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<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54a</td>
<td>HODDOM 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54b</td>
<td>HODDOM 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54c</td>
<td>HODDOM 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55a</td>
<td>HODDOM 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55b</td>
<td>HODDOM 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56a</td>
<td>HODDOM 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56b</td>
<td>HODDOM 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56c</td>
<td>HODDOM 13 &amp; 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56d</td>
<td>HODDOM 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56e</td>
<td>HODDOM 17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57a</td>
<td>HODDOM 18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57b</td>
<td>HODDOM 19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57c</td>
<td>HODDOM 20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58a-d</td>
<td>HODDOM 22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59a-e</td>
<td>HODDOM 23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60a-d</td>
<td>HODDOM 24a &amp; b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61a-b</td>
<td>HODDOM 25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61c</td>
<td>HODDOM 26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61d</td>
<td>HODDOM 27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62a-d</td>
<td>HODDOM 28a &amp; b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63a-d</td>
<td>HODDOM 28a/b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64a-c</td>
<td>HODDOM 29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65a</td>
<td>HODDOM 24a, 28a/b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65b</td>
<td>HODDOM 32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65c</td>
<td>HODDOM 33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66a</td>
<td>HODDOM - church site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66b</td>
<td>HODDOM - air photograph</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67a-b</td>
<td>HODDOM - air photographs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68a-b</td>
<td>HODDOM - air photographs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>HODDOM - map</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Kirkcudbright**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plate</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70a</td>
<td>ARDWALL - Ardwall island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70b</td>
<td>ARDWALL 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70c</td>
<td>ARDWALL 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71a-b</td>
<td>ARDWALL 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71c</td>
<td>ARDWALL 13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plate 72a-b</th>
<th>ARDWALL 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plate 73a</td>
<td>ARDWALL 9/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 73b</td>
<td>ARDWALL 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 73c</td>
<td>ARDWALL 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 73d</td>
<td>ARDWALL 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 74a</td>
<td>ARDWALL 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 74b</td>
<td>ARDWALL 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 74c</td>
<td>ARDWALL 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 74d</td>
<td>ARDWALL 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 74e</td>
<td>ARDWALL 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 75a</td>
<td>ARDWALL 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 75b</td>
<td>ARDWALL 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 75c</td>
<td>ARDWALL 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 76a</td>
<td>ARDWALL 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 76b</td>
<td>ARDWALL 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 77a</td>
<td>ANWOTH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 77b</td>
<td>AUCHENSHINNOCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 78a</td>
<td>BRAIDENOCH HILL 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 78b</td>
<td>BRAIDENOCH HILL 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 79a-c</td>
<td>BRAIDENOCH HILL - present location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 80</td>
<td>CUMNOCK KNOWES - map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 81a-c</td>
