftsmen were itinerant whilst others were associated with a particular site. Further evidence of schools of craftsmen is provided by the concentrations of monuments of diverse forms in south Wales at Llantwit Major, Margam, Merthyr Mawr and Penally and St David’s and in north Wales at Llangaffo.

Remains of at least seven monuments of Group III were found in the vicinity of Llantwit Major church; a disc headed cross form B1 (220), three cross shafts of diverse form (221, 222 and 223), a round pillar (224) and possibly the base of another pillar (226), two fragments, perhaps of another cross (225), and a compass drawn cross-slab (974). Of these, the compass drawn cross-slab may have been a product of a craftsman from Merthyr Mawr or Ewenny, but there is no reason to suggest that the other monuments were not made at Llantwit. The disc-headed cross 220, dated by its inscription to 880, is unrelated in form and decoration to the other monuments. The shafts 222 and 223 are related by the peculiar form of the letter 'M' in their inscriptions which would suggest that the inscriptions were the work of one scribe and possibly, therefore, that they were the product of the same craftsman. The panels of rather incoherent double-stranded interlace on 222 and 224 are so similar that these monuments may be regarded as contemporary, though the difference in form makes it impossible to prove that they were the work of one man. It seems likely that the interlace on these two monuments was an attempt to copy the double stranded knotwork on shaft 221, which is asymmetrical and creates cruciform breaks. It would seem that a craftsman (or craftsmen) was operating at Llantwit Major in the late ninth century and in the first half of the eleventh century. There is a chronological gap of about a century between Llantwit Major 220 and the later monuments which cannot be bridged by the available evidence.

An even more eclectic collection of monuments occurs at Margam, namely four disc-headed crosses of which three have slab-like shafts (231, 234, 235) and one is of the Whithorn type (233), two panelled-cartwheels (236 and 237), an interlaced ring-cross slab (232) and two compass-drawn cross-slabs (230 and 235). The panelled-cartwheels and the compass-drawn cross-slabs seem to derive from the area of the Ogmore estuary, but there are no compelling reasons to suggest that the other monuments were manufactured anywhere but Margam. This is remarkable as, apart from the form of the three disc-headed crosses with slab-like shafts, these monuments are highly individual and bear little resemblance to each other. All these monuments, with the exception of the panelled cartwheels and the
compass-drawn cross-slabs are most comfortably dated to the tenth century, beginning with Margam 231 in the early tenth century (above, 188), but for the reasons given above, it hardly seems valid to talk of a school of craftsmen operating here.

There is no evidence for the employment of sculptors at Merthyr Mawr before the middle of the eleventh century. The ringed cross with fan-shaped arms, 240, is likely to have been the first monument manufactured here (above, 186). The shaft 239 has a similar form and layout, but the degree of degeneration of the ornament suggests that it is a later work. The two panelled-cartwheels 241 and 242 are likely to have been the work of one man, although it is not certain from where he operated. Merthyr Mawr seems to have been a centre of production of angular line-cross-slabs and compass-drawn cross-slabs; these may have been contemporary works of the same school.

The four monuments from Penally, of which three are incomplete cross shafts form a more coherent group. Penally 363 is related to 364 by the use of vine scroll arising from interlace and to 366 by its frets. Three-stranded plaitwork occurs on 363, 364 and 365 and a double row of double 'c'-shaped loops (interlace 29) is found on 365 and 366. These monuments are inter-related, but it seems unlikely that all were the work of one man. The ornament on Penally 364, for example, is confined to interlace and the character of its vine-scroll differs from that of 363. The closest relationships are between 364 and 365, and between 363 and 366. Thus at least two craftsmen were involved and it is reasonable to ascribe the monuments at Penally to a small school of sculptors flourishing there in the tenth century (above, 192). At least one of these craftsmen may have been itinerant outside the site; the sculptor of Penally 363 seems to have been in some way responsible for the design and execution of the hogback monument at Laniyot, Cornwall (Chapter 5, Section 2).

St David's has already been mentioned in connection with the fretted ring-cross-slabs and the western Dyfed group. The latest fretted ring cross-slab, 382, dated to the late eleventh century (above, 173), seems to have inspired a rather incompetent copy in the form of the slab 383. The three other monuments from this site bear little resemblance to each other although again there is no reason to suggest that they were not made at St David's. Number 378 is the ringed head of a free-standing cross, 379 a mutilated cross-shaft bearing an inscription but no ornament, and 377 a fragment of a highly ornamented cross-slab. The dates of all these monuments are uncertain.
In north Wales, the fragments from Bangor may hint at the existence of a school of craftsmen here, but they are too small and the surviving decoration on them too simple for any conclusions to be drawn. In Anglesey, Llangaffo, and Llangeinwen were apparently the centres of production of simple cross-slabs. Three pieces from Llangaffo suggest the existence of a more sophisticated school of sculpture here at some time, namely the cross head 14, the shaft 15 and the decorated fragment 16. As usual the connection between these pieces is not apparent.

Thus it would appear that in a large number of cases the monuments found together at one site are unrelated to each other and should perhaps be treated with the majority of Welsh monuments of Group III which are represented by isolated examples, namely as the products of individual craftsmen. Prior to the eleventh-century groups in south Wales, there are few cases where it is necessary to postulate the existence of more than one craftsman working at one site at any given time. The exceptions are Llantwit Major and possibly also Margam and St David's. In the eleventh century, when schools of sculpture can be identified in south-west Glamorgan, it is evident that very different types of monuments (panelled cartwheels, angular line-cross-slabs and compass drawn cross-slabs) may be contemporary products of the same site.

The status of the craftsmen is obscure. The time and labour involved in the manufacture of a highly ornamented cross or cross-slab from the cutting of the stone from an outcrop or shallow quarry to the erection and perhaps the subsequent painting of the monument suggests that these may have been the work of full-time professional craftsmen. It is not possible to tell whether or not one man was responsible for the whole process, but in the case of the geographically isolated individual monument this seems likely. Where schools are postulated there may have been some division of labour, for example between the quarrying of the stone and its sculpting. There is some evidence that certain schools patronised one particular source of stone. Seven of the Margam monuments are made of local Pennant sandstone and three of the monuments from Llantwit Major are of rhaetic sandstone apparently from the Bridgend-Pyle area. The majority of the simple cross-slabs from Ewenny were made of Sutton stone. It does not appear that any of these sources exercised a monopoly for supplying stone to these sites as a variety of stone is used at each site. This may indicate that the choice of material and its procurement was largely the responsibility of the individual craftsman.
These craftsmen may not have worked in stone alone. The patterns on Penally 363, Lanivet hogsback and the sword hilt from Exeter (Chapter 5, Section 8) imply that the stone sculptor may have been engaged in the manufacture of objects in other media. The angular line-cross-slabs where the cross is represented with a spiked foot (Llangaffo 17, 18, 20, 22, 23, 24; Llangeinwen 28, 29, 30; Llanfihangel Esgeifiog 11a, Whitford 189 and Ewenny 977) seem to indicate that in Anglesey at least, the stone carver was familiar with the simple wooden grave markers, of which these are skeumorphic and which he may also have manufactured. Waste products from the hewing of monuments from blocks of stone are likely to have been utilised and the sculptor may also have been engaged in the manufacture of quern stones and other articles of domestic use.

In some cases, for example the Llantwit Major-Ilanfynydd-Nevern-Carew-Exeter group, it seems likely that the men responsible for the manufacture of the monuments were self-employed itinerants who travelled around seeking commissions. In the few cases where sedentary schools of sculpture have been postulated it seems more likely that these men were in the full-time employment of lay or ecclesiastical authorities. In order to clarify the situation the evidence from the inscriptions relating to the patrons who commissioned the monuments is assembled here.

The inscription on Newcastle-Bridgend 253 is interesting as it refers to the buying of the stone for the monument as distinct from the manufacture of the monument from the stone: 'Aerern fecit lapidem emit hu(tr)um lapidem'. This must imply either that Iutrum bought the stone ready made from the craftsman Aerern who added an inscription to this effect, or that Iutrum bought the stone from a quarry or an outcrop which was regarded as the property of another man and gave it to Aerern to make into a cross-slab. The first hypothesis would imply that the craftsman had a stock of ready-made monuments. It seems unlikely that free-standing crosses and cross slabs were in such demand that these measures would be necessary. Nevertheless it is notable that Carew 303 has a blank panel which presumably once bore the name of the patron. This could indicate that the monument was made with blank panels in order for it to be ready for the first client whose name would then be inserted, most probably in paint. It is more likely, however, that this reflects the illiteracy of the sculptor who left the panel blank in order that the name of the man who commissioned the monument might be inserted by a scribe. Some of the simple monuments, such as the small angular cross-slabs and the compass drawn cross-slabs may have been made in advance but in the case of Newcastle-Bridgend 253,
the second proposition that Iutrum first bought the stone and then took it to a craftsman to process seems more likely. This is an early Norman monument which bears a number of insular ornamental features (above, 117). After the Norman Conquest trade in stone is likely to have been more important than in the preceding period, but the inscription raises the probability that in the pre-Norman period the patron would have had to buy the stone as well as to pay the craftsman for his work.

The names of the patrons of monuments are preserved in a number of inscriptions. The inscription on Margam 234 'Conbelin (p)osuit h(a)nc crucem. Sodna crucem fecit' makes it reasonable to suppose that the term posuit where it occurs indicates the identity of the patron - 'Samson posuit hanc crucem' (Llantwit Major 222); '(Co)mbelani (p)ossuit hanc crucem' (Merthyr Mawr 239). The inscription on Llantisilio Yn Ial 182 refers to Concenn King of Powys as having erected (edificauit) the monument. In view of his status, it seems unlikely that Concenn was himself physically responsible for its erection. It is more likely to mean that Concenn ordered the pillar to be made and in this way was responsible for its erection. The inscription on Penally 365 'h(a)ec est crux quam edificauit mail domna(c)' (Westwood 1864, 328) should also be interpreted in this way. Similarly the term surrexit on Llanhamlach 61 'Moredic sur(r)exit hunc lapidem' must indicate that Moridic was the patron and not the craftsman of the monument.

The inscriptions on Llantwit Major 222 and 223 suggest that two or more persons might act as patrons of one monument. 'Samson posuit hanc crucem' (Llantwit Major 222), but on the back of the monument there are four more names, of which three are prefixed or followed by an initial cross, in separate panels: '+iltuti', 'samsoni regis', 'samuel+', 'ebisar+'. It is unclear whether or not the persons named in the inscription were contemporaries. 'Iltud' for example, is as likely to record the name of the sixth-century founder of the monastery of Llantwit Major as a contemporary of the cross which has been dated to the late tenth or eleventh century. The initial crosses may indicate that the persons so marked were dead by the time Samson 'prepared' the cross, but this is equally hypothetical. If all were contemporaries, then it is likely that all contributed to the monument. If not, then it is likely that all contributed to the monastery at some time and in some way in order to merit having their names inscribed on the monument. Abbot Samson acted as patron of Llantwit Major 223 'pro anima sua: pro anima iuthahelo rex . . . et artmali et tecain' thus suggesting a close relationship between Samson, abbot of Llantwit
Major, and the ruling dynasty of the area in the mid-ninth century. The implications of this are discussed in Chapter 8.

The inscriptions of two other monuments seem to record the name of the patron of the monument. 'Margituit rex' (Carew 303) acted presumably as the patron of the cross, or was commemorated by it, in which case his family are likely to have exercised the patronage. The inscription on Ogmore 255 was reconstructed as 'sciendum est omnibus quod dedit artmail agrum deo et gliguis et nertan et fili episcopi' (Williams 1932, 233).

Arthfael, therefore, seems to have been a wealthy lay patron of the church, and he was presumably responsible for the setting up of this monument in order to record his gift.

In several cases, the inscription on the monument comprises only the name of an individual, and the status of the person named is not specified. In these cases it is impossible to determine whether the person named acted as the craftsman or the patron of the monument.

It is evident, therefore, that craftsmen were patronised by royalty, laymen and monastic officials. Wealth was apparently the only qualification needed to act as patron of a monument. The implications of lay and ecclesiastical patronage are discussed in the appropriate sections of the following chapters. Amongst craftsmen, a diversity of practice is apparent. Some, perhaps most, operated individually, others in small groups. A few may have been itinerant, but the majority seem to have worked only in their immediate locality, and may have been sedentary at particular sites such as Llantwit Major, Margam, Merthyr Mawr, Penally, St David's, Llangaffo, and later in south west Glamorgan, all of which most probably supported religious establishments at this time. The evidence does not permit the existence of a large body of full-time craftsmen working on stone monuments, let alone a distinct social class. None of the groups of sculpture which has been identified was particularly numerous and most were short-lived. Furthermore, the degree of sculptural competence exhibited by the majority of the monuments is not as high as one would expect if sculpture was a full-time occupation. The craftsmen who made the majority of monuments of Group III presumably did this work only very occasionally, at the behest of a wealthy patron, and were otherwise employed in a variety of occupations. Guadan (Llandetty 46) was also a sacerdos, but it is now impossible to determine the other occupations of the craftsmen. In the case of monuments which have a competent inscription of more than three or four words, the craftsman was probably literate and thus perhaps more likely to have belonged to ecclesiastical than to lay society.
Before turning to the economic implications of the monuments, there is one further aspect of society for which they may provide some information, namely its dress. There are no coherent contemporary accounts of the dress in use in Wales in this period, so it is interesting to examine the few figural representations on the monuments. This is problematical for several reasons. Firstly, figural representations are rare and where they do occur they are likely to be representations of exceptional men such as important ecclesiastics and members of the nobility who may not have worn 'normal' dress. Secondly, there is no guarantee that the representations are of authentic dress; the representations may have been taken from other sources such as manuscript illumination. Finally, the majority of the figural representations are too simple and too stylised to allow any detailed information to be drawn from them. The following is a consideration of only the figures which can be identified as wearing some form of clothing; busts such as those on Llandough 206 and very worn or stylised figures, such as Nash 250 and Llanrhidian 218, are not included here.

In her survey of the dress of the Arthurian period, Racy states that 'both men and women wore their hair long and flowing ... the men usually wore beards' (1968, 166). The majority of figures represented on the Welsh monuments, however, appear to be bald. In only two cases are there clear representations of hair, Margam 234 (female) and Llanbadarn Fawr 111 (male), although in both these cases the hair is indeed 'long and flowing'. Nevertheless, the bald figures frequently have beards (e.g. Llanfrynach 56, Llangan 207, Margam 234, Llandyfaelog Fach 49 and St Dogmaels 130). The beards of all these figures are all tapered to a point, which was presumably a fashion of the time (Fig. 2).

