



CHAPTER IX

GROUPS, DATING AND RELATIONSHIPS

INTRODUCTION

There are three main groups of early stone sculpture in Cornwall, characterised primarily by contrasting features of design and layout and by their geographical location. One of the groups can be further subdivided. Most examples of pre-Norman stone sculpture in Cornwall fall into one of these main groups, although, as might be anticipated, there are a few examples which do not conform or which cannot be categorised because insufficient survives to allow the decoration to be identified. In this chapter, the characteristics of the three groups will be examined, as well as their relationships to other sculpture both within Cornwall and elsewhere.

Establishing the relationships of the sculpture, if possible, is essential because it is assumed that its introduction to Cornwall was entirely new. Although inscribed stones were set up in post-Roman Cornwall there is no evidence of any sculptural activity in the eighth century or for most of the ninth century. In fact there is no evidence of an artistic tradition in any field. The archaeological background has been summarised above and reflects a general paucity of evidence for this period (p. 44). The limited documentary evidence tends to emphasise the Anglo-Saxon links of the region at this period, especially in relation to the church (p. 30), but on the other hand, the sculpture which emerges from *c.* AD 900 is witness to a more varied pattern of contacts and relationships. As this section will show, the fact that the different groups do appear to show different patterns and an increasing English influence in the eleventh century is remarkable and is a fascinating reflection of the metamorphosis taking place in Cornwall, at any rate in certain aspects of society.

PANELLED INTERLACE GROUP

Four monuments are considered to belong to this

group. These are St Cleer 2 (the Doniert Stone, Ills. 51–4), St Cleer 3 (the Other Half Stone, Ills. 56–7), St Neot 1 (Ills. 151–4) and St Just-in-Penwith 1 (Ills. 100–2). St Cleer 2 and 3 and St Neot 1 are reasonably close together in east Cornwall but St Just 1 is in the very far west of the county (Fig. 21). Nevertheless its similarity to the other three stones is sufficiently striking to allow it to be included.

All four are parts of crosses, characterised by a near-square cross-section, although this is not so apparent in the case of St Cleer 3, which has been broken. All are of local granite, which at St Just is a fine-grained variety, perhaps selected to facilitate the carving of decoration. Mortices in the top of each of St Cleer 2 and 3 (Ill. 59) indicate that they were originally composite monuments, constructed in sections which were socketted together. Both are in fact the pedestal or lower part of the shaft for a taller monument whose lost parts presumably included separate cross-shafts and cross-heads. In Wales at Llandough in Glamorgan or at Carew and Nevern in Pembrokeshire (Redknap and Lewis 2007, 329–37; Edwards 2007, 303–10, 396–401) are examples of near-complete monuments which may give an indication of the original appearance of monuments in this group. As St Neot 1 is sunk in a base and broken at the top, no mortice or tenon can be seen to indicate whether this was also a composite monument; the same is true of the broken shaft at St Just-in-Penwith. Although it is difficult to be sure when only a small fragment survives, it appears that the St Just stone was a relatively small cross, whereas the St Cleer and St Neot stones must originally have been large and impressive monuments. None of the four has a head surviving, so this important piece of information on the original appearance of the monuments is lacking, although some similarity to other Cornish early medieval cross-heads in east Cornwall, for example Cardinham 1 (Ills. 43–6), would seem most likely.

The decoration characteristic of these stones is evident in the name which has been given to the



group: all include interlace patterns, plaitwork or knots in square or rectangular panels. The Doniert Stone (St Cleer 2) has an inscription, but this is the only stone with anything other than geometric ornament on it. The patterns are all neatly laid out and constructed in high relief with well-modelled, rounded single strands. This group features some of the best and most ambitious interlace in Cornwall on the St Neot 1 shaft, although it should be noted that the St Neot interlace includes a number of rings in the patterns, a feature considered to reflect degeneration in the design and a likely Viking date (Bailey 1980, 72; Edwards 2007, 89). There are differences between the monuments: St Cleer 2 and 3 feature very simple knots and simple plaitwork whereas the St Neot and St Just shafts have more complex patterns. However it may be relevant that for the St Cleer stones only small portions of the original monuments survive, so that the missing parts may have featured more intricate work.

The quality of the carving and design sets these monuments apart from all others in Cornwall and, at least to some extent, the patterns they use are not shared with other groups of sculpture. For example, the pattern consisting of two oval rings placed diagonally and interlaced with one or two circular rings (closed circuit pattern B), which features in square panels on both St Just-in-Penwith 1 and St Neot 1 and with a single ring on the Doniert Stone (St Cleer 2), is only found on one other Cornish monument, the cross-shaft at St Blazey (Ill. 2), an unusual monument which does not fit into any of the main groups, although it has most in common with the Panelled Interlace group. The only other example of interlace which approaches the complexity seen on St Neot 1 appears on the later monument, Padstow 2 (Ills. 165–8), a member of the Mid and East Cornwall group (p. 91). Most commonly seen elsewhere is the plain plait, although only this group features the eight-strand version. The ring-twist which features on St Neot 1 (closed circuit pattern A) is the other pattern which is seen on a number of other monuments in east Cornwall, for example Cardinham 1 and St Breward 2 (Ills. 25, 44). On the other hand, simple pattern E and its closed-circuit version the triquetra, a motif commonly used elsewhere in Cornwall, does not occur in the surviving sculpture of this group.

Only one of the four monuments has an inscription (perhaps because none are complete) but the inscription on the Doniert Stone makes this the only pre-Norman monument in Cornwall with any claim to an absolute date (Ills. 51, 55). The equation of the *Doniert* named on St Cleer 2 with *Dungart*, a

Cornish king who died in 875, although unprovable is philologically acceptable (see catalogue, p. 135): if we were to assume that this cross was his memorial, it would presumably have been carved soon after this date, and probably therefore before the end of the ninth century. Acceptance of this date is qualified by the fact that the carved panels feature the very simple ring-knots which became common during the ‘Viking period’ in the north and west of England, although they were in use earlier (Bailey 1980, 71–2): for other parts of the country this would mean no earlier than the late ninth or early tenth century. So to see such an early date for Viking-influenced design in Cornwall, an area not normally considered to be in the vanguard of sculptural design, may seem anachronistic. Nevertheless, the present authors are persuaded that this, the only reasonably confident date for Cornish sculpture, should not be lightly rejected, and that the high quality of the sculpture supports this date. The layout of the patterns and execution of the carving, which are in outstanding contrast with the rather sketchy execution of some of the other pre-Norman sculpture in Cornwall, make it likely that the St Cleer stones and other members of the group are the earliest examples of stone carving in Cornwall.

The cross at St Neot is on a site which is likely to have originated as an early Christian religious house (Olson 1989, 85–6, 105). Here may have been the shrine that King Alfred resorted to when in Cornwall (see Chapter IV above, p. 25) and it may be mentioned in a tenth-century list of Cornish churches (Olson and Padel 1986, 49–51; Olson 1989, 86; Padel 2002, 324), although by the time of Domesday Book, the *Clerici Sancti Neoti* were in decline, having been robbed of land by the Count of Mortain (Thorn and Thorn 1979, 4,28; 5,14,2). Not surprisingly, considering these indications of status, it is one of the few places in Cornwall that boasts more than a single example of early medieval sculpture, there being a fragment of a trefoil-headed cross here as well (St Neot 2, Ills. 149–50). The proposed late ninth-century date for this group fits remarkably well with Alfred’s visit and it may be tentatively suggested that the cross was in some way connected with royal benevolence following Alfred’s cure at the shrine.

In contrast, St Cleer 2 and 3 (the Doniert and Other Half stones) were erected on open moorland on the edge of Bodmin Moor; and although not apparent now, this was a location of strategic importance, above a ford over the River Fowey and beside a major route into the heart of Cornwall around the south side of Bodmin Moor. The Fowey is also the boundary



between the parishes of St Cleer and St Neot, a boundary which may already have had significance at this time.¹ Here the stones also stood close to the probable seat of the last of the Cornish kings at Liskeard (see Chapter IV, p. 25).