<td>CUMNOCK KNOWES ('Dalshengan')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 82a</td>
<td>DALTALLOCHAN 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 82b</td>
<td>DALTALLOCHAN - map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 83a</td>
<td>HIGH AUCHENLARIE 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 83b</td>
<td>HIGH AUCHENLARIE 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 83c</td>
<td>HIGH AUCHENLARIE - present location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 84</td>
<td>HIGH AUCHENLARIE - map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 85a-b</td>
<td>KILTERLILTIE ('Argrennan')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 86</td>
<td>KILTERLILTIE - map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 87a-b</td>
<td>KIRKCLAUGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 88a-b</td>
<td>KIRKCLAUGH - maps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 89a-b</td>
<td>MINNIGAFF 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 90a-b</td>
<td>MINNIGAFF 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 91a-b</td>
<td>MINNIGAFF 1 - details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 91c</td>
<td>MINNIGAFF - present location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 92a-b</td>
<td>MINNIGAFF 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 93a</td>
<td>MOTE OF MARK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 93b-c</td>
<td>RASCARREL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 94a-b</td>
<td>RASCARREL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 94c</td>
<td>RASCARREL - bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 95a-b</td>
<td>RERRICK 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 95c-e</td>
<td>RERRICK 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 96a-c</td>
<td>STEWARTRY MUSEUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 97a-b</td>
<td>STROANFREGGAN 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 97c</td>
<td>STROANFREGGAN - cairn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 98</td>
<td>STROANFREGGAN 1 - detail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 99</td>
<td>TRUSTY'S HILL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Wigtown**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plate 100a</th>
<th>AIRY LICK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plate 100b</td>
<td>AIRYHEMMING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 100c</td>
<td>ARDWELL HOUSE ('Kirkmadrine K.8')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 101a</td>
<td>BARHOBBLE 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 101b</td>
<td>BARHOBBLE 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate Number</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 101c</td>
<td>BARHOBBLE 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 101d</td>
<td>BARHOBBLE 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 102a</td>
<td>BARMORE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 102b</td>
<td>BARMORE - ford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 103a-d</td>
<td>BOGHOUSE 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 103e-f</td>
<td>BOGHOUSE 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 104a</td>
<td>BRIGHOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 104b</td>
<td>BRIGHOUSE - air photograph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 105</td>
<td>CASSENDEOCH - map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 106a-b</td>
<td>CASSENDEOCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 106c</td>
<td>CASSENDEOCH - map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 107a</td>
<td>CHAPEL DONNAN 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 107b-c</td>
<td>CHAPEL DONNAN 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 108a</td>
<td>CHAPEL DONNAN - map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 108b</td>
<td>CHAPEL DONNAN - air photograph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 109a-b</td>
<td>CHAPEL DONNAN - chapel site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 110a-b</td>
<td>CRAIGLE Mine 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 110c-d</td>
<td>CRAIGLE Mine 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 111a-b</td>
<td>CRAIGLE Mine 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 112a-b</td>
<td>CRAIGLE Mine - maps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 113a-b</td>
<td>CRAIGNARGET 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 113c</td>
<td>SINNINESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 114a-b</td>