Of these bald figures, Llanfrynach 56, Llanhamlach 61, Seven Sisters 269 and St Dogmaels 130 are in the orantes position. All wear knee-length tunics, those of numbers 56, 61 and 130 being straight, and that of number 269 gathered at the waist and falling in folds to the knee, like that of the fragment Bardsey Island 82. The figure of Christ on the cross (Llangan 207) is also shown wearing a straight knee-length tunic. There is no indication that any of these figures were also wearing breeches, although Racy considers these to have been basic articles of male secular attire (1968, 164). There would thus seem to be two possible interpretations of these figures; either that these were intended to be representations of tonsured clerics wearing ecclesiastical dress, or that they were intended to be representations of the deceased wearing shrouds and, in the case of the orantes, asking for intercession for the good of their souls. As the
latter would imply that the head was shaved at death, a practice otherwise unrecorded, the former interpretation seems more likely to be correct.

The bald bearded figure on Llandyfaelog Fach 49, which is apparently a representation of the Briamail Flou whose name is inscribed on the monument, also wears a knee-length tunic, but in this case the interpretation of this figure as a tonsured ecclesiastic seems unlikely. In his left hand the figure appears to hold a broad-bladed sword and, in his right hand, the shaft of what may have been a spear with a wooden shaft. The tip of this weapon is missing from the original monument. If this figure is interpreted as a representation of the deceased then this would imply that he was buried in the pagan manner, accompanied by grave-gods. It seems more probable that this was intended as a portrait of a living warrior associated with his weapons which may also have acted as symbols of his authority. The whole representation is so simplistic, however, that it is impossible to make further comment on the warrior's dress or weapons.

Other representations may provide a more useful indication of contemporary dress. The figures at the base of the cross on Margam 234 show both a male and a female figure wearing flowing robes. These figures most probably represent the Virgin Mary and St John (Appendix B, figures and scenes 4) and their dress is likely to be exceptional. Racy's assertion that 'men's dress was based on three main garments: a simple tunic, long breeches or trousers and a warm cloak' (1968, 164) receives a little corroboration from the figure on Penmon 38, which is apparently wearing a hooded cloak, and the cloak worn by the stately figure on Llanbadarn Fawr 111. This long haired, bearded figure wears a full-length cloak which seems to be fastened in the centre of the chest, although no fastening in the form of a brooch or a pin is visible. In view of the simplistic nature of these figures, it is not possible to draw any conclusions concerning the legwear or the footwear in use at this time.

Thus the Welsh monuments of Group III may be used to provide a little evidence for the structure of the society in which they were produced, and even to give some indication, albeit a vague one, of the dress which was worn by members of that society. It is also possible to use the evidence provided by the monuments to help illuminate some aspects of the economy of this society.

The production of stone monuments is a neglected aspect of the economy of pre-Norman Wales, and one which helps to demonstrate its complexity. It used to be thought that the economy of post-Roman and pre-Norman Wales
was based on nomadic pastoralism. In a number of articles Jones demonstrated the fallacy of this reasoning and put forward a case to support his hypothesis of the existence of settled communities engaged in arable as well as pastoral farming (Jones 1959; 1961; 1964; 1972; 1975). Jones suggested that Welsh society and economy at this time was based on the existence of a lord's court, situated in a prominent position, with dependent hamlets bound to the lord and making returns to him. Jones' so-called 'multiple estate theory' uses the basic units of Welsh administration set down in later medieval laws, and it does not necessarily follow that these were the pre-Norman (and even, as he suggests in one article (1961, 221-262), the pre-Roman) units of agricultural production. It is desirable to use more contemporary evidence.

The Book of Llandaff records grants of land to churches. In her study of the charters, Davies indicates that in the majority of cases it is evident that the land granted is in the form of estates, i.e. a settlement and its associated land (1978, Chapter 4). These estates are given together with the livestock on the land (pigs, sheep and cattle are mentioned) and the men - 'heredes' - tied tenant farmers - who were dependent on the land and who worked it. In a number of cases charters refer to 'heredetarii' - men who seem to have held a hereditary tied tenancy to the land. There is no evidence that these men performed any labour services, and it is probable that they acted in a managerial capacity (Davies 1978, 45). Beneath them would be the agricultural workers and those who tended the livestock, and beneath them, slaves.

The sculptural evidence can add little to this picture. The inscriptions of Ogmore 255 and Merthyr Mawr 240 confirm the practice of granting land to the church. The Ogmore inscription, reconstructed by Williams as '(sciendum) est (omnibus) quod ded(it) arthmail agrum do et gliguis et nertat et fili episcopus' (1932, 233) conforms to the Welsh type of charter found in the Book of Llandaff (Davies 1978, 9) and those appended to the Life of Cadog (Evans 1932, 151-165), and also the marginal charters in the Book of Chad (Jones 1972, 312). The phraseology of the much-damaged inscription of Merthyr Mawr 240 (interpreted and translated by Nash-Williams as 'In the Name of God the Father and of the Son (and) of the Holy Spirit ... (? is hereby assigned) in this writing into its possession until the Day of Judgement)' is apparently unique. Some donors, then, were apparently concerned to have a more permanent record of their grant than a charter which, as the Llandaff charters indicate, could be falsified. The form and decoration of Ogmore 255 suggests that it should be
dated to the late eleventh or early twelfth century (above, 192). It is interesting that a monument of this date records the donation of an ager. In the Llandaff charters, the term ager is used in two ways; in association with a measurement to mean land, and by itself to mean an estate (Davies 1978, 40). The term is used in charters dated 600 to 950, and in this period estates called agri are more common in Gwent than the Glamorgan area. Ager does not seem to have been used to refer to an estate after this date (op. cit 57). The exact interpretation of the ager of Ogmore 255 must therefore remain uncertain - but Nash-Williams' translation, 'a field' (1950, 160), is likely to be too simplistic.

It has already been suggested that wealth was the only qualification needed to act as patron of a monument, and wealth was in land (usually measured in terms of cattle) and not in currency. Only one Welsh coin belonging to this period is known, namely a penny bearing the legend 'Howael Rex'. This has traditionally been assigned to Hywel Dda, but Dykes (1976, 12-14) has shown that this cannot be substantiated. The coin was found with two coins of Eadmund, and is dated to the tenth century. Stylistically, it is a product of a north-western mint, probably Chester. The coin is unique and is unlikely to have formed part of any practical currency. There is no evidence of sums of money being used in any transaction involving the Welsh prior to the Norman Conquest. Charters in the Book of Llandaff which record sales of land give its value in terms of cattle or, more rarely, silver (Davies 1978, 53).

The most likely patrons of monuments of Group III were therefore the landowners - the kings and the aristocracy who possessed large blocks of property, and the churches and monasteries who were the recipients of grants from them. A surplus of arable and pastoral products must have been produced to enable these landowners to patronise men who pursued occupations (such as the manufacture of stone monuments) which were not directly or at least not exclusively concerned with the production of food.

Archaeological evidence helps to confirm this picture. At Dinas Powys, Glamorgan, there was intensive occupation of the site in the fifth and sixth centuries. Finds from the site evidenced pastoral and arable farming, domestic crafts including leather dressing, spinning and metal-working, and the importation of Mediterranean and continental wares and scrap glass from Teutonic contexts (Alcock 1963, 34-55). Similar discoveries were made at Dinas Emrys, Gwynedd (Savory 1960, 13-77). The excavator of Dinas Powys suggested that 'the evidence of domestic and industrial activities at Dinas
Powys can best be reconciled if we interpret it as ... the court of a local ruler with its hall ... surrounded by subsidiary buildings ... and forming the centre of a variety of agricultural, industrial and domestic pursuits' (Alcock 1963, 55). This suggests that in both north and south Wales landowners possessed the means to patronise the arts and crafts in the immediate post-Roman period.

More is known about the landowners than the settlements which existed on their land, indeed there is remarkably little evidence for settlement sites contemporary with the monuments of Group III - that is from the ninth century onwards. The following concerns secular sites only; what little evidence there is for ecclesiastical sites is marshalled in Chapter 7. Most of the excavated evidence centres on the fifth to seventh centuries (Map 2). The evidence for the dating of these sites comes mainly from the presence on the sites of coarse hand-made pottery, or more commonly, sherds of imported Mediterranean and continental pottery (Chapter 5, Section 7). In his article of 1963, Alcock summarised the evidence for these sites, and there has since been little to add. The majority of settlements which have been excavated and which have yielded this material are re-used Iron Age hillforts - such as the Breiddin, Powys (Musson 1972) and Dinorben, Clwyd (Gardner and Savory 1964); fortified homesteads such as Dinas Powys and Dinas Emrys, and enclosed hut groups such as Pant Y Saer, Gwynedd (Phillips 1934, 1-36). This pattern is misleading as it is more likely to reflect the comparative ease of identifying enclosures above ground, than to be representative of the original settlement pattern. In the Llandaff charters where the bounds of estates are given, these generally refer to natural features, and the impression is that the land is largely unenclosed (Davies 1978, 32).

The excavated sites then are unlikely to have been typical. The little historical evidence there is suggests that the majority of the lay population lived on lower lying land. 'The overwhelming proportion of identifiable land' in the Llandaff charters - approximately 90 percent, many of which were estates, are below the 500' contour, and most are in areas well provided with water' (Davies 1978, 26). The historical sources yield no evidence of the physical characteristics of these settlements. Most men who worked on the land probably lived in ephemeral wooden structures which have left no surface traces. If, as it has been suggested, arable farming played a large part in the economy, then these sites would have been situated on or near the best arable land. This is precisely the land on which ancient settlements are most likely to have been des-
troyed by subsequent occupation or agricultural activity. The situation seems to have been similar in the case of ecclesiastical settlements; Bowen's studies indicate that the majority of Celtic churches (which he identified as such by their dedications) were situated on the lower land of each area (1956, 109).

It is reasonable to suggest that the monuments of Groups II and III were erected in the areas in or near which there were contemporary settlements of a lay or ecclesiastical nature. Both groups are found almost exclusively on low-lying ground below 600', and both are concentrated on the northern and southern coasts with a scattered distribution inland. Group II monuments, however, are concentrated in Dyfed (Chapter 3, Map 1), whereas Group III are centred on Glamorgan (Chapter 3, Map 2). It is however unlikely that this reflects a shift of settlement. The Glamorgan sea-plain for example, which has few monuments of Group II, but many of Group III, is a fertile area which is likely to have been occupied throughout the period of manufacture of Group II, and finds from the site of Dinas Powys confirm that there was occupation in this area during the immediate post-Roman period. The reasons for the change in distribution seem to be that whilst the practice of erecting Group III monuments apparently began in Glywysing and was centred there (above), Group II monuments radiated from Dyfed which was most probably their area of origin. The lack of coincidence between the sites yielding monuments of Group II and those with monuments of Group III can only be explained in the light of contemporary ecclesiastical and political events and as such is discussed in Chapters 7 and 8.

The location of the monuments suggests that those of Group III were frequently associated with religious establishments. In the absence of any evidence to the contrary, it is reasonable to suppose that there was a fairly close correlation between the location of religious and secular settlements. In this case, a study of the location of monuments of Group III may provide some additional information concerning the location of contemporary settlements.

In view of growing realisation of the importance of the post-Roman occupation of Roman sites, it is necessary to review the evidence for a number of Group III sites which are on or near Roman sites. Laing has recently assembled the evidence for post-Roman occupation on the sites of Roman forts in Britain (1977, 57-60). The site of only one Roman fort in Wales, that of Caerleon, is known to have been the find spot of a Group I
monument. Caerleon 291 was discovered in the churchyard of St Cadoc's church which was situated partly above the headquarters building of the Roman legionary fortress (Boon 1970, 10-63). Excavations under the New Vicarage in 1968-9 showed indications that the basilica was abandoned in the fourth century (ibid), but a coin of Arcadius (394-408) was found in the churchyard, and this suggests that occupation in this area may have continued into the late fourth century and beyond. This was traditionally the site of the martyrdom of Julius (1) and Aaron (Gildas' De excidio Britonum Chapter 10; Winterbottom 1978, 92), and a pewter vessel incised with a chi-rho which was found at Caerleon (Moore 1975) corroborating the impression that there may have been some Christian activity at the site in the late Roman period. Cadoc's church was traditionally founded here in the fifth century. The next surviving historical evidence for Caerleon is that of Llandaff charter 225 which Davies dated c. 864 (1978, 181). This states that the three sons of Beli gave the territorium of the martyrs Julius and Aaron, which had previously belonged to Dyfrig, to bishop Nudd. Clearly there was an ecclesiastical establishment there in the ninth century. Without evidence for the intervening three centuries it is impossible to be dogmatic, but at this site continuity of settlement from the Roman period to the tenth century (when charter 292 was drawn up) seems probable.

Aside from military occupation and mining activities, the Romans in Wales were responsible for the creation of one town, Caerwent, and a handful of villas (Map 3). Three Group III sites are in the vicinity of villas. The Roman villa at Llandough was discovered in 1979 on land adjacent to the churchyard in which shaft 206, dated to the late eleventh century, is situated, apparently in its original position. The Llandaff charters indicate that the monastery at Llandough, which was presumably on this site, flourished in the period 650-1075 (Davies 1978, 135). The excavators record 'some of the Romano-British walling was still standing to a sufficient height in the thirteenth to fourteenth century to be incorporated in the medieval structure; a number of post-Roman burials were also recorded' (Glamorgan-Gwent Archaeological Trust 1979, 86). This evidence, together with the virtual coincidence of site of the Roman villa and the church is enough 'to suggest continuity of occupation in the post-Roman period' (op.cit).

(1) Lloyd gives a list of manuscripts and editions of Gildas' De excidio et conquestu Britanniae (1954, 134-143). None of these are earlier than the tenth century but ultimately they derive from an original work of circa 540 (Alcock 1973, 22). The most recent text and translation of Gildas' work is that of Winterbottom (1978).
The villa at Llantwit Major showed some signs of occupation continuing beyond the middle of the fourth century, with some buildings falling into decay and metalworking taking place in others. However, by the time the site was used as a cemetery, apparently at some time in the pre-Norman period, the walls of the villa were flat and the site had been abandoned for some time (Hogg 1974, 237). St Illtud's church, the oldest known location of the monuments 220-226, is over a mile from the villa site. Similarly, although the villa at Llanfrynach, Brec, continued into the fourth century and perhaps beyond, with some evidence of metalworking, the site is just under a mile from the later church and settlement (Nash-Williams 1950, 105-8).