Of St Just-in-Penwith, we know almost nothing, although a place-name in **lann* and a seventh-century inscribed stone with *chi-rho* hint at its early origin, and may suggest an early religious house of local importance in the far west of Cornwall, again possessing relics of its patron saint (Padel 1988, 100–1; Padel 2002, 355; Okasha 1993, 243–7; Thomas, A. C. 1994, 286–7, 295).

The distance of about sixty miles which separates the St Cleer and St Neot monuments from St Just is surprising. However the nearest parallels for the sculpture in this group are two granite cross-shafts some fifty miles east of St Cleer 2 and 3 at Copplestone, near Crediton, and Exeter, both in Devon (Cramp 2006, 82–3, 86–7; ills. 10–14, 26–32). These two stones also have roughly square-sectioned shafts, with decoration in panels and the interlace is likewise rendered in single-strands but includes fret patterns as well as the interlace, plain plaits and knots of the Cornish stones; Copplestone also has some now much worn figure carving. The interlace on the Copplestone cross includes loops which, like the simple ring-knots, are generally taken to indicate a Viking-age date and influence in stylistic taste (Bailey 1980, 71–2). A mortice in the top of this cross indicates that it too was a composite monument.

But despite their differences, Cornish monuments in this group are more like the two Devon crosses than any other Cornish crosses. They could therefore be seen as elements of a major regional group, although the fact that the Copplestone and Exeter crosses have been dated to the late tenth and early eleventh centuries, and therefore a century later than the date suggested for the Cornish Panelled Interlace group, does pose problems (Cramp 2006, 42). Although large panels of interlace are certainly a feature of early Wessex sculpture (see for example Ramsbury in Wiltshire: Cramp 2006, 228–9, ills. 489–90) these Cornish and Devon monuments are very different in style from most other pre-Norman sculpture in the

South-west. In fact, they have more in common with sculpture in south Wales, suggesting that we may actually be looking at elements of a Bristol Channel cultural zone.

Closest in style to the two Devon monuments, and especially to Exeter, is a cross-shaft at Llantwit Major (no. 4) in south-east Wales (Redknap and Lewis 2007, 382–9) and crosses in south-west Wales at Llanfynydd, Carew and Nevern (no. 4) (Edwards 2007, 89–90, fig. 8.3; 247–51, 303–10, 396–401). Like the Devon monuments, their decorative schemes feature interlace, plaitwork, simple knots and frets in panels; but unlike the Devon and Cornish monuments, the interlace is normally rendered in double strands. Like the Devon and Cornish monuments, this is a widely scattered group. Of these, the Llantwit Major 4 stone has been dated to the first half of the tenth century (Redknap and Lewis 2007, 376, 389) and the others to the second half of the tenth to early eleventh centuries (Edwards 2007, 89, who includes Llantwit Major 4 in this date range). Another similar monument at Llantwit Major, Llantwit Major 2, which has an S-shaped interlace pattern comparable to that on St Neot 1 side B, has been dated slightly earlier (Redknap and Lewis 2007, 376). The former thus relate closely to the dates for the Devon stones while the Llantwit Major 2 stone (and possibly 4, depending on the preferred dating) is closer to the date suggested for the Cornish group. Llantwit Major was an important monastery and has a wide range of early sculpture. Thus it is a possibility that Llantwit Major may have been the place of inspiration for the Devon sculpture, the Cornish stones, and for the monuments in south-west Wales, but perhaps on separate occasions. Why this should be so, especially given the Devon monuments' undoubtedly English cultural background, is an intriguing question. For Cornwall it may be that, at the date we are arguing for the Doniert Stone, Llantwit Major was the obvious source of inspiration, being a major workshop with sculptors who spoke a language which was closely akin to Cornish.

Despite their differences and the discrepancies in dates suggested for these Cornish and Devon crosses, it is proposed here that they are sufficiently similar to be worthy of re-evaluation as an extensive regional group. There is a possible historical context which is tentatively offered here to explain their unity. All of these stones, apart from St Just-in-Penwith 1 in the far west of Cornwall, have links either to King Alfred or to his advisor Asser. Alfred knew of Cornwall following his visit here in about 865–70: a visit which may have included St Neot and in all probability a meeting with

1. Another ancient track known as the *magnum iter plastronum*, ('great cart-track' or 'great way of waggons') in the thirteenth century, which linked Liskeard across the heart of Bodmin Moor to north Cornwall, may have passed this way as well (Henderson, C. 1928, 71; Hull 1987, 39; see also 'the roadway from Liskeard to Cambleford' in the late seventeenth-century Lanhydrock Atlas: Padel in Holden *et al.* 2010, 313).



the then king of Cornwall, Doniert (see Chapter IV, p. 25). Asser, his advisor and biographer, came from south Wales to Exeter in the late ninth century. Asser was bishop of the vast diocese of Sherborne until 909 when it was split and a separate diocese of Crediton created, to oversee the spiritual needs of Devon and Cornwall. Copplestone is close to Crediton and may have marked a boundary associated with the new bishopric's lands (Pearce 1978, 109). The link with Wales which the two Devon and four Cornish stones show could well have been fostered by Asser, given his Welsh background and probable sensitivity to the cultural differences within his huge diocese. Perhaps some revision to the dating of the group as a whole is called for, in the light of this possible historical context. Even the stone at St Just-in-Penwith might be explained in this light, as an attempt by a sympathetic bishop to promote the influence of his diocese, right to its furthest corners. Even if this historical context is considered too speculative, the links between the monuments must surely be seen to reflect the existence of a cultural landscape which extended across both sides of the Bristol Channel.

PENWITH GROUP

This group comprises nine monuments or fragments of monuments, all found within the ancient hundred of Penwith in the far west of Cornwall (see Fig. 21, p. 84). These monuments have long been recognised as being members of the same group, and in the case of Gwinear 1 (from Roseworthy, now at Lanherne) and Sancreed 1, possibly the work of a single sculptor (Langdon, Arthur 1896, 365; Hencken 1932, 276; Thomas, A. C. 1978, 78). Monuments in this group include Gwinear 1 (Ills. 94–7), St Buryan 1 (Ills. 29–32), Sancreed 1 (Ills. 214–17), Paul 1 and 2 (which may be parts of the same original cross) (Ills. 178–80, 181–2), St Erth 1 and 2 (Ills. 65–80), Ludgvan 1 (Ills. 138–9) and Phillack 1 (Ills. 197–201). Other than their very confined geographical spread, the most characteristic features of this group are the presence of a Crucifixion on one side of the cross-head and five bosses on the other.

The monuments are all crosses, of relatively small stature and generally with a rectangular-section shaft. They are all carved of local granite, other than the Gwinear 1 cross, which is cut from an elvan similar to Pentewan Stone. Gwinear 1, at only 1.49 metres high, is the smallest complete cross in this group and in Cornwall as a whole and on present evidence the

tallest in the group is Sancreed 1, which now stands 1.91 metres high but may originally have been about 2 metres. It is possible that this small size is a reflection of the local geology, but the fact that the Penwith area is also notable for some of the tallest standing stones in Cornwall (the tallest being the Pipers at 4.1 and 5.05 metres: Barnatt 1980, 226–7) argues against this and suggests that the small size is the result instead of local taste. However it is also possible that their modern appearance is deceptive. The bottoms of St Erth 1 and Paul 2 are tapered to create a neat tenon, clearly intended to fit into a base or pedestal, but as none survives it is not known how large these bases were, nor whether they were carved. Analogy with more complete pre-Norman monuments elsewhere suggests that these could have been substantial pedestals decorated with patterns similar to those seen on the crosses; however consideration of those surviving in Cornwall suggests either a plain slab with a mortice (like Padstow 2), perhaps with an inscription around the upper surface (St Ewe 1) or maybe even something like the Doniert Stone (St Cleer 2). Even if the addition of a base did not increase the height of the monuments to the scale seen in east Cornwall, it might at least have added up to a half-metre.