<td>DRUMMORE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 115</td>
<td>DRUMMORE - map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 116a-b</td>
<td>EAST RINGUEINA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 117a</td>
<td>ELRIG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 117b</td>
<td>GLENIRON SEVERAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 118a-b</td>
<td>GLAIK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 118c</td>
<td>INCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 119</td>
<td>GLENLUCE 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 120a</td>
<td>GLENLUCE 2-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 120b</td>
<td>GLENLUCE - churchyard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 121a-b</td>
<td>GLENLUCE 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 121c</td>
<td>GLENLUCE ABBEY 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 122a-b</td>
<td>HOUSE OF ELRIG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 122c</td>
<td>KILMORIE - present location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 123a-b</td>
<td>KILMORIE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 124a-b</td>
<td>KILMORIE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 125a-d</td>
<td>KIRKINNER 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 126a-d</td>
<td>KIRKINNER 1 - details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 127a-b</td>
<td>KIRKINNER 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 127c</td>
<td>KIRKMAIDEN - churchyard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 128a-b</td>
<td>KIRKMAIDEN 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 128c</td>
<td>KIRKMAIDEN 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 129a</td>
<td>GLASSERTON 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 129b</td>
<td>KNOCK 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 129c</td>
<td>KNOCK 2 ('Glasserton parish')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 130a-c</td>
<td>KIRKMADRINE 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 131a-b</td>
<td>KIRKMADRINE 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 132a-c</td>
<td>KIRKMADRINE 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 133</td>
<td>KIRKMADRINE 1-3 - Todd engraving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 134a-b</td>
<td>KIRKMADRINE 1-3 - SRO drawings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 135a-b</td>
<td>KIRKMADRINE - present location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 136a-b</td>
<td>KIRKMADRINE 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 136c</td>
<td>KIRKMADRINE 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 136d-e</td>
<td>KIRKMADRINE 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 137a</td>
<td>KIRKMADRINE 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 137b</td>
<td>KIRKMADRINE 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Plate 137c  KIRKMADRINE 11
Plate 138a  KNOCK OF LUCE
Plate 138b  KNOCK OF LUCE - chapel site
Plate 139  KNOCK OF LUCE - map
Plate 140a-b  LAGGANGARN 1
Plate 140c-d  LAGGANGARN 2
Plate 141a-c  LAGGANGARN - present location
Plate 142  LAGGANGARN - map
Plate 143a-c  LAGGANGARN FARM
Plate 144a-c  LARG LIDDESDALE
Plate 144d  LOCHNAW
Plate 145a-b  LONGCASTLE 1
Plate 146a  LONGCASTLE - map
Plate 147b  LONGCASTLE - air photograph
Plate 147a-b  LONGCASTLE 2
Plate 148a  LOW ELDRIG 1
Plate 148b-c  MAINS OF PENNINGHAME
Plate 149a-f  MAINS ('Whithorn 2')
Plate 150a  MAINS - detail
Plate 150b  MAINS - map
Plate 151  MAINS - map
Plate 152  MAINS - map
Plate 153a-b  MAY
Plate 154a-b  MONREITH
Plate 155a-b  MONREITH
Plate 156  MONREITH - map
Plate 157a  MOCHRUM
Plate 157b  PULTADIE
Plate 157c  RASNACH
Plate 158a  ST NINIANS CAVE R.1
Plate 158b  ST NINIANS CAVE R.2
Plate 158c  ST NINIANS CAVE R.4-7
Plate 159a  ST NINIANS CAVE R.4
Plate 159b  ST NINIANS CAVE R.5
Plate 159c  ST NINIANS CAVE R.6
Plate 159d  ST NINIANS CAVE R.7
Plate 160a  ST NINIANS CAVE R.8
Plate 160b  ST NINIANS CAVE R.9
Plate 160c  ST NINIANS CAVE R.10
Plate 161a-c  ST NINIANS CAVE 1
Plate 162a  ST NINIANS CAVE 3
Plate 162b  ST NINIANS CAVE 2
Plate 163a-b  ST NINIANS CAVE 4
Plate 163c  ST NINIANS CAVE 5
Plate 164a  ST NINIANS CAVE 8
Plate 164b  ST NINIANS CAVE 7
Plate 164c  ST NINIANS CAVE 9
Plate 164d  ST NINIANS CAVE 10
Plate 165a  ST NINIANS CAVE 6
Plate 165b-c  ST NINIANS CAVE 11
Plate 166a-b  ST NINIANS CAVE 12
Plate 166c-d  ST NINIANS CAVE 13
Plate 167a-b  ST NINIANS CAVE 14
Plate 167c  ST NINIANS CAVE 15
Plate 168a  ST NINIANS CAVE 16
Plate 168b  ST NINIANS CAVE 17
Plate 168c-d  ST NINIANS CAVE 18
Plate 169a  'SORBIE'
ABBREVIATIONS