The distribution of Group I stones indicates the continued use of the Roman road system into the seventh century (Nash-Williams 1950, 4), but Group III have a mainly coastal and riverine distribution. Group II occupies an intermediate position; the distribution is orientated towards the coast and river valleys, but the south Powys monuments on the uplands seem to reflect the routes of the Roman roads radiating from Llandovery and Yr Gaer. By the time the Group III monuments were erected, the majority of these Roman roads in north, west and mid Wales seem to have gone out of use. The continued existence of Roman roads in south-east Wales is implied by Davies' identification of the sites of the Llandaff charters which refer to roads in their boundaries, as for the most part these relate to the old Roman roads (1978, 31). Of Group III sites, the proximity of Baglan, Port Talbot, Margam, Kenfig, Laleston, Tytheaston, Merthyr Mawr, Ewenny, Nash, Llancarfan and Llandough to the line of the Roman road which ran from Neath to Cardiff, suggests that this road at least remained in use throughout the period. In north Wales, the Maen Achwyfan (Whitford 190) is situated, apparently in its original position, on a crossing of the Roman road between Chester and Caernarvon, and may have acted as a marker on this route.

The majority of Group III sites, however, are found more in relation to the coast and the river valleys than to the Roman road system and are likely to reflect the most popular communication routes of the period. At this time, Caerleon, Newport, Cardiff (Llandough), Llancarfan (outlet Aberthaw), Llantwit Major, Kenfig, Port Talbot and St David's almost certainly acted as ports, giving egress to the opposite side of the Bristol channel and to Ireland. Analysis of the form and style of the monuments of Group III has indicated that these channels of communication were utilised, and that a further sea route existed between the north Welsh
coast, the Isle of Man and Chester. Trade probably accompanied these cultural contacts evidenced by sculpture and indeed may have preceded the cultural exchange.

The situation of the majority of Group II sites on low-lying land well supplied with water and likely to be fertile enough to support arable and pastoral farming, probably reflects areas of permanent settlement. Thus the evidence of the monuments confirms the existence of a settled and organised society and economy in post-Roman and pre-Norman Wales.
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Map 3. Roman sites and Group III monuments in Glamorgan.
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FIG. 2: CONTEMPORARY DRESS AND FASHION ILLUSTRATED ON GROUP III MONUMENTS.
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Implications concerning the nature of religious life in post-Roman and pre-Norman Wales can be derived from the monuments of Group III in two main ways - firstly from the inscriptions on the monuments which are explicit, and secondly by deductions from the form, decoration and situation of the monuments. This chapter attempts to examine these implications in the context of the evidence of the Group II monuments, and in the light of what is known about the post-Roman and pre-Norman church in Wales.

In order to appreciate the evidence provided by the monuments, it is necessary to begin with a brief historical introduction. Christianity was transmitted to the British Isles within the framework of the Roman Empire. By 314 the faith had spread sufficiently to allow Britain to be represented by three bishops at the Council of Arles (Frend 1955, 1). The Chi-rho, a Christian monogram, has been discovered on Roman mosaic and plaster work at Hinton St Mary and Lullingstone respectively, and on a variety of portable objects (Painter 1971). Church plans have tentatively been identified in Roman contexts at Silchester and Caerwent (Radford 1971, 1-3).

It has sometimes been assumed that Christianity died out with the towns and villas in the post-Roman period, and that it was re-introduced into Britain from Gaul. It is generally agreed that Christian Latin funerary inscriptions of the fifth century and later in western Britain have affinities with Gaulish formulae (see Chapter 1, Section 2). Nevertheless there is some evidence for the continuity of Christianity in Britain in the post-Roman period. For example, Constantius, the biographer of Germanus of Auxerre, records that the saint came to visit British clergy on his visit to this island in 429 (Kirby 1968, 43). The survival of the British egle, a church, in the Anglo-Saxon place-name eccles is also suggestive of continuity (Cameron 1968, 87-90). If, as it seems, Christianity survived in Britain despite the Anglo-Saxon incursions, then it is highly probable that it survived in Wales where there was no conquest. Two known cemeteries in Wales belong to a class characterised by predominancy east-westerly orientation of the body and the absence or paucity of grave-gods, which have been interpreted as Christian burials (Rahtz, 1974), namely the cemetery outside the gates of the Roman fort at Caerwent (op. cit), and that over the disused villa at Llantwit Major (Hogg 1974, 237).
Literary sources, for example the writings of Patrick(1) and of
Gennadius(2) support the view that the immediate post-Roman church, like
that of Roman Britain, was episcopal and diocesan rather than monastic in
character.

The condition of the church in Wales in the sixth century is illus-
trated by the writing of Gildas. In De excidio Britonum, Gildas refers
to both abbots and bishops. The latter have dioceses, but these do not
seem to have any clear territorial definition. He refers to bishops who
go abroad in order to gain pomp and glory (Chapter 67), and to those who
are guilty of simony (Chapter 66). The impression throughout Gildas
(especially Chapters 65-69) is that the predominant element in the church
is episcopal.

The existence of an organised church in Wales in the fifth and sixth
centuries is corroborated by the evidence of four Group I monuments from
Gwynedd. Llantrisant 33 and Bodafan 83 both refer to a sacerdos. There
is some controversy over the exact meaning of the term - Gildas, for
example, seems to use it to mean both bishop and priest. The Life of
Samson(3) refers to sacerdotes who were ordained annually, and to a high-
est sacerdos (Chapter 13). This suggests that only the latter had the
administrative function of a bishop, and that the majority of sacerdotes
formed a class intermediate between priests and bishops. This hypothesis
is supported by the use of the term in the Llandaff charters where some
individuals are said to hold the offices of both sacerdos and presbyter.
It is interesting that the term sacerdos is not used in the charters
dating to the second half of the eleventh century (Davies 1978, 127). The
only other ecclesiastical rank commemorated on Group I inscriptions is
that of presbyter, on Aberdaron 77 and 78. It is notable that in this
period the bishop seems to have been the highest ecclesiastical authority
known. There are no authentic references to an archbishop or to the Pope.

(1) It would seem that the 'Confession' (preserved in the early ninth-
century Book of Armagh) and the 'Letter to the Soldiers of Coroticus'
(found together with the 'Confession' in a number of continental manu-
scripts), are copies of original manuscripts written by Patrick himself
in the mid-fifth century. Both works are translated by Bieler (1949).
(2) Gennadius' de Viris Inlustribus, written in the mid-fifth century
contains several references to Fastidius, bishop of the Britons at this
time. The text is edited by Richardson (1896, 56-58).
(3) The life of Samson of Dol was composed in Brittany, probably in the
seventh century, and as such it is the earliest extant life of a British
saint (Lloyd 1954, 144). A text of the life appears in Fawtier (1912,
92-177).
The two religious offices recorded on stones of Group I relate to an episcopal rather than to a monastic church. No Group II slabs bear inscriptions which make reference to ecclesiastical status. This may mainly be a reflection of the paucity of inscriptions on the simple monuments of this group, but it may owe something to the change in church organisation which seems to have been taking place during the period of production of this group of monuments. From the sixth century onwards, there seems to have been a gradual change from episcopal to monastic organisation within the churches of Wales and Ireland, and probably of Scotland and Cornwall as well. The ultimate inspiration for monasticism came from Egypt and the impulse for the establishment of monastic houses seems to have spread via Gaul to Wales and thence to Ireland (Chadwick 1961, 35-48). The existence of cultural contacts between these areas are supported materially by the various classes of Mediterranean and Gaulish pottery sherds of which have been found on several coastal sites in Britain and Wales (see Chapter 5, Section 7).

A large corpus of later hagiographical material focusses on the sixth century as a period of missionary activity and monastic foundation. Saints who figure in this literature appear to be very mobile between monasteries within the Irish Sea area. The Life of Samson furnishes a typical example; Samson was educated at Llantwit Major (Chapter 7), he then retreated to Caldey (Chapter 20), and afterwards visited various monasteries in Ireland (Chapters 37-38), Cornwall (Chapters 45-51), and finally Brittany (Chapters 52-59).

The monastic church may have grown at the expense of the episcopal system, but it did not oust it completely. Although there is no evidence for the existence of clearly defined dioceses in this period, the historical sources, notably the Llandaff charters, contain many references to bishops and clergy. A number of inscriptions on monuments of Group III bear witness to both the monastic and the episcopal elements in the Welsh church during the period of their production.

A certain 'samsoni apati' figures prominently in the inscription of Llantwit Major 223. This cross shaft has been dated to the first half of the eleventh century (above, 176). In her study of the charters of the Book of Llandaff, Davies indicated that there were apparently no references to abbots in charters that can securely be dated after 950. In the eleventh century monasteries once represented by abbots (including Llantwit, Llandaff, Llanearfan and Llandough) were then represented by
presbyters. She suggested that this might imply a major change within
the monasteries in question, with the secular clergy becoming more impor-
tant at the expense of the abbot and monks (1978, 125-126). If the date
given to Llantwit Major 223 is correct, however, then it must indicate
that at Llantwit, at least in the eleventh century, the abbot was still
a leading member of the community in close relationship with the king.

St David's 392 (c. 1080) refers to 'pontificus' Abraham and his two
sons Hed and Isaac. It is possible to argue that Hed and Isaac were the
issue of a marriage prior to Abraham taking orders, but it is more
likely that he was one of the numerous body of married clergy, represented
for example by the family of Sulien (Lloyd 1941). The inscription indi-
cates that Abraham was associated with the monastery of St David's and it
is likely that he combined in his person the offices of both abbot and
bishop. The exalted title pontificis rather than the plainer episcopus
may be an indication of this.

Another inscription may refer to a bishop. Williams (1932, 233)
read Ogmore 255, Glamorgan, as mentioning one 'Fili epi' — the latter he
regarded as a contraction for episcopi — as one of the recipients of the
land donated to the church by Artmail (discussed in Chapter 6). RCAHMW,
however, suggested that the reading 'fili epi' was not consistent with all
the visible strokes of the inscription and read the last line as 'at filie
suia' (1976, 56). The damaged nature of the inscription makes it imposs-
ible to be dogmatic about either reading.

The inscription on Llandetty 46, Powys, indicates the continued
existence of the office of sacerdos in this period, but it is not poss-
able to be precise about the date of this cross-slab.

The inscriptions thus confirm the existence of both episcopal and
monastic elements within the Welsh church at this time. The evidence is
exceedingly scanty, however, and raises no new issues here. There were
obviously many more clerical and monastic offices than the inscriptions
mention — charters in the Book of Llandaff refer to magistri, doctores,
lectores, scriptores and equonimi — amongst others (Davies 1978, 123).

In this context should be mentioned a certain 'sci' (=sancti)
gliwissi' (Saint Glywys) whose name occurs in the inscription on Merthyr
Mawr 240, Glam. This cross shaft is dated to the second half of the
eleventh century (above, 186). In the seventh and eighth centuries the
term sancti was used to describe members of the church who led a particularly holy life, but who had not been canonised (such as the various saints referred to in the Life of Samson). There is no evidence to show that any of these 'unofficial' saints were ever invoked in prayer. The lack of contact between Wales and the Papacy in this period, and the absence of a continuing cult of Glywys makes it unlikely that he was ever officially canonised. Nevertheless, his title suggests that Glywys was once a leading member of the church in the area of Merthyr Mawr. This is corroborated by charter 224 in the Book of Llandaff, dated c. 935, which refers to Merthyr Glywys when giving the bounds of an estate near Merthyr Mawr. Davies suggested that Merthyr Mawr may have been another name for Merthyr Glywys (1978, 99). The name Glywys occurs again in the vicinity, on Ogmore 255.

The inscriptions on the monuments of Groups II and III offer more evidence for the beliefs of the Welsh church during the period under consideration. Those of Group II are with one exception confined to the exhortation to pray for the soul ('pro anima') of the departed (Nash-Williams 1950, 24). The exception is a stone from Llanlleonfel (62), Powys, which refers to 'iudici adu(e)ntum ... trem(en)dum' translated by Nash-Williams as 'the dreadful coming of the judgement' (1950, 77).

A continued interest in securing the well-being of the soul after death is reflected in the inscriptions of monuments of Group III, many of which were set up for the soul ('pro anima') of the person commemorated by the monument and also for the soul of the patron of the monument (see Chapter 3, Section 1). Eschatological belief remained constant, the day of judgement (in diem iudici) being invoked on Merthyr Mawr 240, Glamorgan.

Orthodox Christian beliefs are expressed on other monuments. Several are dedicated to Christ either by the formula 'crux xpi' (Llangyfelach 211, Margam 231 and 233) or by the abbreviations IHCS XPC/S which occur especially on the unpatterned cross-slabs of south-west Dyfed (C3). On the Dyfed monuments these are often accompanied by the alpha and omega which express the Christian belief that Christ is the first and the last. The inscription on Llantwit Major 223 refers to the monument as 'crux saluatoris' - the cross of the Saviour. This cross and three other Glamorgan monuments (Margam 233, 237 and Ogmore 255) state that they were erected 'in nomine dei summi' - a statement which must be regarded as recognition of the omnipotence of God.
Thus far, the beliefs expressed are obviously orthodox. There has been some controversy, however, over the two inscriptions which invoke the Trinity. Llantwit Major 220 states 'in nomine d(e)i patris et f(iii) (et) (a)peretus sancti (=sancti)', and Merthyr Mawr 240 'in nomine d(e)i patris et filii (et) spiritus sancti'. In neither case is it clear that 'filiu' and 'spiritus' are divided by the preposition 'et'. Conybeare (1898) suggested that these inscriptions expressed a heretical belief that did not distinguish properly between the three members of the Trinity - he rendered the formula on these two monuments as 'in the name of God the Father and of his Son the Holy Spirit'. It seems impossible that such a fundamental doctrinal error could have been held in two churches in Glamorgan. No church in possession of biblical texts could have formulated such a doctrine as the Trinitarian formula and belief is explicitly stated in many passages of the New Testament - for example in the first chapter of the Gospel of John. It is equally inconceivable that such an error would have escaped the notice of the Anglo-Saxon churchmen when the date of Easter (in comparison a minor issue) had been the subject of such controversy. Conybeare's arguments may be discounted and the inscriptions on Llantwit Major 223 and Merthyr Mawr 240 regarded as expressing the orthodox Trinitarian belief.