The crosses are all ring-headed and often have a relatively small diameter head in relation to the size of the shaft (see Fig. 18a–d, p. 60). The ring is normally plain and thick, with the holes poorly or only partly drilled through, being cut from both sides and sometimes not meeting in the middle. In the case of Sancreed 1, which has wide-flaring arms and a disc head, there are no holes at all. The cross-arms are unequally sized to accommodate the shape of the Crucifixion. For example at St Buryan 1 the lower arm extends down onto the shaft and at Gwinear 1, Phillack 1, and St Erth 1 it is simply not defined. The top three arms are not so widely flared and have rounded ends. The fact that the holes between the cross-arms and ring are poorly drilled or not cut through at all calls for some comment. It may suggest a lack of confidence in the sculptors, at least in this respect, or an uncertainty whether the granite, if drilled, would be able to support the head without breaking.

To summarise up to this point: the Penwith group crosses are small and do not cut a striking figure, unlike some of their very tall east Cornwall counterparts to be described below. Perhaps a strong physical appearance was not felt necessary for monuments which include a Crucifixion and five bosses as a prominent feature of their design and whose intention was to convey a spiritual rather than political message; or their size

may simply have been a reflection of local taste or even economy. They are not located out in the countryside but are all at parish churches (apart from Gwinear 1 which was originally at a chapel site).

The Crucifixions have been described above in Chapter VII (p. 78). In summary, they are simple tunic-clad, forward-facing figures with outstretched arms, carved in relief and standing alone on the cross-head. On all but Sancreed 1, which has triquetras in the cross-arms, the opposite side of the head features five prominent bosses. In addition to these outstanding attributes, a number of other ornamental features are characteristic of the group, whose decoration is in fact the most varied of the Cornish cross groups. The repetitive use of very basic interlace patterns, mainly simple patterns E (the Stafford Knot or triquetra) and F (the Carrick Bend), executed in double and triple strands, is typical, and the different knots are combined in a line, not separated into panels. The most ambitious monument, which combines a number of different knots, is Gwinear 1. A serpentine beast and inscriptions also appear on the only two complete monuments, Gwinear 1 and Sancreed 1, which both feature a rather similar text in the inscription (pp. 152, 198), while a simple triangular key pattern or fret appears on Sancreed 1 and St Erth 1.

In seeking parallels for the different ornamental features of these crosses, the use of the Stafford Knots in the cross-arms, as on Sancreed 1, is perhaps easiest to find, since it occurs commonly in Cornish crosses of the Mid and East Cornwall group (p. 91), for example Cardinham 1 (Ills. 43, 45). Such a use of Stafford Knots has a long history in pre-Norman sculpture, so is of little help in defining the group's relationships and dating. In contrast, the source of the five bosses which appear on St Buryan 1, Gwinear 1, Paul 1, St Erth 2 and Phillack 1 is more problematic since such bosses are not a common feature of Anglo-Saxon stone sculpture. On the other hand, they are frequent in Irish sculpture and this is accepted above (Chapter VII, p. 80) as the most likely origin for this motif, since Ireland has also been invoked as a probable source of inspiration for the Crucifixion (see Chapter VII, p. 79).

In contrast, the ribbon animal seen on Gwinear 1 and Sancreed 1 has rather different parallels (Ills. 93, 97 and 215). With its ribbon-like body and interlacing tail clamped in the creature's mouth, it has a superficial resemblance to animals of the late ninth- to mid tenth-century Viking Jellinge art style, but lacks the diagnostic contoured body, spiral hips, and lip lappets (Bailey 1980, 55–7; Wilson 1984, 143–4; Bailey and Cramp 1988, 24–5). An obvious and more

local source for the animal might appear to be the lively south-western 'Colerne' creatures, seen in mid Devon at Dolton (Cramp 2006, 83–5, ill. 20–5), but again, the Penwith animal lacks the attributes which help to define these, for example the hatched bodies enmeshed in an irregular cobweb of very fine strands (Cramp 2006, 42–8). The closest sculptural parallels for the Penwith beast are a ribbon animal which appears on a late tenth-century cross-shaft at Aycliffe in Co. Durham (Aycliffe 2: Cramp 1984, 43, pl. 9.30) and others seen on a coped grave-cover at Bexhill in Sussex, dated to the tenth to eleventh centuries (Tweddle *et al.* 1995, 122–3, ill. 10, 18, 19). Although these seem far-flung, examples recently discovered in Cornwall of Hiberno-Norse metalwork ornamented with serpents' heads, though not exactly like the Penwith examples, do raise the possibility that closer models might be found at some time in the future (see above, Chapter V, p. 47).

The simple key pattern seen at St Erth and Sancreed (Ills. 65, 68 and 217) appears to be a long-lived motif whose parallels have a wide temporal and geographical range. However, although this pattern appears on the St Augustine's or Vespasian Psalter (Allen, J. R. 1903, 341, no. 926; Cramp 2006, ill. 527), a manuscript written in Canterbury in the late eighth century, most of its sculptural parallels are in the west and north of Britain, on monuments of tenth- and eleventh-century date: for example in Cumbria at Burton in Kendal (Bailey and Cramp 1988, 82–3, ill. 183) and in Wales at Llandyfaelog Fach, Breconshire and Marthyr Mawr 2, Glamorganshire (Redknap and Lewis 2007, 185–90, 466–72). The same is true of the very limited range of simple interlace patterns seen on the Penwith group crosses: in themselves, the patterns carved on these crosses have a long currency and are not particularly diagnostic. However, the invariable use of multiple strands — mostly double, sometimes triple — to render the patterns is a trait which, although found throughout Britain, is more common in Wales (for example in some of the sculpture of Llantwit Major: Redknap and Lewis 2007, 369–93). It also features frequently in Manx sculpture (Kermode 1907) and is ubiquitous in the South-west, although the delicately modelled strands with a median-incised line are of a very different character to the work found in Cornwall (Cramp 2006, 41).

Emerging from this discussion of the parallels for the motifs employed on crosses of the Penwith group is a picture of variety and eclecticism. Parallels for individual traits have been identified in Wales, Ireland, Cumbria, the North East, south-east and south-west



England and even the Isle of Man. Unlike the Panelled Interlace group above, there is no one obvious source of inspiration: ideas are drawn widely. The decorative motifs employed must reflect the artistic and cultural mix to which Penwith was open at the time, and the recently discovered fragments of metalwork of similar date, referred to above (Chapter V, p. 47), confirm trading contacts which may have been the means by which ideas were transmitted. In the hands of a sculptor working with the coarse-grained granite of the area, they were combined to create these small but distinctive, and uniquely Cornish, monuments.

As far as dating is concerned, the parallels noted above clearly indicate that the Penwith group belongs in the tenth and eleventh centuries, but most of the decorative motifs employed are of little help in refining this very broad date. The close parallel for the ribbon animal with that on the Aycliffe cross may point more firmly to the tenth century for the crosses on which it appears, and the Irish and Yorkshire parallels for the Crucifixions suggest the same. But further than this it is not possible to go. The documentary evidence, limited though it is, lends some support. The charter to St Buryan suggests the (re-) foundation of a religious house here, presumably along more 'English' lines, in *c.* AD 940 and, as Thomas has suggested (Thomas, A. C. 1978, 75–6, followed by Preston-Jones and Langdon, Andrew 1997, 118), this may have been the context for the development of cross-carving in the area.

Within the group, some refinement to the chronology is perhaps possible on the grounds of competence and quality of carving. The finest, in terms of the proportions and detail of the Crucifixion figures, the depth of the carving and the trouble taken to drill the holes in the heads, are St Buryan 1 and Gwinear 1 (Ills. 29–32, 94–7), and it is possible that these are the earliest, perhaps of the second half of the tenth century. As noted above, Gwinear 1 also displays the greatest competence in the choice and execution of interlace, although this may be related to the more amenable freestone from which it is carved. The others, whose carving is executed in much lower relief and where the figures of Christ are less well proportioned, may be close but rustic local copies, inspired by the innovative major monuments. The possibility is enhanced by the fact that one of the latter, St Buryan 1, was associated with the probable minster church of the area (as noted below). Most obviously, the cross at Phillack (Phillack 1) bears the usual Crucifixion and five bosses, but its interlace is a poor angular plait, the proportions of the shaft are peculiar, and bosses have been added in unusual places (Ills. 197–201). This quirky copy may

therefore be the latest in the series and perhaps of mid to late eleventh-century date.