IB. Royal Museum of Scotland, catalogue number prefix (early medieval sculpture).

MOD. Ministry of Defence (RAF air photographs per SDD).

MS. unpublished manuscript.

NMRS. National Monuments Record of Scotland, 6-7 Coates Place, Edinburgh.

NMAS. National Museum of Antiquities of Scotland (now RMS).

NMS. National Museums of Scotland.

NSA. *New Statistical Account of Scotland* (see Bibliography under NSA).

OS. Ordnance Survey.

PSAS. *Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland*.

RCAHMS. The Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical Monuments of Scotland.

RMS. Royal Museum of Scotland, Queen Street, Edinburgh.

SAS. Society of Antiquaries of Scotland.

SDD. Scottish Development Department.

SRO. Scottish Record Office, West Register House, Charlotte Square, Edinburgh.

TDGNHAS. *Transactions (formerly, Transactions and Journal of Proceedings) of the Dumfriesshire and Galloway Natural History and Antiquarian Society*.

Other abbreviations follow the Council for British Archaeology guidelines (CBA 1979, 25-31).
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<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volume / County / Sculpture Site</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>III/9 W AIRYHEMMING</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III/11 W AIRYLICK</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/295 K ANWOTH</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/354 K (Anwoth symbol stone, see TRUSTY'S HILL)</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/8 D APPLEGARTH</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/272 K ARDWALL 1</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/274 K ARDWALL 2</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/280 K ARDWALL 3</td>
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<td>II/280 K ARDWALL 4</td>
<td>280</td>
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<td>II/281 K ARDWALL 5</td>
<td>281</td>
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<td>II/281 K ARDWALL 6</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/282 K ARDWALL 7</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/283 K ARDWALL 8</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/284 K ARDWALL 9/16</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
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<td>II/284 K ARDWALL 10</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
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<td>II/285 K ARDWALL 11</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
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<td>II/286 K ARDWALL 12</td>
<td>286</td>
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<tr>
<td>II/286 K ARDWALL 13</td>
<td>286</td>
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<tr>
<td>II/287 K ARDWALL 14</td>
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<td>II/287 K ARDWALL 15</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/288 K ARDWALL 17</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/289 K ARDWALL 18</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/289 K ARDWALL 19</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/290 K ARDWALL 20</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/290 K ARDWALL 21</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/291 K ARDWALL 22/23/25/29</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/292 K ARDWALL 24</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/292 K ARDWALL 26</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/293 K ARDWALL 27</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/293 K ARDWALL 28</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III/16 W ARDWELL HOUSE (‘Kirkmadrine K.8’)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III/318 K (Argrenan, see KILTERLILITIE)</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/297 K AUCHENSHINNOCH (Woodlea, Dumfries)</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/10 D AUCHINLECK MOOR</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III/13 W ‘AVIEHOLLAND’/‘AIRIEOLLAND’</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III/18 W BALFERN</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III/19 W BARHOBBLE</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III/22 W BARHOBBLE 1-4</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III/23 W BARMORE</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/12 D BOATFORD 1 (Thornhill / Nith Bridge)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/25 D BOATFORD 2</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III/25 W BOGHOUSE 1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III/28 W BOGHOUSE 2</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/300 K BRAIDENOCH HILL 1</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/303 K BRAIDENOCH HILL 2</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/305 K (Broughton House, see CUMNOCK KNOWES)</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III/30 W BRIGHOUSE</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III/48 W (Carleton, see CRAIGLEMIN 3)</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III/32 W CASSENDEOCH</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III/35 W CHAPEL DONNAN 1
III/38 W CHAPEL DONNAN 2
II/26 D CLEUCH
II/28 D CLOSEBURN 1
II/37 D CLOSEBURN 2
III/40 W COLFIN
III/92 W (Corsewall, see KILMORIE)
III/41 W CRAIGLEMINE 1
III/46 W CRAIGLEMINE 2
III/48 W CRAIGLEMINE 3 (Carleton)
III/50 W CRAIGNARGET 1
III/56 W CRAIGNARGET 2
II/305 K CUMNOCK KNOWES
III/182 W (Curgie, see LOW CURGHIE)
II/39 D DALGARNOCK
II/305 K (Dalshangan, see CUMNOCK KNOWES)
II/308 K DALTALLOCHAN 1
II/311 K DALTALLOCHAN 2
II/40 D DRUMCORK (Morton)
III/57 W DRUMMORAL 1-2
III/58 W DRUMMORE
II/43 D DURRISDEER

III/65 W EAST RINGUINEA
III/66 W ELRIG
II/47 D FOREGIRTH
II/78 D (Friars Carse, see LAUCHMOOR)

III/68 W GLAIK
III/70 W GLASSERTON 1
III/72 W 'GLASSERTON 2' (Glasserton parish)
II/50 D GLENCAIRN 1
II/54 D GLENCAIRN 2 (Kirkland)
III/73 W GLENIRON SEVERAL
III/75 W GLENLUCE 1
III/79 W GLENLUCE 2-4
III/81 W GLENLUCE 5 (Kilncroft)
III/83 W GLENLUCE ABBEY 1
III/86 W 'GLENLUCE ABBEY 2'
II/55 D 'GRIERSON MUSEUM'