Finally, in the context of the evidence from the inscriptions, there should be mentioned the cross-slab St David's 383 which records the names of the four evangelists 'mathevs', 'marcvs', 'lvc(as)', '(I)ohanes', and thus provides indirect evidence for the study of the gospels at this site.

As the form of the cross is itself an expression of Christian belief, so may other elements of the decoration of the monuments of Group III indicate something of the nature of these beliefs.

Religious scenes on Welsh monuments of Group III are not prolific, but the few that there are illustrate the basic tenets of the Christian belief. Llangan 207, Glamorgan bears a representation of the crucified Christ flanked by the sword and spear bearers. On Llanfachraeth 8, Anglesey and Meifod 295, Powys, the crucified Christ appears alone, and on Margam 234 and Nash 250, Glamorgan, the crucifixion is represented by the figures of the Virgin Mary and St John flanking the cross shaft. Llanbadarn Fawr 111, Dyfed, bears the only other unambiguous representation of a scene from the New Testament, namely the visitation of Mary to Elizabeth.
Angels in human form are commonly represented in the sculpture of the British Isles - Allen (1903, 407) lists twenty-two examples from Scotland alone. However, the bird-headed angels figured on the Gwent slabs Caerleon 291 and St Arvans 292 seem to be unique. The flying robes of these angels are very vaguely reminiscent of the elegantly draped angels of the Reform period in England - such as those at Deerhurst, Bradford on Avon and Winterbourne Steepleton (Cramp 1975, 165), but the extreme simplicity of the Gwent angels makes a comparison untenable. The Gwent angels are perhaps best regarded as the products of one particularly imaginative craftsman.

More conventionally, the slab St Davids 377, Dyfed, represents a three-winged cherubim; throughout the Old Testament cherubim are associated with the presence of Jehovah (eg. Exodus 25 19-21). The knowledge and use of Old Testament typology by the Welsh church is suggested by the figure of a man holding a horn which appears beneath the crucifixion on Llangan 207. This figure probably represents David, the Old Testament 'type' figure of Christ.

One of the panels on the cross-slab Nash 250, Glamorgan, has sometimes been identified as showing the meeting of St Paul and St Anthony. If this is the case, then the slab would indicate a familiarity with this non-canonical story of asceticism. It has already been pointed out, however, that this particular panel is so worn that its interpretation can only be tenuous (Chapter 5, Section 3).

With regard to the rites illustrated by the monuments, the font provides an obvious illustration of the rite of baptism. It is probable that throughout the pre-Norman period the baptism of adults most often took place in the open air, at rivers or springs, after the manner of the baptism of Christ at the River Jordan. By the mid-tenth century, however, infant baptism seems to have been common and as a matter of convenience this rite took place in churches, the infant being immersed in water in a font (Bond 1908, 30). Throughout the British Isles pre-Conquest fonts are rare; many early fonts must merely have been wooden buckets. The Anglesey fonts mentioned in this thesis belong to the early Norman period, but bear insular ornament which suggests that the rite which they represent was familiar to the Welsh craftsmen who carved them.

Documentary sources indicate the existence of a large number of ecclesiastical establishments in Wales in the pre-Norman period. Most of
the evidence comes from the Llandaff charters which record the donation of estates called *ecclesia* and *poda* or *monasteria*. The first term seems to refer to a church, the other two terms to a religious settlement ruled by an abbot or principal officer (Davies 1978, 121). The existence of other monasteries is implied by the inclusion of its officers in the witness lists of the charters. The following table lists the monasteries which have documentary evidence for their existence either before or after 800 AD; or both. The number (if any) of monuments of Group II and/or Group III found at each site are noted. Where a site has one or more monuments of Group III, the documentary references appear in Appendix C. Documentary references to other sites are given as footnotes. Where the references are to the Llandaff charters, these are designated LL and numbered according to Evans and Rhys 1893. The dates assigned to these charters are those of Davies (1978, 134-8). The sites are recorded on Map 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Pre-800</th>
<th>Gp.II</th>
<th>Post-800</th>
<th>Gp.III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gwynedd</td>
<td>Bangor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Bangor</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Clynnog Fawr</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Penmon</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Towyn (4)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clwyd</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Abergyle (5)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Diserth</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powys</td>
<td>Llowses</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Llowses (6)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Llangors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Llangors</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyfed</td>
<td>Llanarth</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Llanarth</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Llanbadarn Fawr</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Llandeilo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Llandeilo</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Nevern</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>St Davids</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Llanddowr (7)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glam.</td>
<td>Llancarfan</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Llancarfan</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Llandaff</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Llandaff</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Llandough</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Llandough</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Llantwit Major</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Llantwit Major</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(4) BYT 963
(5) AC 856
(6) LL 146, 237; c. 730-925
(7) LL 77; c. 625
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Pre-800</th>
<th>Gp.II</th>
<th>Post-800</th>
<th>Gp.III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glam.</td>
<td>Bishopston (8)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Bishopston</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rhosili (9)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Rhosili</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwent</td>
<td>Ballingham (11)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Ballingham (10)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bellimoor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Caerleon 1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Caerwent</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dewchurch (13)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Dixton (14)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dixton</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doward (15)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Foy (16)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Garway (17)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Llanarth (18)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Llanartha</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Llancaut (19)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Llancillo (20)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Llandegfedd (21)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Llandineabo (22)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Llandogo (23)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Llandogo (24)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Llangwm</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Llanloudy (25)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Llansoy (26)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(8) LL 144, 145, 239; c. 650-925
(9) LL 144, 239; c. 650-925
(10) LL 164, 171b; c. 620-860
(11) LL 161, 163b, 164, 165; c. 610-625
(12) LL 221, 243, 244, 269, 274; c. 950-1075
(13) LL 163b, 164, 165, 190a; c. 620-675
(14) LL 183a, 230b; c. 735-866
(15) LL 163b, 164; c. 620
(16) LL 230b; c. 866
(17) LL 162a, 163b, 165; c. 615-625
(18) LL 121, 123, 225; c. 600-864
(19) LL 165, 174b; c. 625-703
(20) LL 160; c. 620
(21) LL 199a; c. 750
(22) LL 73a, 165, 192; c. 585-625
(23) LL 156, 165, 222; c. 625-942
(24) LL 173, 274; c. 860-1075
(25) LL 163b, 192; c. 620-745
(26) LL 187; c. 725 365
Several scholars have also regarded the following as important monasteries in the pre-Norman period, from the evidence of early Norman sources such as the writings of Giraldus Cambrensis, later traditions and place-names, although there is no pre-Norman documentary evidence for their existence (Lloyd 1912; Bowen 1956, 117; Rees 1959, 127):

Gwynedd  Caer Cybi (Lloyd 1912, 205 note 50)
          Ynys Seiriol (Lloyd 1912, 232)
          Aberdaron - 2 Group II monuments (Lloyd 1912, 237 note 46).

Clwyd    St Asaph (Lloyd 1912, 208 note 68)
          Llanynis (Lloyd 1912, 206 note 60)

Powys    Llanrhaeadr - 2 Group III monuments
          Meifod - 1 Group III monument (Lloyd 1912, 247 note 205)

Gwent    Llandinam (Lloyd 1912, 206 note 59)
          Llangurig (Lloyd 1912, 250)
          St Harmons (Llottd 1912, 254 note 143)
          Glascowm (Lloyd 1912, 223 note 139)
          Glasbury (Lloyd 1912, 207 note 62)

It is difficult to draw conclusions from these lists because of the problem of differential survival of both the documentary evidence and the monuments themselves.

(27) LL 163b, 164; c. 620
(28) LL 175, 186b; c. 733
(29) LL 74, 171b, 264b, 272; c. 860-1072
(30) LL 221; c. 950
(31) LL 217; c. 960
(32) LL 162b, 165, 171b, 192; c. 605-860
(33) LL 72a, 163b, 164, 165, 176, 178, 230b; c. 575 166
Although many monasteries are referred to in the Llandaff charters, only a few were important enough to be mentioned over a period of two hundred years or more (Map 2). These are:

- **c. 550-866** Welsh Bicknor, Ergyng
- **c. 625-942** Llangogo, Gwent
- **c. 650-925** Bishopstone, Gower
- **c. 650-925** Rhosili, Gower
- **c. 650-1075** Llancarfan, Glamorgan
- **c. 650-1075** Llandarfan, Glamorgan
- **c. 650-1075** Llandarfan, Glamorgan
- **c. 650-1075** Llandarfan, Glamorgan
- **c. 650-1075** Llantwit Major, Glamorgan
- **c. 680** Llandaff, Glamorgan
- **c. 750-925** Llangors, Brecon
- **c. 750-1075** Caerwent, Gwent
- **c. 860-1072** St Maughans, Gwent
- **c. 860-1075** Llangwm, Gwent

The impression given by the charters is of the existence of 'a few, large, powerful institutions, and a large number of very small ones' (Davies 1978, 124). It is remarkable that the charters refer to far more religious institutions (monasteries and churches) in Gwent and Ergyng than in Glamorgan. The monasteries of Glamorgan seem to have been major property owning concerns, leaving little room for unaffiliated churches.

It is unfortunate that the area best served by the Llandaff charters is so poor in monuments of Group III, indeed Gwent seems to have been outside the main area of the production of the monuments. Nevertheless, it is interesting that two of the three sites in this area where monuments of Group III have been found, namely Caerleon and St Arvans, are known to have been religious establishments in the ninth and tenth centuries.

Elsewhere, it is remarkable that the majority of the monastic sites documented in the period after 800 have at least one sculptured monument of Group III. Llantwit Major and St David's, two of the most important monasteries in the period, have large collections of monuments. The date of the crosses at Penally suggests the continuation of the monastery well beyond the seventh century when the documentary references to it cease. There may be a distinction here between monasteries and churches which did

---

(34) An ecclesia (LL 218; c. 955)
not support a *clas*. The Book of Llandaff refers to almost forty *ecclesiae* of which nearly thirty must have been in existence in the ninth century and later. Most of these are situated in the non-sculpture-producing area of south east Gwent, but three (St Y Nyll(35), St Brides Super Ely (36), St Lythans (37)) are found in south Glamorgan. Of all these *ecclesiae* only St Arvans has yielded any sculptural material.

Thus a monastery in existence in the pre-Norman period in Wales seems likely to be represented today by at least one carved monument. It is remarkable that the majority of the sites regarded as *clas* churches by scholars such as Lloyd, Rees and Bowen, but for which there is no early documentary evidence, do not have monuments of Group III. This must throw some doubt on the authenticity of these 'monasteries' with the exception of Llanrhaeadr Ym Mochnant and Meifod where Group III cross-slabs are found.

If the existence of a monastery implies the existence of a monument or monuments of Group III then it is possible that the reverse may also be the case. Most monuments were discovered on or near a church site (Chapter 3, Section 2). The easiest explanation for this phenomenon is that the site was of an ecclesiastical nature from the pre-Norman period onwards. This receives some confirmation from the fact that the majority of churches where Group III monuments were found are dedicated to Welsh saints. *A priori* it cannot be stated that every church site which produces a monument was once a pre-Norman religious establishment. The chances of the site being original increase with the number of monuments found there.

Several sites for which there are no documentary references to an ecclesiastical establishment existing in the pre-Norman period yield four or more monuments of Group III - namely Llangaffo (11), Margam (7), Merthyr Mawr (7), Ewenny (6) and St Edren's (4). Of these, Merthyr Mawr was the subject of a grant by King Hywel to bishop Cerennis (LL 212; c. 862) and it may be that a religious establishment was founded here after this event. Certainly none of the monuments found in the vicinity of the church at Merthyr Mawr need be dated prior to 862. The number of monuments at Margam suggests the existence of an undocumented monastery in the area in the pre-Norman period. The monuments found in the immediate vicinity of the Norman abbey (231, 232, 233, 234 and 235) seem to have been produced

(35) LL 216b; c. 870
(36) LL 263; c. 1040
(37) LL 157; c. 685
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in the tenth century (above). The panelled cartwheels 236 and 237 now at Margam were found over four miles away from the abbey, and are unlikely to have come from the same site. The implication is that the pre-Norman religious establishment here flourished only in the tenth century. Margam is in the west of Glamorgan, outside the main area of interest of the compilers of the Book of Llandaff, and this may partly explain the absence of documentary evidence. If the monastery here had only a short floruit, and it escaped the attentions of the Scandinavians, then it is not surprising that no record of it exists.

The number of pre-Norman monuments at Ewenny implies the existence of a further otherwise undocumented religious establishment in west Glamorgan. The cross-slabs 977-981 are likely to have been used as gravestones by this community. The middle of the twelfth century has been suggested as a terminus ante quem for these slabs (Chapter 4, Section 3), but the simplicity of these slabs makes it impossible to be precise about their dating. The use of Sutton stone for several of the slabs suggests that the date should be late rather than early in the pre-Norman period; indeed none need be dated earlier than the eleventh century. This is corroborated by the existence of a damaged panelled cartwheel cross from the site (196). The pre-Norman religious community at Ewenny is likely to have been small and short-lived.

The interpretation of the four monuments at St Edren's is more problematical. Three of these are small slabs which were inserted in the west wall of the church when it was built in the nineteenth century. There are apparently no earlier remains on the site (RCAHM 1925, No. 1029). The suggestion has been made that the stones were assembled there brought from elsewhere in the locality (Lewis 1976, 185). The disc headed cross 391 is first recorded in the churchyard, however, and its size suggests that it would not have been moved far, if at all. These monuments should probably be taken to represent the existence of a pre-Norman monastery if not at St Edren's itself, then somewhere nearby.