All the crosses in this group are, with one exception, at parish church sites in the hundred of Penwith and all but one of the parish churches are at sites where place-names and archaeological evidence suggest early Christian foundations. However it is uncertain whether by the tenth and eleventh centuries these were small religious houses (as Paul probably had been: Olson 1989, 20–8) or simply parish churches. Only St Buryan was recorded as a community in Domesday Book (Thorn and Thorn 1979, 4,27) and may have acted as the minster church for the southern part of the West Penwith peninsula (Orme 2010, 12), but the overall shortage of documentation for this area means that no assumptions can be safely made regarding the status of other sites at this time. The exceptions, which are not at ecclesiastical sites of demonstrably early Christian origin, are Gwinear 1, originally from Roseworthy, and Ludgvan 1. Ludgvan, however, was a substantial estate in 1086 held by Richard, a tenant in chief of the Count of Mortain (Thorn and Thorn 1979, 5,3,27) and the Gwinear 1 cross was almost certainly from the chapel of St Gwinear at Roseworthy, a royal demesne manor in Domesday Book (Thorn and Thorn 1979, 1,11). It is of interest, though this may be a coincidence, that none are at the sites of dependent chapelries.

It is notable, then, that the two finest members of the group, St Buryan 1 and Gwinear 1, are from the principal religious house in Penwith and one of the area's paramount manors. This is clear evidence that they are high status monuments, set up at the most important secular and religious sites in the area. At the time they were carved, St Buryan was almost certainly under English influence and it is possible that by then Roseworthy was under English administration too. On the other hand, the obscurity of two of the names inscribed on Gwinear 1 and the possible Cornish nature of the third (see pp. 153–5) might argue against English influence in their carving, unless these are the names of local administrators for the king's estate. No other religious houses are recorded in Penwith at this date, so for the others we must assume, no matter what their earlier status may have been, that they were set up at sites which by then were only fulfilling the function of parochial centres.

As a final point, it is interesting to note that the distribution of these crosses is confined to an area which is co-terminous with the ancient hundred of Penwith (Fig. 21, p. 84), a fact which may reflect a Cornish sub-region with a particular identity. This is





in contrast with crosses of the Mid and East Cornwall group, which are discussed next.

MID AND EAST CORNWALL GROUP

Although named from its geographical location, the Mid and East Cornwall group is also well defined stylistically, being identified principally by the appearance of plant scrolls and trails. Where cross-heads survive, these are ring-heads whose wide-flaring arms are decorated with triquetra knots (Fig. 18e–j, p. 60). The decoration tends to be executed in very low relief and there is a notable tendency towards the use of a wider variety of stone-types. With monuments up to four metres high, some of these crosses are over twice the height of the largest of the Penwith group crosses and the presence of plant decoration is in very marked contrast with the other Cornish groups. A sub-group is identified by the appearance of trefoil-shaped holes between the cross-arms (Fig. 18h–j). Although not strictly part of the group as they are so individual and contrasting in their designs, two notable monuments stand at the head of this series: Cardinham 1 and St Neot 3 (the Fourhole Cross). The group includes fifteen monuments and fragments of crosses (seventeen if Cardinham and St Neot 3 are included) and one coped stone (see Table 2 below). They are widely dispersed, from St Columb Major in mid Cornwall to Quethiock in the south-east and from St Breward and Minster in the north to Pelynt in the south (Fig. 21, p. 84). The distance between St Columb, the most westerly and Quethiock, the most easterly, is about thirty miles. Bodmin, at the centre of Cornwall, is at the approximate centre of this geographical spread, although the majority of the monuments lie to the east and north of Bodmin rather than to the west.

Because Cardinham 1 and St Neot 3 are so important to understanding the development of this group, they are described first.

Cardinham 1 is a well-proportioned monument with tapering rectangular shaft, a large ring-head with flaring arms, and an impressive silhouette (p. 131, Ills. 43–6). A section is missing from the top of the shaft, so that originally it may have stood over three metres high. In overall shape, it is very similar to St Neot 1; the difference is in the style of decoration employed. The cross is carved with patterns which are wholly characteristic of western and northern British sculpture of the Viking Age, that is of the tenth and eleventh centuries. Features which are particularly diagnostic of this artistic influence are the ring twist,

simple T-fret patterns and in particular the Manx or Borre style ring-chain (Ill. 46). The Borre style ring-chain is a decorative motif which came from Scandinavia and was introduced into England during the Viking period (Bailey 1980, 54–5, fig. 3). The motif is common on stone sculpture of the Isle of Man and is found in Cumbria. In Wales there is only one example, on Anglesey (Nash-Williams 1950, 65, fig. 38; Edwards 1999, 5, fig. 1) and there are no examples in southern England, other than this at Cardinham. The motif is generally considered to be in use from the late ninth to the mid to late tenth century (Bailey 1980, 54–5; Wilson 1984, 142–3). In summary, there is a strong Scandinavian influence in the design of this cross, which may be broadly dated to the mid tenth century. In addition the tight spiral scroll, which is unrealistic and leafless apart from small buds in the corners between the shaft and the plant stem, finds its closest parallels in crosses of the Viking-period Cumbrian ‘spiral-scroll school’ (Bailey and Cramp 1988, 33–8; and see above, Chapter VII, pp. 75–6). Simple plaitwork and a unique knot also feature on this monument and the different pattern elements may be combined in a single panel without any moulding to separate the motifs.

The patterns on St Neot 3 (the Fourhole Cross) are difficult to discern, because they are so lightly sculpted. However, in contrast with Cardinham 1, three sides of the monument feature plant decoration which is naturalistic and relaxed (p. 174, Ills. 155, 157–8). On the front a single trail rises from a base in the bottom corner and swoops from side to side of the shaft, with fleshy three-lobed leaves drooping down within the volutes; small ties hold the plant’s stem to the sides of the shaft. On the back is a double trail and on the side a narrower but nonetheless leafy plant trail (Colour Pl. 32).

These plant trails with their fleshy acanthus leaves are an excellent example of Winchester-style ornament. As the name suggests, this was a style of decoration which developed in Winchester during the tenth century and this decoration is particularly closely paralleled in early phases of the Winchester school, as seen for example in Bede’s *Life of St Cuthbert* (Wilson 1984, 154–7, ill. 190, 192, and pl. 203), written at Winchester in the first half of the tenth century. More so than any other Cornish cross, therefore, St Neot 3 has strong allegiance to southern English art of the tenth century. Only one side of the cross has anything other than plant decoration (Ill. 156, Colour Pl. 31), but the neat figure-of-eight knots here are an absolutely characteristic feature of Wessex sculpture of



the period (Cramp 2006, 41, and see for example the Colyton cross in east Devon, ill. 6).

The decoration is notable for its use of space as well as pattern. Except on face *D*, the sculptor did not suffer from the need to fill every available square inch of the surface: for example, the triquetras on the head are very well defined and on the main face there are no 'fillers' in the gap between the plant stem and the edge of the shaft as there would be on almost every other Cornish cross. In fact the style of the decoration overall is painterly rather than sculptural, in contrast with almost all other Cornish sculpture; it is as though its designer were copying a manuscript original.

In date, St Neot 3 (the Fourhole Cross) may be a little later than Cardinham 1 and perhaps of the second half of the tenth century. Certainty is impossible, but the holes in the head are more cleanly cut and the arms more widely flared than Cardinham, perhaps suggesting greater competence and a slightly later date.

In summary, these two monuments display contrasting ornamental and artistic influences, differences which may have been highly symbolic in the political climate of the day. Whereas Cardinham 1 was influenced by Viking-age sculpture of the Irish Sea province, the decoration on St Neot 3 is indicative of Southern English influence. Whatever the background to their creation, however, the form and patterns of both appear to have had a far-reaching influence on the design of other crosses in the area.

As indicated above, the feature unifying this group of crosses, apart from the location in mid to east Cornwall, is the plant ornament with which the monuments are decorated. But if selected ornament types on each monument in the group are analysed in relation to Cardinham 1 and St Neot 3, it can be seen that they all combine elements from each. This is summarised in Table 2, and can be exemplified here by examining two of the crosses in more detail. The first example is Minster 1 (Waterpit Down, p. 168, Ills. 140–3), which features a spiral scroll (like Cardinham 1) on one side, but an acanthine scroll (like St Neot 3) on the other. The second example is a fragment of a shaft at St Breward (St Breward 2, p. 125, Ills. 23–8). Being on the edge of Bodmin Moor and under eight kilometres (less than five miles) from St Neot 3 (the Fourhole Cross), it is not surprising to see that the two main faces feature acanthine scrolls, both single and double, somewhat like those on St Neot 3. However, these appear in combination with a simple plait and ring-twist which are similar to those patterns on Cardinham 1.