II/348 K (Hastings Hall, Moniave, Dumfries, see STROANFREGGAN 1)
II/312 K HIGH AUCHENLARIE 1
II/322 K HIGH AUCHENLARIE 2
II/198 D HODDOM 1a/1b
II/202 D HODDOM 1c/1d
II/206 D HODDOM 2
II/209 D HODDOM 3a
II/211 D HODDOM 3b
II/212 D HODDOM 3c
II/214 D HODDOM 3d
II/216 D HODDOM 4
II/218 D HODDOM 5
II/220 D HODDOM 6
II/221 D HODDOM 7
II/222 D HODDOM 8
II/223 D HODDOM 9
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11/224 D HODDOM 10
11/225 D HODDOM 11
11/226 D HODDOM 12
11/227 D HODDOM 13
11/228 D HODDOM 14
11/229 D HODDOM 15
11/230 D HODDOM 16
11/231 D HODDOM 17
11/232 D HODDOM 18
11/233 D HODDOM 19
11/234 D HODDOM 20
11/235 D HODDOM 21
11/236 D HODDOM 22
11/243 D HODDOM 23
11/246 D HODDOM 24a/b
11/249 D HODDOM 25
11/251 D HODDOM 26
11/252 D HODDOM 27
11/253 D HODDOM 28a/b
11/255 D HODDOM 29
11/257 D HODDOM 30
11/259 D HODDOM 31
11/260 D HODDOM 32
11/264 D HODDOM 33-65
11/58 D HODDOMCROSS
III/87 W HOUSE OF ELRIG

III/89 W INCH

III/92 W KILMORIE (Kirkcolm / Corsewall)
III/81 W (Kilnacroft, see GLENLUCE 5)
II/318 K (‘Kiltarlity’, see KILTERLILTIE)
II/318 K KILTERLILTIE (Argrennan)
II/322 K KIRKCLAUGH
III/92 W (Kirkcolm, see KILMORIE)
II/62 D KIRKCONNEL 1
II/64 D KIRKCONNEL 2
II/66 D KIRKCONNEL 3
II/67 D KIRKCONNEL 4
II/68 D KIRKCONNEL 5
II/70 D KIRKCONNEL 6
II/72 D KIRKCONNEL 7
II/74 D KIRKCONNEL 8
III/103 W KIRKINNER 1
III/111 W KIRKINNER 2 (Knockgray, Kirkcudbright)
III/114 W KIRKINNER 3
II/54 D (Kirkland of Glencairn, see GLENCAIRN 2)
III/117 W KIRKMADRINE 1
III/127 W KIRKMADRINE 2
III/130 W KIRKMADRINE 3
III/135 W KIRKMADRINE 4
III/137 W KIRKMADRINE 5
III/139 W KIRKMADRINE 6
III/141 W KIRKMADRINE 7
III/144 W ‘Kirkmadrine 8’ (see ARDWELL HOUSE)
III/145 W KIRKMADRINE 9
III/146 W KIRKMADRINE 10
III/147 W KIRKMADRINE 11
III/148 W KIRKMAIDEN 1
III/151 W KIRKMAIDEN 2
III/153  W  KNOCK 1
III/155  W  KNOCK 2 ('Glasserton parish')
III/159  W  KNOCK OF LUCE
III/111  W  (Knockgray, Kirkcudbright, see KIRKINNER 2)
II/195  D  (Knockhill, see HODDOM 1-21)

III/162  W  LAGGANGARN 1
III/165  W  LAGGANGARN 2
III/167  W  LAGGANGARN FARM
III/169  W  LARG LIDDESDALE
II/78  D  LAUCHMOOR (Friars Carse)
III/172  W  LOCHNAW
III/174  W  LONGCASTLE 1
III/178  W  LONGCASTLE 2
III/181  W  LONGCASTLE 3
III/181  W  LONGCASTLE 4
III/182  W  LOW CURGIE (Curgie)
III/185  W  LOW ELDRIG 1
III/187  W  LOW ELDRIG 2
II/80  D  LUCE