Llangaffo yielded three monuments definitely to be ascribed to Group III (numbers 14, 15 and 16), all apparently found in the churchyard. The cross-slabs 17-24, however, are ascribed by Nash-Williams (1950) to Group II, but they lack any clearly datable features and could equally be dated later than the ninth century (see Chapter 4, Section 6). If Nash-Williams were correct, the coincidence of monuments of Groups II and III at Llangaffo would be exceptional. Sites which yield monuments of Groups II and III are for the most part mutually exclusive (Chapter 3,
Section 2). Students of Group II have also claimed the existence of a pre-Norman ecclesiastical site where two or more of these stones are assembled (Nash-Williams 1950, 18; Lewis 1976, 184). On this criterion, the following would be identified as ecclesiastical sites in the period sixth/seventh to ninth century to which Group II has been ascribed (Map 3; Nash-Williams 1950, 17; Lewis 1976, 181). The number of Group II monuments at each site is given in brackets:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gwynedd</th>
<th>Dyfed</th>
<th>Clwyd</th>
<th>Powys</th>
<th>Glamorgan</th>
<th>Dyfed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nefyn (2)</td>
<td>Nevern (4)</td>
<td>Llangernywl (2)</td>
<td>Llanelieu (2)</td>
<td>Port Talbot (2)</td>
<td>Llandew'i Brefi (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Llandovery (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Llanllawer (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Llanwnda (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Llucchael (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Llanychdlwydog (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mathry (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only five of the above sites have monuments of Group III in addition to those of Group II, namely Llanwnda, Nevern, St. David's, St. Dogmael's and Port Talbot.

If the assumption that two or more monuments of Groups II and III indicate the existence of some sort of religious establishment is correct, then it follows that at some time prior to the main period of production of Group III (from the late ninth century onwards) there was a major change, not only in the type of monument erected, but also in the religious sites where these monuments were erected. This is not as radical a change as it would at first appear. In some cases documentary evidence indicates that a monastery was in existence in the period of manufacture of Group II, but no Group II monuments have been found there - for example, Bangor, Llowes, Llanarth, Penally, Llancarfan, Llandaff, Llandough, Llantwit Major, Bishopston and Rhosili. It is notable that all these sites are outside the main area of manufacture of Group II, which was mainly concentrated on the west coast. Equally, a number of sites with documentary evidence for their existence after 800 have one or more stones of Group II, implying that the life of the monastery can be traced back several decades - for example Towyn, Llangors, Llandeilo, Nevern and St David's.
Nevertheless, it seems obvious that there was some sort of change. The inception of Group III has been ascribed to impulses from Ireland, soon modified by the native Welsh sculptor (Chapter 4, Section 7). It may be that this coincided with the establishment of new religious foundations. Davies' studies of the Book of Llandaff suggest a reason for the establishment of new religious foundations in the eighth and ninth centuries. Prior to c. 700 it seems that grants of land to churches were the prerogative of kings. During the eighth century, laymen appear to have gained the right to alienate their family property in order to grant it to the church (Davies 1978, 50). Given this power, wealthy laymen are more likely to have created new foundations over which they could exercise some control than to add to the property of already existing monasteries which were the recipients of grants from the king. This may have happened all over Wales, not just in the area with which the Book of Llandaff is concerned.

The movement away from sites where monuments of Group II have been found to sites which have yielded monuments of Group III may be accounted for by two main factors. Firstly, the contact already alluded to between Wales and Ireland may have encouraged the growth of large monasteries such as St David's and Llantwit Major along the lines of the Irish 'monastic cities' exemplified by Clonmacnoise. This would have been to the detriment of the smaller more ascetic communities which may have comprised the majority of sites yielding Group II slabs. Secondly, the official acceptance by the Welsh church of the Roman Easter in 768 (AC) may have led to a schism between the older communities which are likely to have been unwilling to accept the change, and the newly-founded monasteries where the Roman system was adopted. Neither of these hypotheses can be established on any concrete evidence, but whatever the case it is notable that it is the sites with monuments of Group III, rather than those which have yielded Group II, which emerged as important monasteries in the Middle Ages.

A number of other sites yielded two or three monuments of Group III, inferring the possible existence of a pre-Norman religious establishment at these places:

Gwynedd - Cerrig Ceinwen (3)  
*Dyfed - *Llanbadarn Fawr (2)  
*Penmon (2)  
*Llandeilo (2)

* Marks sites where the existence of a pre-Norman religious establishment is supported by documentary evidence (Appendix C).
All of these sites are situated on or near a river - a factor common to the known monasteries of the period (Bowen 1956). Certain modern church sites which have yielded only one monument of Group III may once have been pre-Norman religious establishments, but this can only be established by the discovery of more monuments or of documentary evidence relating to the site. The distribution of monuments of Group III therefore suggests the existence of many flourishing religious communities in Wales in the period c. 850-1100, few of which are mentioned in the historical record. Not all of these sites would have been monasteries - some monuments may have marked the sites of small churches which did not support a clau.

On both church and monastery sites, the monuments of Group III provide the only archaeological evidence for these sites which survives above ground.

It may be possible to infer something of the nature of these monastic sites from the number and quality of the monuments which have been found at them. The number of monuments found at a site does not necessarily reflect the size of the monastery there. Several monasteries known to have been important in the period under discussion have yielded only one monument of Group III - for example Clynnog Fawr, Llancarfan, Llandough and Llandaff. Nevertheless as wealth has been identified as the prerequisite for the setting up of monuments it follows that sites where several monuments are found together must have been wealthy. In particular, Llantwit Major, Penally, Merthyr Mawr, St David’s, Llangaffo and Llangelnwen seem to have supported schools of craftsmen operating from the monasteries which must, therefore, have had considerable resources.

The Llandaff charters record the growth of church possessions through grants of lands and estates, and this is further evidenced by the inscriptions of Merthyr Mawr 240 and Ogmore 255. It is not possible to determine the size of the ager which Arthfael donated (number 255) (above). The monastery which was the recipient of this gift may have been Merthyr Mawr, if the identification of Merthyr Mawr as the merthyr or shrine of Clywys is correct (above). The nature of the grant recorded on Merthyr Mawr 240, and its recipient, remains obscure.
For the most part, the income and maintenance of the monasteries seems to have been derived from the land given to them. Llantwit Major seems to have had a further source of revenue. The inscriptions on two of the monuments here (220 and 223) suggest that the monastery acted as the burial place of a royal dynasty from the late ninth century. This confirms hints in the Llandaff charters of royal burial at principal centres which were an advantage to these monasteries, presumably because of fees (Davies 1978, 132 and note 2). The wealth of the monasteries must have been at least partially responsible for their attractiveness as targets for Viking raids. The historical sources indicate that Llantwit Major, together with other south Glamorgan monasteries, was subject to Scandinavian raids in the late tenth century (BYT 988). This does not seem to have affected the production of monuments, indeed most of the monuments at Llantwit seem to belong to the early eleventh century (Nos. 222, 223, above). These two cross shafts bear inscriptions which indicate that some sort of English influence had penetrated the monastery by this time (Chapter 5, Section 2). The pillar(s) 224 (and fragments 225 and 226) were also manufactured at this time (above, 199). At this date as in the earlier period, Llantwit must have been a flourishing monastery.

At Penally and St David's schools of craftsmen flourished in the tenth century indicating that this was a period of prosperity for these two monasteries. If the monuments are anything to go by then the community at Penally must have been cosmopolitan, perhaps employing the services of a northern English craftsman (Chapter 5, Section 2) and also being sensitive to the influence of Scandinavian designs (Chapter 5, Section 6). St David's too felt the influence of Scandinavian designs (Nos. 378, 383; Chapter 5, Section 6), but was more receptive to impulses from Ireland (Nos. 374, 375, 376; Chapter 5, Section 3). The Merthyr Mawr school was effective at a later date, namely in the second half of the eleventh century, and produced a simple but purely Welsh form of cross slab.

The production or acquisition of a monument by a religious establishment most probably took place when that establishment was flourishing. Llandeilo, for example, seems to have been one of the two main episcopal houses in south-east Wales in the pre-Norman period (the other was Welsh Sicknor), as well as a monastery, until the episcopal house was dispersed c. 870 (Davies 1978, 158). The two extant monuments of Group III from this site (155 and 156) almost certainly belong to what was presumably the period of the greatest prosperity of this site prior to the dispersal.
In this connection it is worth reiterating that in Wales as in Ireland the Scandinavian depredations seem to have had little detrimental affect on the production of the monuments - and so presumably on the fortunes of the monastery. Llantwit, St David's, Llanbadarn Fawr, Penmon, Penally and Nevern all have fine monuments dating to the second half of the tenth and the eleventh centuries. The adoption of Scandinavian motifs into the stonework repertoire of designs supports this hypothesis.

The non-Welsh artistic influence upon the Welsh monuments of Group III has been examined in Chapter 5. It may not always be valid to draw conclusions concerning the monasteries from this in view of the fact that certain craftsmen were obviously itinerant (see Chapter 6). The outlook and contacts of the craftsman do not necessarily reflect the outlook and contacts of the monastery. Nevertheless, the most likely setting for the absorption of foreign trends into the Welsh sculptural tradition lay in the monasteries. There was lively communication between the churches of Wales and Ireland throughout the period. Such contacts are frequently referred to in the hagiographic material, such as the Life of Samson (Chapter 5, Section 3). In the eleventh century, the writings of the clerical family of Sulien, sometime bishop of St David's, indicate a particularly strong connection between Ireland and the monastic foundations at Llanbadarn Fawr and St David's (Chadwick 1958, 121-182). These contacts are likely to have been accompanied by the scholarly exchange of ideas and probably also of decorated books and artifacts. Whilst portable objects must have been the most common means of the adoption of motifs, there remain some instances where the existence of non-Welsh persons in the Welsh monastic community must be postulated. The Englishmen at Penally and Llantwit have already been mentioned in this context. Similarly the pure Irish form of the monuments at St Edren's (291) and Clynnog Fawr (85) suggests that there were Irishmen in the monastic communities associated with these two places (Chapter 5, Section 3).

In Chapter 6, groups of monuments by the same craftsman or school have been discussed. Where these occur over scattered areas, notably the Nevern-Carew-Llantwit-Llanfynydd-Exeter group, it is difficult to decide whether this implies communication between the monasteries at which these monuments are found or whether they should be ascribed to the work of a peripatetic school unassociated with any particular monastery. The latter would seem to be true in the case of the group mentioned above, as the monuments at Carew and Llanfynydd have no known ecclesiastical associations and also because there is only one of these distinctive monuments at each
site. In the case of the more concentrated groups (the panelled cart-wheels in the region of the Ogmore estuary in south-west Glamorgan, the angular line-cross slabs produced at Ewenny and Merthyr Mawr, the cross slabs of western Dyfed and the Gwent slabs) communication between the monasteries involved is more likely.

An attempt was made to see if the sculptural links between certain religious sites was the result of their belonging to the same monastic aggregation. It should be explained here that in early Welsh laws (38), Welsh churches are divided into two classes, namely mother churches and others. The term 'mother churches' has so far been avoided because it is impossible to be dogmatic about the arrangement of the pre-Norman Welsh church, as this was obscured by the Norman ecclesiastical arrangements. The situation may well have varied from area to area; the Llandaff charters, for example, imply a difference in practice between Gwent and Glywyssing and communication between these two areas was not obstructed by geographical factors. With these reservations in mind, it seems that the mother churches were generally monasteries upon which other churches were dependent. The membership of the mother church comprised an abbot, at least one priest, and a community of canons, called a clas (Lloyd 1954, 205). It used to be thought that smaller churches had no abbot and no clas, only clerics (ibid). The Llandaff charters, however, show that the clas, the hereditary property holding religious community, was both widespread and powerful (Davies 1978, 130). This implies that not all clasau were also mother churches. The property of the mother church was regarded as the property of the clas; this was often a family affair as members of the clas were allowed to marry and thus frequently were related. Both the office of the abbot and the property of the clas seem to have been regarded as hereditary (Davies 1946, 70).

The charters of the Book of Llandaff indicate that each of the major religious houses of south-east Wales evidently possessed scattered dependent properties. The main function of these dependent properties (not all of which were religious institutions) seems to have been to provide income for the main house. Davies reconstructed the property of the major religious houses in south-east Wales according to the evidence of the charters.

(38) Statements made in a number of late twelfth-century and later Welsh law codes imply that the initial setting down of a code of laws was the work of Hywel Dda in the mid-tenth century, and that the extant manuscripts were all later rescriptions of this code (discussed by Lloyd 1954, 364-5).
Llandaff charters (1978, 139-146), but for the area where most of Group III are found dedications of churches provide the major class of evidence. This material has to be treated with care as the date of dedication is often in question. Maps of the dedications to the major Welsh saints Teilo, Padarn, Tysilio, Cadog, David, Illtud and Dubricius bear little detailed relationship to the grouping of Welsh sculpture (maps 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10 respectively). It is remarkable, however, that the mother house of the cults of each of these saints, with the exception of Dubricius, has yielded at least one monument of Group III (Llandeilo, Llanbadarn Fawr, Llantisilio, Llancarfan, St David’s and Llantwit Major respectively).

When the dedications of each church that had produced one or more monuments of Group III were listed, it was found that rarely was more than one of these churches dedicated to one particular saint, with the exception of dedications to David and Illtud. These were then selected for further study.

The following churches yielding monuments of Group III were dedicated to St David:

Mother church - St David’s (Nos. 374-383)
Churches dedicated to David - Laleston, Glamorgan (Nos. 202, 203)
   Llanarthney, Dyfed (147)
   Llandew, Powys (46a)
   Llandewi Aberarth, Dyfed (113-4)
   Walton West, Dyfed
Church dedicated to disciple of David - St Ishmael’s, Dyfed (396-8)

Study of the monuments in question showed that those from sites outside the immediate vicinity of St David’s were apparently entirely unrelated to each other in form and decoration. The close relationship between the cross slabs St David’s 380 and 381, Walton West and St Ishmael’s 396 has already been remarked upon (Form C3c). The three other monuments connected with this group were found at the churches of St Edren’s (392 and 393) and Steynton (404) which are dedicated to saints Edren and Cewydd respectively. Neither of these saints is related in any way to David, but it has been suggested that St Edren’s may not have been the original resting place of the stones now assembled there (Lewis 1976, 85). Here there seems to be evidence of a craftsman working mainly within the monastic ‘family’ of St David’s and perhaps living within one of these
monasteries, but it would seem that he also undertook work for other monasteries and was not in any way bound to this aggregation.