Alongside the overall impression that these two major monuments may have provided the main source of inspiration for this group, there is also a suggestion of very local copying (for some comparative drawings, see Fig. 20, pp. 74–5 above). For example, on St Teath 1 is a spiral scroll (p. 200, Ill. 222), whose closest counterpart is found on the coped stone at St Tudy (p. 203, Ill. 232), only four kilometres (two and a half miles) distant. Warleggan 1 (Carne) was originally discovered just two miles from Cardinham church and its spiral scroll (p. 206, Ill. 239) is the closest to that on Cardinham 1. However, the two most similar in the group are the crosses at Lanhydrock and Lanivet (no. 1) in adjoining parishes close to Bodmin (pp. 158, 159). Both feature a spiral scroll on the main face and panels of interlace on the reverse (Ills. 110–13, 114–18). Whether they are identical patterns is impossible to tell since Lanhydrock 1 is so worn, but it must be a possibility. Both have conspicuously broad edge-mouldings and the sculpture is in very low relief, making photography very difficult.

As far as the date is concerned, the fact that these crosses are, in all probability, derived from two monuments which may be broadly of the mid tenth century, must mean that they are of this date or later, but there are no features allowing any refinement to this. Some may well be of the eleventh century. Features of the trefoil-headed sub-group, which is discussed next, point to the fact that they may be amongst the latest.

Crosses with trefoil-shaped holes in the heads perhaps represent a local development, although it may also be possible that they represent the work of a different school of masons (Fig. 18h–j, p. 60). In these, the triquetra which decorates the cross-arms is also represented in the hole between the arms but is cut away, leaving cusp-like projections on the arms and ring and a very distinctive silhouette. Only two crosses in this group are complete enough to enable an assessment of their ornamental repertoire (three if St Breward 1 and 2 are agreed to represent parts of the same original cross; see pp. 124–6, Ills. 20–2, 23–8), but this is enough to suggest that they are correctly included here as a sub-group which forms a development within the group as a whole. For example, Padstow 3 (Prideaux Place) has both a spiral scroll and an acanthine scroll (p. 178, Ills. 169–72) and Quethiok 1 has a spiral scroll, ring-twist and plaitwork (p. 196, Ills. 206–11). For this reason, all trefoil cross-head fragments, even those without a surviving shaft, are included within the group. Further features of these crosses include very wide-flaring arms with often a more prominent central boss, a

TABLE 2: MID AND EAST CORNWALL GROUP, TABLE OF DECORATION

Bold = 'English' attributes, as seen on St Neot 3
 Italic = 'Western' attributes as seen on Cardinham 1

Monument	Acanthine plant trail	Other acanthine	Figure of eight	Uncertain plant	<i>Spiral plant scroll</i>	<i>Plaitwork/ interlace</i>	<i>Ring twist</i>	<i>Fret</i>	Other	Trefoil head
St Breward 1										yes
St Breward 2	yes		yes				<i>yes</i>			
Cardinham 1					<i>yes</i>	<i>yes</i>	<i>yes</i>	<i>yes</i>	<i>yes</i>	
St Columb Major 1										yes
Egloshayle 1										yes
Lanhydrock 1			yes	????	<i>yes</i>	<i>yes</i>				
Lanivet 1	yes		yes		<i>yes</i>	<i>yes</i>				
Minster 1	yes				<i>yes</i>	<i>yes</i>	<i>yes</i>		<i>yes</i>	
St Neot 2										yes
St Neot 3	yes	yes	yes							
Padstow 1		yes				<i>yes</i>	<i>yes</i>			yes
Padstow 2										
Padstow 3			yes		<i>yes</i>	<i>yes</i>				yes
Pelynt 1										yes
Quethiock 1					<i>yes</i>	<i>yes</i>	<i>yes</i>			
St Teath 1		yes			<i>yes</i>	????				
St Tudy 1					<i>yes</i>	<i>yes</i>			<i>yes</i>	
Warleggan 1					<i>yes</i>	<i>yes</i>			<i>yes</i>	

double moulding around the edge of the arms and on the ring, and a tendency to use very thin slabs of fine-grained stone (the most extreme example is St Columb Major 1, Ills. 62–4). Quethiock 1 and Pelynt 1 (Ills. 183–4) were composite monuments, with the head socketed on separately.

Quethiock 1 is the tallest pre-Norman cross in Cornwall (p. 196, and see Fig. 17g, p. 58), and the fact that the masons involved were prepared to construct such very tall monuments, as well as to cut elaborate holes in the cross-heads, might suggest increasing mastery in the difficult art of cutting granite and other hard stone-types, as well as a strong flair for design. The wide arms expanding from a narrow centre, particularly notable on Padstow 3 (Ills. 169, 171), are indicative of a later date, probably eleventh-century. In fact Padstow, with two, possibly three examples (if Padstow 2 is included), appears on present evidence as the centre of this development.

Including St Neot 3, four of the monuments in the Mid and East Cornwall group are in a landscape rather

than ecclesiastical setting. The others are Warleggan 1, Minster 1 and Egloshayle 1. Originally in open moorland, but now standing beside the A30 road across the heart of Bodmin Moor, St Neot 3 (the Fourhole Cross) is also on the boundary of St Neot parish (p. 174, Ills. 155–8). The origin of the A30 as a route across Bodmin Moor is uncertain since it is likely that the main routes into west Cornwall in the past went to south and north of the moor (see above, pp. 86–7, on the Doniert stones, St Cleer 2 and 3) but this cross may also be evidence for the existence and importance of the route by this date.

Turner suggests that the cross may originally have marked the boundary of lands associated with St Neot's monastery and may have been a way 'to make claims on local land and power' at a time when marginal land was perhaps subject to English encroachment (Turner 2006a, 162). However this is surmise, based on an alleged threat to the monastery's lands and on the assumption that its lands extended 7 km north to the cross. But the fact that the monastery survived to

1086, when Domesday Book specifically records the theft of land from the clergy of St Neot by the Count of Mortain (Thorn and Thorn 1979, 4,28), in an act which led ultimately to the loss of the community, may imply that there had not been much threat a century earlier when the cross was erected. Oliver Padel suggests a possible alternative context for the cross, as a marker on the boundary of the secular manor of Fawton. The origin of Fawton is uncertain, but it was the primary manor of the Domesday hundred of the same name (Thorn and Thorn 1979, 5,1,1) and as such was a massive estate, whose lands may well have included the majority of the parish of St Neot and therefore have extended to the cross (or further: Henderson C. 1929c, 52). Assuming that Fawton had gained its comital status by the tenth century it would have been run by someone either of Anglo-Saxon background (or partly so), or with Anglo-Saxon cultural leanings (and trusted administratively by whoever was in charge of the county then). So the fashionable 'English' style of the monument may have been a deliberate and natural choice in such a context.

The original locations of Egloshayle 1, now at Pencarrow (p. 141, Ills. 60–1), and Warleggan 1, now at Glynn (p. 206, Ills. 238–40) are not known, although Warleggan 1 has a close relationship to the east–west route across the south side of Bodmin Moor via St Cleer 2 and 3, St Neot 1 and Cardinham 1, that was discussed above in relation to the Doniert stones and the Panelled Interlace group (Chapter IX, p. 86). Turner has suggested that Minster 1 (Waterpit Down, p. 168, Ills. 140–3, Colour Pl. 11), like St Neot 3 (the Fourhole Cross), may have marked the boundary of an estate associated with a pre-Norman church at Minster (Turner 2006a, 163–5). However the suggestion made above that St Neot 3 may alternatively have been associated with a secular estate bears consideration here too. It is also very close to Lesnewth whose name, *lys noweth*, 'new court' implies the court of a native Cornish ruler and, as Turner points out, to long-distance tracks over the downs here. Although in later times these headed for Camelford, one of them may have been the northern end of the *magnum iter plaustorum* (see above, p. 87, fn. 1), making this cross potentially similar to the Doniert stones (St Cleer 2 and 3) in relationship to both significant routeways and to a *lys*.