III/188  W  MAINS ('Whithorn 2') *
III/199  W  MAINS OF PENNINGHAME
III/202  W  MAY
II/326  K  MINNIGAFF 1
II/333  K  MINNIGAFF 2
III/204  W  MOCHRUM
III/207  W  MONREITH
II/40  D  (Morton, see DRUMCORK)
II/82  D  MOSSKNOW
II/337  K  MOTE OF MARK

II/12  D  (Nith Bridge, see BOATFORD 1)
II/86  D  ORCHARD
II/89  D  PENPONT 1
II/91  D  PENPONT 2
II/93  D  PENPONT 3
III/214  W  PULTADIE

II/339  K  RASCARREL
III/217  W  RASNACH
II/343  K  RERRICK 1
II/344  K  RERRICK 2
II/94  D  RUTHWELL 1
II/104  D  RUTHWELL 2
II/106  D  RUTHWELL 3
II/108  D  RUTHWELL 4

III/228  W  ST NINIAN'S CAVE R.1
III/229  W  ST NINIAN'S CAVE R.2
III/230  W  ST NINIAN'S CAVE R.3
III/231  W  ST NINIAN'S CAVE R.4
III/232  W  ST NINIAN'S CAVE R.5
III/233  W  ST NINIAN'S CAVE R.6
III/234  W  ST NINIAN'S CAVE R.7
III/235  W  ST NINIAN'S CAVE R.8
III/236  W  ST NINIAN'S CAVE R.9
III/236  W  ST NINIAN'S CAVE R.10
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>III/239</td>
<td>W ST NINIAN'S CAVE 1 (C.4) *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III/244</td>
<td>W ST NINIAN'S CAVE 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III/246</td>
<td>W ST NINIAN'S CAVE 3 (C.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III/249</td>
<td>W ST NINIAN'S CAVE 4 (C.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III/251</td>
<td>W ST NINIAN'S CAVE 5 (C.16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III/253</td>
<td>W ST NINIAN'S CAVE 6 (C.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III/254</td>
<td>W ST NINIAN'S CAVE 7 (C.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III/255</td>
<td>W ST NINIAN'S CAVE 8 (C.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III/257</td>
<td>W ST NINIAN'S CAVE 9 (C.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III/258</td>
<td>W ST NINIAN'S CAVE 10 (C.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III/259</td>
<td>W ST NINIAN'S CAVE 11 (C.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III/261</td>
<td>W ST NINIAN'S CAVE 12 (C.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III/263</td>
<td>W ST NINIAN'S CAVE 13 (C.18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III/264</td>
<td>W ST NINIAN'S CAVE 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III/265</td>
<td>W ST NINIAN'S CAVE 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III/266</td>
<td>W ST NINIAN'S CAVE 16 (C.11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III/269</td>
<td>W ST NINIAN'S CAVE 17 (C.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III/271</td>
<td>W 'ST NINIAN'S CAVE 18' (C.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/110</td>
<td>D SANQUHAR 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/111</td>
<td>D SANQUHAR 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III/273</td>
<td>W SINNINESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III/276</td>
<td>W 'SORBIE'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/112</td>
<td>D STAPLEGORDON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/345</td>
<td>K STEWARTRY MUSEUM (unknown provenance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/348</td>
<td>K STROANFREGGAN 1 (Hastings Hall, Dumfries)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/352</td>
<td>K STROANFREGGAN 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/12</td>
<td>D (Thornhill, see BOATFORD 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/354</td>
<td>K TRUSTY'S HILL (Anwoth)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/115</td>
<td>D UPPERCROSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/117</td>
<td>D WAMPHRAY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/126</td>
<td>D WAUCHOPE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III/278</td>
<td>W WEST CROSHIE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III/188</td>
<td>W ('Whithorn 2' * - see MAINS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III/285</td>
<td>W WHITHORN 1 (1) *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III/290</td>
<td>W WHITHORN 2 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III/294</td>
<td>W WHITHORN 3 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III/297</td>
<td>W WHITHORN 4 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III/299</td>
<td>W WHITHORN 5 (36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III/302</td>
<td>W WHITHORN 6 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III/311</td>
<td>W WHITHORN 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III/313</td>
<td>W WHITHORN 8 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III/316</td>
<td>W WHITHORN 9 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III/319</td>
<td>W WHITHORN 10 (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III/322</td>
<td>W WHITHORN 11 (37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III/324</td>
<td>W WHITHORN 12 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III/326</td>
<td>W WHITHORN 13 (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III/328</td>
<td>W WHITHORN 14 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III/330</td>
<td>W WHITHORN 15 (38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III/332</td>
<td>W WHITHORN 16 (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III/334</td>
<td>W WHITHORN 17 (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III/336</td>
<td>W WHITHORN 18 (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III/338</td>
<td>W WHITHORN 19 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III/340</td>
<td>W WHITHORN 20 (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III/342</td>
<td>W WHITHORN 21 (40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III/344</td>
<td>W WHITHORN 22 (29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III/346</td>
<td>W WHITHORN 23 (30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III/347</td>
<td>W WHITHORN 24 (28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folder</td>
<td>Path</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III/348</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III/349</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III/351</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III/353</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III/355</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III/358</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III/360</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III/362</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III/363</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III/365</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III/367</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III/369</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III/370</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III/371</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III/373</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/297</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 1
Introduction