Turning now to St Illtud, the dedications of the following churches where Group III sculpture has been found are relevant. All are in Glamorgan:

Mother church - Llantwit Major (220-226)
Churches dedicated to Illtud - Bridgend (252-4)
   Llanrhidian (well) (218)
Churches dedicated to disciples of Illtud - Coychurch (Gallo) (193-4)
   Llangan (Canna) (207-8)

Of the monuments found at these sites, Llanrhidian 218 and Bridgend 253 and 254 stand outside the mainstream development of Group III stones. The monuments at Llangan are also unrelated to the other monuments discussed here. Bridgend 253 closely resembles Coychurch 193, but as it was discovered over 1½ miles from the church in question, the connection is not necessarily related to that suggested by the dedications. It is, however, not out of the question. The Llandaff charters furnish examples of grants of land to religious establishments extending over two or three miles (Davies 1978, 32-3). The crosses Llantwit Major 222 and Coychurch 193 and 194 are linked by the name Ebisar which appears on all three monuments, but in other respects they are distinct. Indeed, Llantwit Major 222 was obviously the work of the peripatetic craftsman who also erected monuments at Nevern, Llanfynydd, Carew and Exeter - and none of these sites is in any way associated with Illtud. This confirms the hypothesis that the craftsmen who made monuments of Group III worked at sites dedicated to different saints and were not bound to work within any one monastic aggregation.

It is remarkable that only two of the sites so far mentioned in this chapter have yielded any physical remains of a pre-Norman ecclesiastical site other than the monuments themselves, namely Clynnog Fawr (Stallybrass 1914, 271-296) and Bangor (Hughes 1925, 432-6). A few remains at Ynys-Seiriol, off Penmon, Anglesey, have been identified tentatively as the sixth-century cell and oratory of St Seiriol (Hughes 1901, 85-108), and remains of earlier structures were found beneath the twelfth-century church at Burryholms, Gower (Hague 1973, 29).

Little is known about the physical form of Welsh religious establishments, other than that which can be inferred from the hagiographic
material and the excavated evidence from contemporary sites elsewhere in the British Isles. The Life of Samson gives perhaps the clearest picture of the working of a monastic estate, namely the monastery of Illtud at Llantwit Major. The Life refers to fields and crops (Chapter 12) and a herb garden (Chapter 16). There are no references to livestock other than to horses which are used for draught and riding. Books and the rich vestments of silk and linen referred to in the text may have been imported, but it is likely that some were home-made. In this case the curing of hides and vellum and the growing and spinning of flax must have been carried out on the premises. The tenth-century Colloquy or Welsh school-book preserved in Oxoniensis Posterior (Bodleian MS. 572) supplies references to livestock and to the men who tended them. Lists of food including corn and dairy products and drinks - ale, wine and mead - are included and hint at other 'industries' which must have existed.

To this picture of the monastic estate and life in the monastery may be added the manufacture of stone monuments of Group III which must have taken place occasionally at these monastic sites. The fact of the physical presence of crosses and cross-slabs in the environs of the monastic establishment was apparently so taken for granted that only monuments intimately connected with the lives of the saints are mentioned in the hagiographic material. These crosses and cross-slabs may have been revered and cared for by the inhabitants of the monastery for many years after their manufacture and erection. The author of the Life of Illtud, which he wrote in the twelfth century, refers to what he considered to be the grave of Samson (who died in the sixth century) which Illtud had marked by 'a stone cross ... with an inscription station that a bishop lay there' (Evans 1971, 112). This story was presumably fabricated around the monument Llantwit Major 222 which bears the names of both Samson and Illtud, but which was manufactured over four hundred years after their deaths. This cross may, however, have replaced an earlier and simpler cross which had commemorated this event.

The majority of the crosses and cross-slabs must have stood outside. Church furniture seems rarely to have survived from this period in any region of the British Isles. It is possible, however, that certain fragments have been misinterpreted in the past. At Melsonby, Yorkshire, for example, two fragments that were previously interpreted as grave covers have been re-interpreted by Cramp and Lang as fragments of an octagonal shaft which may have supported a reading desk (1977, Nos. 7 and 8). The pair of pillars represented by Llantwit Major 224 and 225-226 is apparently
unique in Wales as church furniture. If these pillars once supported an internal screen (above, 61), it is likely that this screen once stood in front of the altar to make a division between the nave and chancel. Nothing more can be inferred from the monuments concerning the appearance of the pre-Norman ecclesiastical establishments in Wales.

The policies of the Welsh church in the pre-Norman period are equally obscure. During the early post-Roman period, the church of the Celtic areas of the British Isles had diverged from the Roman church in England in a number of practices; the most famous (mainly because of the emphasis laid upon it by Bede) being the so-called Easter controversy. This concerned the date of the celebration of Easter; it being the exception rather than the rule for the two churches to celebrate the festival on the same day, due to their different methods of calculating its date (discussed by Deansley 1963, 86-88). There were also other less clearly defined differences between the two churches involving tonsure, the consecration of bishops and of churches, and the rite of baptism (discussed by Gougaud 1932, 185-217).

The Welsh church adhered to the Celtic Easter long after 664 when the Synod of Whitby settled the question for Northumbria (Bede, Ecclesiastical History Chapter 25). Wales did not begin to conform to the Roman Easter until 768 (AC) when Elfodd, on his death called 'archi episcopi in guenedote' (AC 809), took this step, and his action probably had immediate effect only in north Wales, spreading only slowly to the south.

Whilst the sculptural evidence can do little to illustrate the policies of the Welsh church in this period, one monument should be mentioned in this connection. The seraph represented on the cross-slab St David's 377 appears to sport a Celtic tonsure in profile and the 'orant' figure, Pontardawe 256, seems to show one full face. According to one rather tenuous argument, this involved the shaving of all the head in front of a line drawn from ear to ear, rather than the Roman tonsure of a circular crown (Bund 1897, 258). If this is correct, then the implication is that the monks of St David's were still practising the Celtic form of tonsure in the tenth century.

Norman policies resulted in the cessation of the production of monuments of Group III because their religious practices did not favour the Welsh church. Only six sites with monuments of Group III were the subject of known Norman monastic foundations, namely Llangenydd (1106-1115), Llanbadarn Fawr (1116-1117), Neath (1130), Margam (1147) and Caerleon (1179) (Cowley 1977, 270-1). Llanbadarn Fawr was still a clas when
Gilbert fitz Richard granted it to Gloucester Abbey for the foundation of a Priory. This was an abortive foundation as, soon after the death of Henry I, the Welsh regained control of Ceredigion and the monks of Gloucester were driven out (Cowley 1977, 39). The question is whether or not the other five sites were still operating as Welsh religious foundations when they were taken over by the Normans. The lack of pre-Norman sculptural material later than the tenth century at Llangenydd and Caerleon would seem to preclude this in these two cases.

The situation at Neath, Margam and Ewenny is more difficult to determine as at these sites the sculptural evidence alone suggests that there was any ecclesiastical activity in the pre-Norman period. Neath has yielded only one monument, 251a, a panelled-cartwheel derivative of the late eleventh or early twelfth centuries, which was found in the boundary wall of St Illtud's church. In 1130, which cannot have been long after 251a was set up, Richard de Granville founded Neath Abbey, about a mile west of this church (Cowley 1977, 21). In view of the paucity of the evidence, it is not possible to postulate that the Norman foundation disrupted an active Welsh ecclesiastical establishment at Neath. A pre-Norman religious institution, perhaps large enough to have been a clag, flourished in the vicinity of Margam Abbey in the tenth century as evidenced by monuments 231, 232, 233, 234 and 235. The lack of later material from this site implies that the clag at Margam flourished only in the tenth century, and was not still in existence in 1147 when a colony of monks from Clairvaux established themselves there on a foundation of Robert Earl of Gloucester (Cowley 1977, 23). At Ewenny, however, it seems that the Norman foundation broke up a small Welsh religious community which had not long been in existence (Chapter 4, Section 3).

Monuments of Group III ceased to be produced in the late eleventh and early twelfth centuries. It has already been suggested, in Chapter 6, that the practice was largely dependent upon the patronage of local landowners and kings, and this was withdrawn when the Normans became the principal landowners in the lowlands - where the practice of setting up monuments was most common. Whilst the Normans were active patrons of the church, their patronage was confined to English and European monasteries and to the new foundations which they made in Wales. Norman generosity did not extend to the existing Welsh monasteries and churches, many of which lost their endowments. St Peter's of Gloucester and the Abbey of Tewkebury, for example, were the recipients of many endowments from Glamorgan, including the greater part of the properties of Llandough, Llancarfan and
Llantwit Major (Nicholl 1936, xiii). Without Norman patronage, both the Welsh church and the monuments connected with it became redundant.
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CHAPTER EIGHT

KINGS, KINGDOMS AND SCULPTURE -
THE POLITICAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE MONUMENTS

From the sixth century onwards, there is evidence for the emergence in Wales of a number of kingdoms with ruling dynasties claiming descent from various ancestors. The evidence comes primarily from the writings of Gildas, the genealogies, the Life of Samson and the Llandaff charters.

In the middle of the sixth century when Gildas was writing, the most powerful king was Maelgwn, king of the north Welsh kingdom of Gwynedd (Gildas De excidio Britonum, Chapters 33-35). This dynasty traced its descent from Cunedda, a northern British chieftain. The ancestors of Cunedda, recorded in the Harleian genealogy of the kingdom (Bartrum 1966, 9, No 1), have Romanised names. This has led a number of scholars to suggest that Cunedda's move to north Wales was made under Roman auspices (Morris 1973, 66).

Also claiming descent from Cunedda and perhaps in some way subordinate to Gwynedd were the small north Welsh kingdoms of Rhos, Dunoding and Merionydd, and further south the kingdom of Ceredigion (Harleian genealogies, Bartrum 1966, 10, No 3; 11, No 17; 11, No 18; 12, No 26 respectively). None of these kingdoms appears to have a royal line separate from that of Gwynedd after the ninth century.

In the south, the kingdoms of Gwent and Dyfed were probably in existence by the end of the sixth century. They are both referred to by name in the seventh century Life of Samson (Chapter 1). Gwent, named after the Roman town of Venta Silurum, and Dyfed, which took its name from the pre-Roman tribe of the Demetae, were both long-lived kingdoms. Their approximate extents are preserved in the modern counties of these names.

In the Life of Samson, Gwent is said to be the province next to Demetia. By the late seventh century, however, there is evidence of the existence of a kingdom between them - namely Glywysing. Grants in the Book of Llandaff indicate that there was a strong dynasty here from this date, apparently centred on Glamorgan, but with authority extending into Gwent (Davies 1978, 91). The kings of Gwent and Glywysing traced their descent from a certain Morgan, and seem to have represented two branches of the same dynasty (Davies 1978, 94-95). The Llandaff charters further indicate that there was a short-lived dynasty called Ergyng in the south-west Herefordshire area in the sixth and early seventh centuries (ibid, 93).
In central Wales, Powys was probably the only kingdom recognisable as such in the sixth century. Selim son of Cinan (Bartrum 1966, 12, No 22) is probably to be identified with the Selim whose death at the Battle of Chester is recorded in the Annales Cambriae under the year 613. By the ninth century Brycheiniog had emerged as an independent kingdom. The comments inserted in the genealogy of Brycheiniog recorded in Jesus College Ms 20 (Bartrum 1966, 45, No 8) and in the Harleian genealogy (ibid, 11, No 15) suggest that the rise of the kingdom of Brycheiniog may have been at the expense of the kingdom of Powys.

Throughout the period under consideration, political authority was in the hands of kings, and this office was hereditary in nature. The genealogies indicate that members of several branches of one family might call themselves king, but it is likely that one branch was always dominant. As it has been stated, several north Welsh kings traced their descent from Cunedda, but only one line produced kings of Gwynedd (Bartrum 1966, Nos 1, 3, 18, 26). In the earliest post-Roman sources the kings are referred to as kings of groups of people – for example, king of the Demetians. It is not until the eighth century that the sources refer to kings of regions – for example, king of Gwynedd – and so it is only from this date that kingship can be regarded as having any clear territorial content. Although the broad areas of the kingdoms are known, it is not possible to be precise about the position of the boundaries of these kingdoms at any time in the pre-Norman period. Indeed, the evidence suggests that these boundaries were not static, but constantly changing according to the incursions made by neighbouring kingdoms. Map 1 gives the approximate boundaries of the major kingdoms after Rees, 1959.

The inscriptions on Group I stones recognise the existence of distinct political divisions by making reference to an Elmetian ('Aliortus Elmetiaco' No 87), an Ordovician ('Ordous', No 126), and a citizen of Venedos ('Venedotis Cives', No 103). Local kings are also commemorated; 'Vorteporigis Protctoris' at Castell Dwyran, Carm. (138), perhaps to be identified with the Vortepor of Demetia who was addressed by Gildas (De excidio Britonum Chapter 31). Llangadwaladr, Anglesey (13), records the burial place of king Catamanus 'rex sapientis(s)imus opinatis(s)imus omnium regum', who may be identified with the Cadfan of Gwynedd who ruled in the early seventh century (Nash-Williams 1950, 57). Both Castell Dwyran and Llangadwaladr were apparently ephemeral as royal sites as each has only the one monument. Certain Group I stones also refer to government officials such as a magistrate (No 103) and a consul (No 104); these imply the exis-
tence, at least in north Wales, of an ordered system of government in the sixth and seventh centuries. Evidence is unfortunately lacking from the south.

The relative wealth of evidence from the inscriptions of Group I contrasts with the absence of explicit references to political divisions and ranks on the monuments of Group II and the rarity of these on the crosses and cross-slabs of Group III. With the inscriptions of Group III, the focus of the evidence has shifted to the south, and in particular to Llantwit Major where a number of kings are commemorated. It is remarkable that, with the exception of Llantisilio Yn Ial 182, the monuments of Group III which refer to kings (Llantwit Major 220, 222, 223; Carew 303) give the title (rex) without reference to any territory, although the annals from the eighth century onwards often refer to kings as king of a particular territory - for example 'rex guent' (AC 848), 'rex giuos' (=Glywysing, AC 900). This is presumably because the kings were commemorated within their own kingdoms and thus it would be self-evident to which king the inscription referred. It may, however, be taken to reflect the provincial nature of the contemporary political horizons. Eliseg's Pillar (182) is exceptional in this respect; the inscription on this monument amounts to a public declaration of the origins and deeds of the Powys dynasty. The Pillar has been discussed in Chapter 4, Section 1, and it is enough here to recall that it may have been erected in the period 950 to 1050 and reflect an otherwise unrecorded attempt by a local ruler to break away from the power of Gwynedd and form an independent Powysian dynasty with English (presumably Mercian) help.