The cross at Prideaux Place, Padstow (Padstow 3, p. 178, Ills. 169–72) is now located 240 m (0.15 miles) from the church. Though its original context is lost, Oliver Padel (pers. comm.) has suggested that it may

have marked the privileged sanctuary that existed at Padstow. Alternatively, it might have been brought to Prideaux Place after the Reformation to act as an ornamental feature in the gardens (see catalogue, p. 180).

However, the majority of crosses in the Mid and East Cornwall group were set up in churchyards where, although some may be early Christian foundations (as with Lanhydrock with its place-name in **lann*, or Lanivet, where there are also two early inscribed stones), only those at Padstow were likely to have been associated with a major monastic house at the time they were carved. Quethiock, St Tudy and Lanhydrock were Domesday manors in 1086, the latter two in the ownership of St Petroc's Monastery at Bodmin. This is a suggestive relationship since Bodmin was noted earlier as being at the centre of the distribution of these monuments.

Indeed, the key to understanding this group is likely to be St Petroc's which, from the tenth century at least, was the most powerful monastery in Cornwall. Until at least the late tenth century, the monastery was based at Padstow, originally *Languithenoc*, where there were a privileged sanctuary and a shrine of its patron saint. However, at some point, the main focus of the monastery moved inland to Bodmin (Olsen 1989, 70–1), where it was recorded in 1086 and was, in the twelfth century, reconstituted as an Augustinian Priory (see Chapter IV, p. 32). Domesday Book records that St Petroc's holdings were extensive, and based mainly but not exclusively in the hundred of Pydar ('Petroc's Shire': see Padel 2010b, 212). The overall distribution of the Mid and East Cornwall group, and the particular concentration of monuments at Padstow, suggest that St Petroc's Monastery may have had a connection with the development of this group of sculpture and with the trefoil-headed crosses in particular. Even if it did not have a direct hand in commissioning and carving all the individual stones, it may, as an influential monastic centre, have had workshops with masons who could advise and teach, and lead by example.

The date at which St Petroc's moved from Padstow to Bodmin is uncertain (Orme 2010, 126–7), and the fact that sculpture of probably eleventh-century date exists at Padstow whereas none is known from Bodmin may suggest that it was later than has been sometimes assumed. However, by at least the second half of the eleventh century Bodmin had become the more important place and will have seen more development and disturbance than Padstow. So the stones at Padstow may not be the primary works associated with St Petroc's but a reflection of developments taking

place in Bodmin at the time, all traces of which have disappeared. Indeed, it seems a strong possibility that the royal patronage of St Petroc's (above, p. 30) and the re-location of the monastery to Bodmin, with the associated requirements for a new church, monastic and administrative buildings, may have created the innovative cultural milieu that these crosses imply.

Another point relevant to this argument is that a significant number of the trefoil-headed crosses (St Columb Major 1, Egloshayle 1, Padstow 1 and Pelynt 1) are cut not from the usual Bodmin Moor granite, but of a finer-grained stone, which would have enabled the execution of more detailed work. Pelynt 1 is carved from sandstone and St Columb 1, Padstow 1 and Egloshayle 1 are cut from greisen. The precise source of the stone used for the three greisen crosses is uncertain, but it is probably from the western end of the St Austell Granite (see Chapter II, pp. 13–14), which for Padstow 1 would have meant transportation of up to twelve or thirteen miles. The indication is of some experimentation with stone types, with masons going further afield for selected stone. This might be exactly what would be expected in the context of an extensive building programme which involved a search for quarries and new sources of stone.

Although it has been suggested that the trefoil-headed heads were the result of local innovation, a small number of examples are known elsewhere. There are two in Wales: a complete cross in north Wales at Dyserth (Nash-Williams 1950, 126; Edwards 1999, 9–13) and a fragment of a cross-head at St David's (Edwards 2007, 429–31, fig. 5.2 on page 52). That from north Wales is a disc-head on which the trefoil is not fully cut away, and the decoration shows strong Viking influence. However the St David's example appears strikingly similar to the Cornish monuments in the form of the 'cusp' and the double edge-mouldings which would have been carried around on the ring as well as the arms. In the one surviving arm are simple pattern E knots which, although not found on most of the Cornish trefoil heads, do appear on St Columb Major 1 (p. 140, Ills. 62, 64). Interestingly, Edwards suggests that the St David's fragment can be reconstructed as approximately 3 m high, with a head 93 cm across, and that it may have marked the boundary of the sanctuary there. These dimensions are well within the parameters for the Cornish group, and the location would be similar to that proposed for Padstow 3 (p. 180). Comparable also are examples at Laugharne and Llantwit Major (no. 1) in south Wales, and at Penmon in Anglesey, where trefoils decorate the space between the arms of straight-armed disc-

headed crosses (Edwards 2007, 221–2; Redknap and Lewis 2007, 369–73; Edwards 1999, 8, fig. 4; Nash-Williams 1950, 65–6). In these cases, the triquetras are presumably used as the best form of knot to decorate triangular spaces, and it may be from this that the cut-away triquetras or trefoils of the Cornish group (and St David's) evolved. Alternatively, the idea may have derived from the fashion prevalent in Ireland for inserting mouldings into the well-cut holes between the cross-arms, in all sorts of positions (see for example Harbison 1992, II, figs. 32, 117, 355, 473).

But despite these parallels, there is no doubt that the Cornish monuments are unique, for the foliage decoration which also characterises them is not something which is found in Wales or Ireland, other than in a very few examples: it is a feature of English sculpture, whether of the Viking-dominated parts of England like Yorkshire, Cumbria, or the West Midlands, or of Wessex and the south-east. It inevitably points to the fact that Cornwall, or at least St Petroc's, was at this period coming under increasing English influence.

TRANSITIONAL MONUMENTS WITH INCISED DECORATION

The monuments considered here are not a well-defined group either stylistically or geographically: they are linked more by the technique of their carving, which suggests that we may be looking at monuments of the transitional period, between the very end of the pre-Norman period and the beginning of the Romanesque. They are varied and have a wide geographical spread. While they share general characteristics with the pre-Norman monuments, in aspects of their design and execution they look forward to developments of the twelfth century. Some may even belong to the twelfth century. However none has decoration that could be regarded as properly Romanesque. These monuments help to demonstrate the problems faced in Cornwall in trying to draw a line at the end of the pre-Norman period, and in deciding which monuments should be included in the main catalogue and which should not. In Cornwall the carving of sculptured crosses was effectively a continuum from the late ninth century to the Reformation, and trying to draw lines between the different eras can be very difficult. These monuments therefore also serve to introduce the important group of later Cornish monumental sculpture summarised in the next chapter as the Continuing Tradition (p. 100).

Monuments included in this group are Lanteglos by Camelford 1 and 2, Lanivet 2, Penzance 1, Kenwyn

1 (Tregavethan, now at Eastbourne), Perranzabuloe 1 and Bodmin 1 (Carminow). Oddities in its appearance suggest that Phillack 1 should also be included in this group, even though its relationship to the Penwith group crosses is close; but the related Phillack 3 altar frontal is a more obvious example of a transitional monument.

To understand these monuments and their relationships it is helpful to summarise the types of ornament characterising early medieval monuments, to contrast with the features which are characteristic of later medieval sculpture. These attributes are then discussed in relation to the individual monuments in order to explain and justify the date which is accorded to each in the catalogue.

As this volume shows, Cornish sculpture which is demonstrably of early medieval type consists for the most part of free-standing crosses, so the discussion focuses on them. In almost all, the cross-head consists of four splayed arms linked by a supporting ring and with a boss at the centre. All-over decoration is a feature of these monuments and on the head this may consist of four triquetra knots or, in the case of the Penwith group, further bosses and a Crucifixion. On the shaft the varied decoration includes interlace, knotwork, foliage scrolls and frets. The decoration can be identified as being of early medieval date by comparison with dated examples in other media like metalwork and manuscripts; it is generally carved in relief, with a good understanding of the principles behind the often complex patterns.