Of the three kings commemorated at Llantwit Major, two have been firmly identified with historical figures, namely Hywel ap Rhys (220) and king Ithel (223) (Chapter 4, Section 1). The historical sources yield no information concerning the activities of Ithel and his contemporary, Arthfael. The fact that Abbot Samson 'prepared' the 'cross' 223 for their souls suggests that they had in some way benefitted the monastery at Llantwit, presumably by a grant of land. Arthfael's grandson Hywel must have continued this tradition. It is remarkable, however, that the inscription of the disc-headed cross 220 gives neither Hywel, nor his father Rhys, the title of king. This opens up the possibility that a number of other persons named in the inscriptions of Group III may also have been kings, but to speculate along these lines without the hope of a positive identification would be idle. The question is related to the 'audience' of the monuments and here it is notable that the majority of the lay population
must have been illiterate. In many cases the person responsible for the monument and his status may have been well enough known not to require a record. To have one's name inscribed on a monument must imply a regard for posterity. The status of Hywel and his father was presumably well enough known in the locality not to need a record. It is not surprising to find Hywel ap Rhys setting up a cross; the Llandaff charters (226, 212, 227b, 228, 229a and b) record his activities as donor or guarantor of grants of land to the church in both Ergyng and the Vale of Glamorgan, and show that he was an active patron of the church.

'Samsoni regis' of Llantwit Major 222 cannot be identified, indeed there is no known king of this area with this name. There are two main alternatives according to whether or not it is held that Samson the king was a contemporary of the monument. It may be that he should be identified with the Samson who is recorded elsewhere on the cross shaft as having set up the monument, but in this case it is remarkable that on no other monument is the name of the person responsible for its erection recorded twice. Llantwit Major 222 has been dated by its form and ornament to c. 1000-30 (above, Chapter 4). It is noticeable that the historical sources name no king of Morgannwg between c. 975 (Idwallon ap Morgan; Davies 1978, 71) and c. 1020 (Rhys ap Owain ap Morgan; Davies 1978, 72). King Samson could fit in here, and if so he is likely to have been a son of Morgan, but the name is not known in the dynasty, and there is no a priori need to postulate an interregnum between Idwallon and Rhys. The title 'regis' is peculiarly disposed in the panel as SAM RE rather than SAMSONI REGIS

- it seems to refer to Samson, but it could in fact have been meant to stand alone, the two panels reading '(the cross) of Illtud, of Samson, of the King.' In this case, however, one would normally expect a division or at least a gap between the two. Alternatively, as the Illtud commemorated in the adjacent panel is almost certainly the founder of the monastery, and not a contemporary of the monument, 'Samsoni regis' may refer to Saint Samson, a contemporary of Illtud, who was of noble parentage, and who held the ranks of abbot and bishop. The Life of Samson gives no indication that he was ever called a king, but it is just possible that the title king could be applied, in ecclesiastical contexts, to a bishop. The concept of the reign of a bishop is recorded in the annals, for example 840 (AC) 'Nobis episcopus immiui incipit'. In the absence of any indisputable evidence, however, the problem of Llantwit Major 222 remains an insoluble one.
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The inscriptions on the crosses at Llantwit indicate that there was a close connection between the ruling dynasty and Illtud's monastery, particularly in the ninth century when the monastery may have acted as the burial place of its kings. Royal burial at monastic centres is confirmed by a charter in the Book of Llandaff (Number 149) which refers to the tomb of king Meurig at Llandaff.

Finally, in this context, Carew 303 should be mentioned for it seems to record the name of Maredudd ap Edwin, king of Deheubarth 1033-35 (Chapter 4, Section 1). All that can be said in this connection is that it is perhaps remarkable that a king with such a short and troubled reign should have commissioned such a fine cross.

It is evident that from the earliest Christian period a close relationship existed between the Welsh kings and the church. Gildas speaks of royal interest in ecclesiastical affairs and the royal appointment of clerics, and implies that Maelgwn of Gwynedd was once a monk (De excidio Britonum Chapter 34). Both Cyncen of Powys and Hywel Dda made pilgrimages to Rome (AD 854, 928). This interest was not always benevolent – the Llandaff charters furnish several examples of royal disputes with clerics, attacks on the church and violation of sanctuary rights (LL 217, 231, 233, 237b, 239, 249b, 259, 267, 272). Davies dates all these charters to the tenth century and later (1978, 180-188). In general, however, kings seem to have been concerned to patronise the church. The inscriptions on the monuments of Group III confirm this and indicate that the royal motive was to build up merit for the good of their souls. They also indicate that certain kings were concerned to have memorials to themselves erected either during their lifetime or after their death.

No secular rank other than king is recorded on the monuments of Group III. It has already been suggested that anyone with a surplus of wealth could afford to have a cross or cross-slab erected, and this source of wealth in the majority of cases must have been land. Thus most of the persons mentioned in the inscriptions (with the exception of the craftsmen) are likely to have been landowners, and were probably members of the aristocracy. Certainly Arthfael, who gave an ager to the church (Ogmore 255) must have been a member of the landed aristocracy, and may have been a relation of the kings of Morgannwg in whose dynasty the name Arthfael was common. The name 'Ebisar' is recorded on Coychurch 193 and 194 and Llantwit Major 222. The dates suggested for these three monuments on other grounds are approximately contemporary (Chapter 4, Section 6), although it
is obvious that they are the work of different hands. It is possible, therefore, that the same man acted as patron of all three.

The situation of certain monuments of Group III has a bearing on the contemporary political situation. There is no indication that the pre-Norman Welsh kings had any one permanent royal residence; indeed they and their courts are likely to have been peripatetic, perhaps staying at local vills designated for their use (Jones 1976, 15). Nevertheless, scholars are in agreement that several sites which can be identified in the historical sources as important secular sites in the medieval period were also important in the pre-Norman period — namely Aberffraw, Degannwy, Mathrafel and Dinefawr (Richards 1968, 9). None of these places has yielded monuments of any group, corroborating the hypothesis that these are mainly an ecclesiastical phenomenon. Nevertheless, three of these sites have monuments nearby (Map 2). The fourth, Degannwy, traditionally the seat of Maelgwyn of Gwynedd, has been the subject of a small-scale excavation which yielded about a dozen sherds of 'B' ware, giving it a sixth-century context, but no certain evidence of occupation after this date (Alcock 1967). The Annales Cambriae record the destruction of Degannwy in 822 and it may be that the site went out of use at this date. Aberffraw in Anglesey may have replaced Degannwy as principal seat of Gwynedd, and it is within a ten mile radius of this site that most of the Group III monuments of Anglesey are found. Excavations in 1973–4 at Aberffraw indicated post-Roman fortification and occupation of the site (White 1979). In the seventh century royal activity close to the site is attested by the Group I stone from Llangadwaladr (No. 13) which bears an inscription to king Cadfan of Gwynedd (Nash-Williams 1950, 57). Of the Group III sites in the neighbourhood, Llangaffo has the largest collection, although most of the Llangaffo cross-slabs are too simple to need to postulate royal patronage operating here.

The royal site of Mathrafel is centrally placed with regard to the three monuments of northern Powys (Llanrhaiadr Ym Mochnant 181, Llandrinio 293 and Meifod 295). Of these, Meifod is within two miles of the royal site, on the opposite bank of the river Banw, and is the traditional burial-place of the princes of Powys (Richards 1970–1, 339). This suggests a relationship between a royal dynasty and a particular ecclesiastical site such as that postulated at Llantwit Major. In this case, however, the sculptural material does little to corroborate the hypothesis, Meifod yielding only one monument, an elaborate cross-slab (295) which was not inscribed.

Dinefawr, at one time the principal royal residence of Deheubarth is little more than a mile away from the ecclesiastical site of Llandeilo.
The latter, as the historical and sculptural evidence suggests, was at its most important as a monastery and perhaps an episcopal house before the tenth century. The richness of the sculpture from Llandeilo (155 and 156) would be compatible with royal patronage at this period, though nothing of a later date remains.

A number of other sites yielding monuments of Group III are on or near sites with secular, usually royal, connections. Rhuddlan, which has yielded a few fragments of sculptured monuments (187, 188), was a stronghold of Gruffydd ap Llywelyn (Lloyd 1954, 382). Llanbadarn Fawr is close to the hill-fort of Pen Dinas, which Melville Richards implies may have been in use during the period (1970-1, 339), although no evidence for this is apparent. In south Wales, Kenfig is reputed to have been a private possession of Iestyn ap Gwrgan, who was defeated and deprived of his kingdom by the Norman Fitzhamon (Spencer 1970, 38). Finally, near to Tytherston, finds from the Cae Summerhouse enclosures hint at occupation continuing into the sixth century and perhaps beyond (Morganw 1966, 52).

Thus far, the accumulated evidence is slight, but when taken with the evidence of the sculptured material from Llantwit Major, may hint at royal commissioning of monuments at a nearby ecclesiastical site, which was probably just one aspect of their patronage of that site. Members of the royal family in each area are likely to have been particularly interested in ecclesiastical institutions that were founded upon their own land. Davies has shown that grants in the Book of Llandaff indicate that the kings, and to a lesser extent the aristocracy, of south-east Wales held large blocks of property from which they made grants to the church (Map 3). Despite the fact that the Llandaff evidence is concentrated in the region between the Usk and the Wye which has yielded few monuments, a number of sites with Group III monuments were the subject of grants recorded in the Book of Llandaff. The dates of the charters are those proposed by Davies (1978).

Llandaff charter 225, c. 864 records that Gulfet, Hegoi and Arwysti, sons of Beli, gave Caerleon, which had previously belonged to Dyfrig, to Bishop Nudd. This is interesting as it suggests that despite the fact that the site had previously been given to the church (Dyfrig), the controlling interest remained secular. This introduces the possibility that secular interest in a site was maintained long after the site had ostensibly been handed over to the church. In the Brecon area, Llanfihangel Cwmdu seems to have been granted to the church by king Tewdwr, c. 925 (237b) -
and the Group III monument here is approximately of this date. Further
north, LlOWes, which has yielded only one cross-slab of eleventh-century
or later date, (No 408) was, surprisingly, granted to the church as
early as 680 by king Morgan (charter 149).

In Morgannwg, it is not recorded when Llantwit, Llancarfan, Llandough
and Llandaff passed into the hands of the church. Merthyr Mawr, however,
was the subject of a grant by King Hywel c. 862 (charter 212), and c. 705
a certain Conuil bought a villa on the Ewenny river from king Morgan and
gave it to Bishop Berthwyn (176a, 190b). These two grants are valuable in
indicating the existence of blocks of royal property belonging to the dom-
inant dynasty in an area where there is a concentration of monuments of
Group III.

Many of the grants recorded in the Book of Llandaff were made from
west Gower (Davies 1978, 99). The three Gower sites with Group III monu-
ments are within this area. Of these, Llanrhidian may expressly be mention-
ed in charter 144, c. 650 as being donated to Bishop Buddogwy by Arthwys
under his father Meurig. The dominant dynasty in the south-east (kings of
Glywysing and Morgannwg) seems to have lost their property in the Gower in
or after the mid-tenth century, apparently to kings of Dyfed (Davies 1978,
101). It is notable in this connection that two of the three Gower monu-
ments, Llanrhidian 218 and Llangenydd 209 are dated to the ninth or early
tenth century - which may suggest that the kings of Morgannwg were more
concerned to patronise the religious establishments of the Gower than were
the kings of Dyfed.

The situation may have been similar further west. Llandeilo has
already been mentioned as the subject of a charter of dubious authenticity
(77) which purports to record its donation to Dyfrig by King Nowy c. 655.
This charter also refers to the donation of Penally at the same time. It
is at these two sites, Llandeilo and Penally, that some of the earliest
and best sculpture in the south-west is found; 155, 156 and 364 being
dated to the ninth and early tenth centuries respectively.

It is remarkable that in south Wales most of the earliest monuments
of Group III, dated to the ninth and early tenth centuries, come from or
near sites recorded in the Llandaff charters as either the subjects or
recipients of royal grants. Llandeilo (155 and 156), Llantwit Major (220
and 223), Penally (364), Llanrhidian (218) and Llangenydd (209) have
already been mentioned. The other monuments in question are Pontardawe
256, St Fagans 267, St Lawrence 393, Llanynis 65 and Bulmore 190. Of
these, St Fagans is close to 'villa Meneich', granted by Brochfael ap Gwyddien to Bishop Euddogwy c. 685 (159b), and to St Y Nyll which Aguod granted to Bishop Cerennyr with king Meurig's guarantee c. 870 (216b) - which suggests that there was a block of royal property in the area.

Charter 127b, although dubious, hints at the existence of royal property in the vicinity of St Lawrence. In the east, Llanywis is close to Llanfihangel Cwmdu, and Bulmore is close to Caerleon; the charters referring to these two places have already been mentioned. Only Pontardawe is from an area where no royal grants are recorded, and this may be due to the selective nature of the Llandaff material.

This suggests that the earliest monuments of Group III in south Wales may have been erected under royal patronage at ecclesiastical establishments which were founded on, or the recipients of, royal property. Abbot Samson, who in the second half of the ninth century prepared a cross at Llantwit Major for his own soul and for the souls of King Ithel, Arthfael and Tecain (223) had presumably received a grant, or grants, of some kind from the aforementioned in order to do this. This grant would not necessarily have been specifically for the erection of a cross; it may, for example, have been an endowment of land which was of sufficient size for Abbot Samson to erect the monument out of gratitude for it. The proliferation of monuments in the tenth and eleventh centuries may then have been the result of the practice of setting up monuments spreading to the aristocracy and to other wealthy lay and ecclesiastical members of society. The Llandaff charters provide a model of a once royal practice spreading to wealthy laymen, namely the granting of land to the church, which seems to have taken place in the first half of the eighth century, the practice spreading gradually at first and then rapidly (Davies 1973, 50).

In south Wales then, the tradition of royal patronage of the church as indicated by the Llandaff charters seems to have provided the context for the erection of the first monuments of Group III. There is no source material comparable to the Book of Llandaff for north Wales, but there are hints in the available sources that the north Welsh kings, like those of south Wales were concerned to act as patrons of the church by giving land to the church. Maelgwn of Gwynedd for example, is reputed to have given Holyhead to St Cybi in the sixth century (Lloyd 1912, 130). Furthermore, north Wales had the appropriate resources for the erection of monuments of Group III from an early date. In particular, Gwynedd, always an important kingdom, underwent a period of great expansion in the ninth century. In 925 (AD) the old dynasty of Maelgwn Gwynedd came to an end with the death of Hywel. The Harleian genealogy (Bartrum 1966, 9. No 1) indicates that
the dynasty then progressed through the female line - the next king being Merfyn Frych, son of Ethel. The genealogy recorded in Jesus College Ms 20 indicates that Merfyn allied himself to the kingdom of Powys by marrying Nest, daughter of king Cincen of Powys (Bartrum 1966, 46, No 18). Merfyn died in 844 (AC) and was succeeded by his son Rhodri, who became king of Powys as well as Gwynedd on the death of Cincen in 854 (AC). Rhodri himself married Angharad, sister of the king of Seisyllwg (the region comprising Ceredigion and Ystrad Tywy - Bartrum 1966, 46, No 20). Rhodri thus succeeded to Seisyllwg on the death of king Guocaun in 871 (AC; Map 4a). In 878 (AC) however, Rhodri was killed by the Saxons, and his kingdom was divided amongst his sons (Lloyd 1954, 326).

The political expansion of Gwynedd in the ninth century caused, or at least coincided with, a period of great intellectual activity. This is illustrated by a number of literary works which have survived and which are known to have been in Wales in this period. The Book of Chad, for example, seems to have been kept at Llandeilo at this time (Richards 1973). In the early ninth century Nennius produced his Historia Brittonum, (1) using earlier written and oral traditions which were most probably preserved in Gwynedd (Jackson 1963, 20-62). Collections of northern British poetry seem to have been made in north Wales at this time (the books of Aneurin (Jackson 1969), Taliesin (Williams 1960) and Llywarch Hen (Williams 1932)). In the early tenth century, the anti-Saxon poem Armes Prydein was produced (Bromwich 1972, xxx). To this period also belong several Latin works which were glossed in Welsh, namely the Liber Commolei and an Ovid Ars Amortoria (both in Oxford Bodleian. MS Auct. F 4.32; Jackson 1953, 47, 54), a Juvenescus (Cambridge University Library Ff 4.42; Jackson 1953, 49) and a Martianus Capella (Corpus Christi College Ms; Jackson 1953, 53).

Particularly interesting is the Welsh schoolbook already mentioned (above) as this suggests an interest in the formal learning of Latin, an activity which presumably took place in monasteries.

Gwynedd, then, must have been very wealthy in terms of land and resources from the ninth century onwards, and its kings evidently possessed both the means and the inclination to patronise the arts. There were also ample resources of stone. In spite of this, none of the north Welsh monu-

---

(1) Nennius' Historia Brittonum is found in a number of manuscripts discussed by Bartrum (1966, 58). A complete edition of the text based on that in Harleian manuscript 3859, together with a translation, is provided by Morris (1980).
ments of Group III can be dated earlier than the middle of the tenth century. In north Wales creative activity was apparently channelled into literary works rather than sculpture.

With regard to the beginning of sculpture in north Wales, it is possible that the practice spread from the south. In this case, the most likely historical context at first appears to be the reign of Hywel Dda, grandson of Rhodri Mawr, who extended his rule over most of Wales in the first half of the tenth century (Map 4b). By c. 943, Hywel was master of Gwynedd and Powys as well as of Deheubarth (Dyfed plus Seisyllwg). In south-east Wales, however, the Llandaff charters suggest that the two branches of the dynasty of Morgan had again coalesced in the person of another Morgan, Morgan Hen. This Morgan gave his name to the kingdom of Morgannwg, a term which came to replace the earlier Glywysing (Davies 1978, 95). Such was the strength of this dynasty, that it alone was able to remain outside the sphere of Hywel's rule.

The region outside the sphere of Hywel's rule, however, is that richest in monuments of Group III, several of which must have been manufactured at about this time. Furthermore, with the exception of the simple cross-slabs, these south Welsh monuments were always distinct in form and decoration from those of the north. The north Welsh monuments are a separate development, distinct from those of the south. The initial impetus for the setting up of this type of monument in north Wales is as likely to have come from England, Ireland or the Isle of Man as from south Wales. Political conquest, as in the case of the rule of Hywel Dda, was not necessarily accompanied by intimate cultural contact and exchange.

This may largely be accounted for by the ephemeral nature of these political conquests, and by the hostility which characterises the relationships between the Welsh kingdoms at this time. On the death of Hywel Dda in 950 (AC), for example, his kingdom was split among his sons. During the next few years there were frequent battles which involved several Welsh rulers. The sons of Rhodri Mawr and the sons of Idwal played a particularly aggressive role (BYT 949, 952, 954, 958, 974, 979, 980, 983, 985). Owain, son of Hywel Dda, obtained the Kingdom of Deheubarth after the deaths of his brothers Rhodri (in 953) and Edwin (in 954; AC s.a. 952). He was succeeded by his son Maredudd who in 986 invaded Gwynedd and slew its king, thus making himself ruler of north as well as south Wales (Lloyd 1954, 346; Map 4c). On Maredudd's death in 999, the rule of Gwynedd reverted to the line of Idwal.
The evidence of the historical sources, coupled with the distinction between the monuments of north and south Wales in this period, suggests that even when the same king ruled in the north as well as the south (for example Hywel Dda in the mid-ninth century, Maredudd ap Owain in the late tenth century, Llewellyn ap Seisyllt in the early eleventh century, and Gruffydd ap Llewellyn in the middle of the century (Map 4d)), each adhered to a distinct cultural tradition. Thus it is worth examining the groups of monuments identified by form or decoration with regard to the known kingdoms at different dates, in order to assess the cultural content of the major political divisions.

One of the earliest groups of sculpture, belonging to the late ninth and early tenth centuries is represented by the three cross-slabs from Gwent (Bulmore 290, Caerleon 291, St Arvans 292). At this period, the Llandaff charters suggest that there was 'extreme flexibility in the apportioning of responsibility' amongst the members of the dominant south-eastern dynasty who grant land in Glamorgan as well as Gwent (Davies 1978, 95). However, the lack of any similarity between the Gwent cross-slabs, (which are all on or near royal land) and the contemporary royal crosses of Glamorgan (Llantwit Major 220 and 223) suggest that Gwent existed as an area distinct from Glamorgan, even when ruled by one king.

To the north of this area, in southern Powys, there are no distinctive groups of sculptured material with the exception of Llanyini 65 and Llandewi'r Cwm 47 which are both situated in Buellt. Little is known about the pre-Norman area of Buellt as distinct from Brycheiniog and Powys. The monuments may hint that this area had a distinct sculptural identity in the late ninth and first half of the tenth centuries, but as only two monuments are in existence, and one may be a copy of the other, it is impossible to press this point.

The unpatterned cross-slabs St Ishmaels 396, Steynton 404, St Davids 380, Walton West and St Edrens 392 and 393 indicate the existence of a Dyfed group of monuments, whose influence in Ceredigion was felt on only one cross-slab, Llanarth 110, at a time when both Dyfed and Seisyllwg were generally ruled by one king of Deheubarth. The fretted ring cross-slabs are an even more localised group within Dyfed.

Similarly, local sculptural groups may be identified within Glywysing/Glamorgan. These are the interlaced ring cross-slabs of the tenth century, the angular line cross-slabs and compass drawn cross-slabs and the panelled
cartwheel monuments of c. 1090-1100. It is remarkable that the last three
groups named fall mainly within the later cantref of Gorfyndd. This may
be coincidental, a result of the availability of suitable stone in the
area, or it may suggest that this area had some sort of sculptural identity
in the pre-Norman period which is not otherwise recorded.

The angular line cross-slabs of Anglesey and the localised sculpture
at Penmon, Whitford and elsewhere in north Wales confirm the impression
that sculptors generally worked within small areas which did not cut across
the boundaries of kingdoms, and that forms and motifs peculiar to a partic-
icular group of sculpture are frequently confined within these boundaries.
This was not always the case. The form of the disc-headed cross with
slab-like shaft is widely distributed in south Wales over a period of two
centuries. The ringed cross with fan-shaped arms is found in both Dyfed
and Glamorgan with one outlier at Llangenydd in Seisylltwg. Within this
group it has been suggested that between c. 1000 and 1035 a sculptor or
group of sculptors was responsible for the five crosses Carew 303, Nevern
360, Llanfynydd 159, Llantwit Major 222 and Exeter. This was a period of
political instability for Morgannwg and Dyfed, with no one king secure as
ruler of Deheubarth at any one time. This sculptor or sculptors apparently
worked for King Samson (of Glywyssing - the authenticity of 'Samsoni
Regis' has been questioned above), and Maredudd ap Edwin of Deheubarth.
The magnificence of the monuments in question makes it likely that Llan-
fynydd 159 which bears the name 'Eiudon' (Iddon) and Nevern 360 which may
have the name Houelt (? ap Edwin, brother of Maredudd) were also commis-
ioned by royalty. In this context the Exeter shaft remains enigmatic.

It would seem then that the larger political divisions of pre-Norman
Wales, the kingdoms, generally had a distinct artistic tradition, if groups of
sculpture may be taken as an index of this. In this connection,
it is notable that the monuments of Powys, which is difficult to trace as
an independent kingdom after the middle of the tenth century, do not form
a coherent group. Furthermore, it is interesting that few monuments of
Group III occur in the border regions between kingdoms (Map 5). This may
have been because these regions were potential trouble spots and as such
may have been only sparsely populated. There is no apparent geographical
reason for this; the land in these boundary regions was capable of
supporting settlement.

With the exception of the monuments already discussed, the impact of
known political events upon the commissioning and manufacture of the -monu-
ments is difficult to determine, partly because of the incomplete nature of the historical and archaeological record, and partly because few of the extant monuments can be dated with any degree of precision. The little evidence there is suggests that political and social instability in the pre-Norman period (frequently attested in the historical sources) is unlikely to have caused much dislocation in their manufacture. The tenth and eleventh centuries were a period of great political instability throughout Wales, with a number of pretenders to the thrones of the Welsh kingdoms. In the south-east, the Llandaff charters indicate the existence of intrusive kings in both Gwent and Glamorgan from the mid-tenth century onwards, alongside the main dynasty of Morgan. From c. 1020-70, the general title king of Morgannwg was appropriated by the family of Rhydderch ap Iestyn, whose power base was in Gwent. The ancient dynasty retained its title, but must effectively have been confined to Glamorgan (Davies 1978, 95-6). Meanwhile, Llewellyn ap Seisyllt, son in law of Maredudd king of Deheubarth, made himself king of Gwynedd in 1018 after he had massacred the quite considerable opposition (BYT). In 1022 he defeated the Irish pretender Rhain, who claimed to be a son of Maredudd, and thus took Deheubarth. After his death in the next year, Llewellyn's son Gryffydd, succeeded to Gwynedd and to Powys. Rhydderch ap Iestyn's family also seem to have had some interest in Deheubarth at this time; the BYT state that in 1023 Rhydderch held rule over the south after the death of Llewellyn ap Seisyllt. Rhydderch's son Gruffydd was king of Dyfed as well as Morgannwg from 1046 (BYT) until he was killed by Gruffydd ap Llewellyn (BYT 1056).

After Gruffydd ap Llewellyn's death in 1063, there were numerous internecine wars between the various rulers which are chronicled in the BYT. At some point in this confused period, Gruffydd ap Cynan, a descendant of Rhodri Mawr who had been living as a fugitive in Ireland and who had married the daughter of the Norse king of Dublin (Jones 1910, 43), managed to re-establish his line in Gwynedd. In 1081 Gruffydd helped to restore Rhys ap Tewdwr, the legitimate ruler of Deheubarth, to his throne, when their combined forces defeated Trahaern and Caradog ap Gruffydd, king of Morgannwg, at the battle of Mynydd Carn (BYT).

Political instability was mirrored by social insecurity in this period. Davies cited cases of aristocratic lawlessness from the Llandaff charters and suggested that the situation in south-east Wales became 'particularly anarchic' in the ninth, tenth and eleventh centuries (1978, 116). It was in this area and in these centuries, however, that the
practice of erecting sculptured monuments was begun and rapidly expanded. The permanence of a stone memorial may have been particularly attractive in these unsettled times. In this context, the advent of the Normans as another disruptive element in politics and society is unlikely to have had any immediate impact on the production of monuments. The establishment of Norman political divisions and political institutions is unlikely to have caused the immediate disruption of their manufacture. Norman castles of the late eleventh and early twelfth centuries coincide with only five sites which have yielded monuments of Group III, namely Coity, Ogmore, Port Talbot, Neath and Rhuddlan. With the possible exception of Port Talbot (where the original situation of the monuments is uncertain), none of these sites was the scene of a flourishing group of sculpture immediately prior to the Norman conquest of the area.

The pre-Norman sculptural tradition apparently ceased when the Norman aristocracy came to own more land in the areas in which the monuments were produced that the native Welsh, and thus took over from them as patrons of the church. The Normans, however, despised the existing Welsh ecclesiastical establishments and institutions and patronised only conventional European-type religious institutions outside Wales - or founded new religious institutions of a type of which they approved in Wales. As the Welsh crosses and cross-slabs of Group III were closely connected with the Welsh religious establishments, patronage was presumably withdrawn from these also. Without the patronage of wealthy landowners the tradition could not survive.
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CONCLUSION

Study of the Welsh monuments of Group III demonstrates that whilst Wales participated in the insular tradition of the production of sculptured crosses and cross-slabs, the country possessed a distinctive sculptural, and presumably, therefore, cultural, tradition in the period, c. 850 to c. 1100 in which regional groups may be defined. In treating the Welsh sculptured monuments as historical evidence, it proved possible to use them to help to throw some light on the social, economic, ecclesiastical and political history of a country which is otherwise sparsely documented for this period.

This has not claimed to be an exhaustive treatment of the subject. Further work is desirable, for example on the petrological examination of the monuments, and a more detailed analysis of the depth of carving and size of motifs used could be revealing. Nevertheless, it is hoped that this study has helped to show the potential value of sculptured monuments as historical evidence in the post-Roman and pre-Norman period, and that it will encourage the treatment of other groups of material in a similar manner.
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