By contrast, the later medieval Continuing Tradition monuments (catalogued in Appendix D, p. 231, and Ills. 285–337) are for the most part far simpler, although there are some examples with decorative features which may help in assigning broad dates to the plainer majority. Often the carving is limited to the shaping of the stone and the cutting of a cross on the head; if there is decoration it is usually incised or created by ‘sinking’ parts of the stone to create a false impression of relief. The wayside crosses of the Penwith area may feature Crucifixions on their heads, clearly derived from the earlier Penwith style monuments, but rendered more crudely and simply. Cross-heads are normally simple disc-heads (known as wheel-heads in Cornwall); plain latin crosses are thought to be a later type again. The most common further decoration includes incised zig-zags and diagonal crosses. Potentially datable features which are discussed further in Chapter X below include the type of cross on the head, chamfering of the shaft, the way the Crucifixion is rendered, chevrons, and

occasional examples of *fleur-de-lys*, chalice and wafer, and a sword. In some parts of the country, cross-slab grave-covers are a ubiquitous feature of the later medieval period. Cornwall does not have many of these but the decorative features of the wayside crosses are often comparable to them. After *c.* 1200, there are no inscriptions.

Monuments considered here to be transitional between early and later medieval styles of ornament may show some of the features of each group and exhibit stages of evolution towards the later medieval crosses. They may have some early medieval features but these can be used in a way which shows them to be misunderstood or misinterpreted. Although the group is varied, certain attributes which may be derived from early medieval forms do recur: these include an abundance of simple decoration, especially rows of dots, bosses (although they may be in unusual places), and roll-mouldings at the neck. The features which are more in common with later medieval crosses include the invariably incised decoration, a disc head, and a tendency in some to simpler ornament.

Of the varied crosses described here, there are two which have good reason to be considered pre-Conquest, because they have some pre-Norman-type decoration, although these appear alongside other features which are persuasive of a transitional date. The first is Phillack 1 (p. 193, Ills. 197–201), a churchyard cross which, with its relief-carved Crucifixion and five bosses on the head, is closely related to the Penwith group. However the merging of the cross-arms and ring has the effect of creating something more like a disc-head, and the bosses placed on the side of the ring are notable departures from the norm for an early medieval ring-headed cross. On the shaft, the decoration is all incised and consists exclusively of untidy angular plaitwork, in contrast with the varied decoration which is normally characteristic of the Penwith group. A late eleventh-century date has been suggested for this monument. The Crucifixion on this cross is similar to that seen on Phillack 3, a slab thought to be part of a stone altar (p. 195, Ill. 205): however on the latter the very simple outline image of Christ is incised, and other incised decorative elements include dots, which are discussed further below as features likely to indicate a transitional monument.

Lanivet 2 (p. 161, Ills. 119–23) is another monument whose rich all-over decoration is based to some extent on pre-Norman patterns, although like Phillack 1 it is less well executed, while the decoration is mainly incised and contains other non-mainstream elements. Lanivet 2’s decoration is all panelled, like



the early group which includes St Cleer 2 and 3 and St Neot 1 (p. 85); however the decoration within the panels includes rows of dots and incised crosses (some diagonal) alongside some very poorly executed key patterns where the concept behind this type of decoration is clearly little understood. The origin and meaning of the dots is uncertain: they may perhaps represent a simple attempt to render interlace, by showing the hollows between the crossing strands only. One panel of dots, near the bottom of face *A* is so neatly arranged that it may indeed denote interlace but others, for example the bottom panel on face *D*, are less tidily executed and less convincing as interlace. However, such dots are a recurring theme in sculpture of this group. On the shaft is an incised figure — a feature not found in Cornish pre-Conquest sculpture except in the Crucifixions of the Penwith group and in two small incised figures on the Penzance 1 cross, which is discussed below. Lanivet 2 stands in a churchyard alongside another cross (Lanivet 1) whose interlace and foliage-scrolls clearly indicate an early medieval date (p. 159, Ills. 114–18). Here, side by side, are two crosses which demonstrate the development taking place in Cornish sculpture in the eleventh century. With its purely early medieval decoration, Lanivet 1 seems likely to be the earlier (even though an origin in the eleventh century has been suggested for it), and Lanivet 2, with its incised work and misunderstanding of interlacing and frets appears later. A broad late eleventh-century date may therefore be acceptable for this monument. Lanivet 2 does not have a ring-head; instead it has a disc head whose form can be compared to that of Lanteglos 2, which is considered next, although it lacks the bosses in the spaces between the cross-arms.

If it can be accepted that Lanteglos by Camelford 1 and 2 are two parts of the same monument (p. 165, and see Fig. 17d, p. 58), then the combined stones add up to a cross whose separate parts are socketed together, with a tall, well-cut rectangular shaft which is plain apart from the inscription (Ills. 131–3), and a disc-head with widely flared cross-arms, a central boss, and four bosses carved in relief in each of the spaces between the cross-arms (Ills. 136–7). The cross, with its socketed parts, is reminiscent of early medieval monuments like St Cleer 2 and 3, and the bosses on the head can be compared with the Penwith group. However the lack of decoration, the actual arrangement of the bosses on the head, and the disc head represent a development away from these. The vertical arrangement of the inscriptions is surprisingly like that of the post-Roman inscriptions of Cornwall (discussed in Chapter VIII);

but they are particularly significant because they can be broadly dated. The inscription commemorates people with English names and is considered to be in early Middle English, possibly of the late eleventh or early twelfth century (p. 165). The features which this cross exhibits must therefore be of that date and may help in dating other similar monuments. The most significant attribute in this respect is the plain disc head with its roll-mouldings at the neck.

A rather more unusual type of disc head is seen on the Penzance 1 Market Cross, an impressive and unusual monument which also features panels of dots, some incised figures and vertically-set inscriptions (p. 186, Ills. 185–92). Careful mathematical analysis of the inscriptions has led Thomas to the conclusion that the cross is of early eleventh-century date (Thomas, A. C. 1999, 25–6): but here it is considered that the inscriptions, which in theory might be of help in dating, are so worn that they cannot be interpreted (see Ills. 191–2). However, examination of the form of this cross suggests that it should be dated rather later than the early eleventh century. While it is carefully designed, well carved, and has attributes which are similar to features of the earlier crosses, it is plain that it is derivative. For example, the head does not have a properly cut cross supported by a ring, but a solid oval disc on which the holes are indicated by incising or sinking four curved triangular segments. The shape of the cross thus defined is not unlike that of Gwinear 1 (Roseworthy, now at Lanherne, Ills. 94–7) or St Buryan 1 (Ills. 29–32), but it is not carved in relief. Moreover the roll-mouldings at the neck, which may represent the point on a true ring-headed cross where the cross-head joins the shaft (see this feature on Gwinear 1, for example), are reduced to small decorative projections (Thomas, A. C. 1967a, 90).

The decoration on the shaft, which consists for the most part of carefully laid-out panels filled with rows of incised dots, may, as Thomas has suggested, have a symbolic significance but again, the dots could have served to highlight painted interlace. Alternatively, the dots on this cross could simply have been a method of providing a textured surface and a chequer-board effect, and in this case it is tempting to look to the geometric designs of Romanesque art for parallels. Painted examples of such a chequer-board effect can be seen at Kempsey church, Gloucestershire, and St Albans Abbey (Zarnecki, Holt and Holland 1984, 29, 49). Beading appears commonly as a form of enrichment in Romanesque sculpture, though used rather differently as a type of moulding, and spots appear on the reconstructed paint scheme of the St



Paul's Cathedral sarcophagus, dated *c.* 1030, although here the use is not as part of a geometrical scheme, but to fill the creature's body (Wilson 1984, ill. 271; Zarnecki, Holt and Holland 1984, 149). So although these examples use their spots and beads in a rather different way from the dots on Penzance 1, they suggest that this form of enrichment may be acceptable in an eleventh- or twelfth-century context. In Chapter VII (p. 78) it was suggested that the simple incised figure just below the cross-head on face *A* could be a Crucifixion (Ills. 185, 189). However, if this is so, then again this is a much-debased version of the figures on the Penwith group crosses. Another feature on Penzance 1 which may suggest an early Norman date is the cross on the head, made by sinking and incising curved triangular areas. As will be shown in Chapter X (Continuing Tradition), this form compares with Norman Early Geometric cross designs, for example Almondbury I, west Yorkshire, dated by Ryder (1991, 10) to the late eleventh or twelfth century. In all, although it appears that much care has been taken with its design and execution, this monument appears to mark a development from the earlier sculpture, which though closely based on the pre-Norman crosses, marks progress anticipating the wheel-headed wayside crosses to be described in Chapter X.

The Penzance cross is so remarkably similar in its proportions and decorative features to a cross from the Truro area, now in Eastbourne (recorded here as Kenwyn 1, Tregavethan, p. 157, Ills. 103–9) that the two must be very closely related, perhaps even by the same sculptor, despite the fact that they were located some distance apart. However, on the Kenwyn cross, the design of the head has moved further from the original concept and the function of the holes has been forgotten so that three of them are placed where the cross-arms would normally be, at the top and sides; and the spaces between, in which are incised lines linked to fragments of an edge-moulding, form a diagonal St Andrew's cross. The panels of dots are very similar to Penzance 1, but some contain diagonal crosses, a motif which in Cornwall and elsewhere is also seen in a Romanesque context (compare the fonts at Roche and Southill: Sedding, E. 1909, pls. CXXXVIII and CXXLI) and again is found on the sculptures to be discussed below in Chapter X.

On the face of it, Perranzabuloe 1 (St Piran's Cross) has a water-tight claim to a pre-Conquest date. A grant of land at Tywarnhayle in Perranzabuloe, referred to in a charter of King Edgar dated AD 960 (Sawyer 1968, no. 684, p. 227; Hooke 1994, 28–33), has a feature described as a *cristelmael* in its boundary

clauses, at a point which should have been near the present location of this cross, and many have assumed that the *cristelmael* is identical with the extant cross (for example Hencken 1932, 267–8, 306). This would therefore suppose that the cross is of tenth-century date or earlier, and that all others like it must be of similar date. However, the decoration on the monument makes this argument difficult to sustain (p. 189, Ills. 193–6).

Stylistically, a tenth-century date for the cross seems unlikely because it is so much cruder than anything else which was being carved in Cornwall in the tenth century. If a tenth-century date is accepted for this cross, then it must also be accepted that it was being carved at the same time as, or even before, crosses for which a tenth-century date is acceptable on stylistic grounds, such as Cardinham 1, or Gwinear 1. These are competently executed monuments, carved in relief, with ring-heads, interlace, key patterns and scroll-work (Ills. 43–6, 94–7). Compared to these, the features of Perranzabuloe 1 are simple and crude, although the fact that the cross is so worn may in part explain this. However, with holes in the head placed to form a diagonal St Andrew's cross, and ubiquitous dot-decoration in simple panels, Perranzabuloe's closest resemblance is in fact with the better-executed but similar monuments at Eastbourne (Kenwyn 1, Tregavethan) and Penzance 1 or Bodmin 1 (Carminow). The fact that the Kenwyn cross may originally have come from the Truro area and therefore only 5 km (8 miles) from St Piran's Cross makes a relationship between the two a possibility. Perranzabuloe 1 also compares closely with Egloshayle 2 (the Three Holes Cross) and Gwinear 2, from Connor Downs (Ills. 297–300, 301–4). But on each of these, the decoration is simpler again and they may therefore be further (later?) copies of Kenwyn or St Piran's. Although it is difficult to be certain, they have been included here as examples of Cornwall's 'continuing tradition' (Appendix D, pp. 236, 237).

The Bodmin 1 (Carminow) cross is perhaps the least certain member of the main catalogue (p. 121, Ills. 8–12). Only the head and a short section of the shaft survive, but from this it is clear that this was a massive monument with a disc head, projecting roll-mouldings at the neck, unusual edge-mouldings which curl in at the top, and exuberant incised dot decoration extending like a rash over the head as well as the shaft. On one hand, its extreme size links this cross with other substantial early medieval monuments like Cardinham 1 or Quethiok 1 but on the other the disc head and incised dots ally it with the

transitional group. However the greater eccentricity introduced with the excess of dots and the peculiar edge-mouldings suggests a further movement away from early medieval forms.

Finally, the cross at Mertheruny chapel site (Wendron 3) is mentioned here even though it is recorded in Appendix D, *Continuing Tradition* (p. 248, Ills. 328–9). Like other monuments discussed above, the decoration includes rows of dots, some random and some in panels, a boss on the front of the shaft and on the side, mouldings between the head and the shaft, vertical sausage-like mouldings and some undecorated panels. But the feature that gives it its particularly unusual appearance is the head, which is over-large compared to the shaft and almost rectangular in shape. At the centre is a large boss and the cross is indicated by four sunken holes. Although none of the decoration is diagnostic, a date of about AD 1000 has been hazarded. This is based on the date proposed for the adoption of a former round as a chapel yard (Thomas, A. C. 1968b, 81–2). This in turn is based not on a stratigraphical relationship of the cross, but on intuition and the discovery here of bar-lug pottery. However, as the dating of bar-lug pottery has now been revised (Thorpe and Wood 2011, 280), so too must be the alleged date of the cross. Bar-lug is now considered to date from the eighth century to the twelfth, so even assuming that the cross relates to this, the date remains wide open, and it could be as late as the twelfth century. Some elements of the monument are like the Penzance 1 cross — the incised dot decoration, the moulding at the neck, the sunken holes in lieu of a cross — but overall it is cruder and far less well laid out. If Penzance 1 is to be dated to the late eleventh century or early twelfth century then Wendron 3, if not simply a rustic version of this or any other transitional monument, is later. However its shape and decoration compare most closely with a substantial stone at Roche which, because it has a sword on one side of the shaft, is considered further below, in Chapter X (*Continuing Tradition*); because of its similarity to this, Wendon 3 has been placed there too, although its date must remain uncertain until the excavation is re-evaluated and fully published.

Given the geographical spread of this varied group, discussion of context is of limited value. However it is worth noting that both Bodmin 1 (Carminow Cross) and Perranzabuloe 1 (St Piran's Cross) may have done duty as boundary markers, each perhaps in relation to

holdings of St Petroc's Monastery. Their significance in this respect is discussed further in their respective catalogue entries. Lanivet 2, close to Bodmin, may also have had a relationship with St Petroc's Monastery, although this is far from certain. It might therefore be tentatively suggested that St Petroc's Monastery, identified above as potentially leading the development of the trefoil-headed crosses, may also have been involved in the evolution of these transitional cross-forms towards the end of the eleventh century. On the other hand, Lanteglos by Camelford 1 and 2 and Penzance 1 may have an association with manors recorded in Domesday Book as demesne manors of the Count of Mortain.

Of the members of this group, only two have an original churchyard location. Instead, a number seems to have occupied strategic and prominent positions in the landscape. This is exemplified to the present day by St Piran's Cross (Perranzabuloe 1), which still stands in a ridge-top position, visibly cutting the skyline. Originally set here to mark the meeting of boundaries of possibly three manors, it must have lost its presence in the landscape when St Piran's church was built, arguably in the late twelfth century (Allan and Blaylock 2007, 31). Once the church was moved further inland due to encroaching dunes, the cross was left and so regained its former prominence (Colour Pl. 14). Having been moved several times, and located as it now is outside Penlee House, an art gallery and museum, the Penzance 1 Market Cross has lost any connection with its original context: however Cahill has suggested that in its original location the prominent ridge-top positioning of the cross may have suggested the name of Penzance, the 'Holy headland' (Cahill and Russell 2003, 13, 15). The original landscape setting of the massive Carminow Cross (Bodmin 1), which stands at the centre of a large and busy roundabout, is nowadays similarly difficult to perceive. However it is clear that as well as marking significant boundaries and roads, it stood at a watershed between the rivers flowing south and north to the estuaries of the Camel and Fowey; and although the land rose to the north to Castle Canyke, it may well have been positioned to be visible from lower ground nearby. Regrettably the original location of the Kenwyn 1 (Tregavethan) cross, now at Eastbourne, is far from certain but again an originally conspicuous location on higher ground is possible.