Aims

The customary pessimism with which any attempt to discuss the context of early medieval sculpture is usually regarded is summed up in a recent statement by an historian: "The distribution of inscribed stones, for example, may to some extent be representative of settlement patterns: it is not unreasonable to suppose that it broadly represents areas that were inhabited, but it is perfectly clear that it is useless as a precise indicator, since many stones have been moved from their original positions, and since the communities of some areas did not adopt the practice of erecting them" (Davies 1982, 19).

This is largely because it is not common practice to examine all the available evidence, so that it has not usually been possible to which stones can be closely tied to a precise find-spot, and which must be regarded as unprovenanced. In this thesis I have therefore made it a primary concern to examine in detail the context in which each sculptured stone in the Dumfries and Galloway Region was discovered. By the use of this evidence, like scatters of pottery located during fieldwalking, one may identify potentially datable activity at specific sites, in an area where there is limited historical evidence for the early medieval period, and where few sites dated to this period have been identified until recently.

The other qualification made by Davies is also examined in detail here: the pattern of clusters and blank areas when the distribution of the original find-spots is plotted on a map, and the extent to which defined groups of sculpture are limited to specific areas. This data has been co-ordinated with other, non-sculptural evidence where
available to examine the reasons for these groupings, and to test if economic, administrative or cultural factors can be recognised.

The Region

The Dumfries and Galloway Region was chosen because it includes a diverse range of monuments varying between the inscribed stones at Whithorn and Kirkmadrine, the Ruthwell cross, and a number of monuments of great potential interest which have hardly been discussed. It is likely that this is because of the ambiguous location of the region, north of the border with England, but to the south of the area of Scotland where the Pictish symbol stones are concentrated. Recent survey in Argyll to the north and Cumbria to the south has shown the potential of this western maritime area (RCAHMS 1971 to 1992; Bailey & Cramp 1988). The remarkable diversity of monuments in this region, as will be shown below, relates to this balance between its location in the Irish Sea province and the influx of influence on its eastern border.

Method

In Volume 1 the sculpture will be analysed into stylistic groups within areas defined by the former counties of Dumfries, Kirkcudbright and Wigtown, and working from east to west. This approach, which may appear questionable, will be shown to produce clear regional groupings, and also serves to highlight sculpture that appears divorced from the stylistic repertoire of its area, but can be shown to have links with defined groups outside the region. The presence and absence of different motifs in different areas is emphasised. In addition the iconography of the major decorated pieces is considered, in order to try and understand the intellectual background to these
monuments.

This synthesis is underpinned by the other primary aim of this thesis, which was to analyse the antiquarian and other records in order to establish the provenance of each piece of sculpture within the region, and if possible its context. Once the history of each discovery is established, it becomes possible to decide if field work at the site is likely to be productive, or if the stone must be considered unprovenanced. The earliest known position of a number of major monuments is established here for the first time, and their potential for further fieldwork or excavation is assessed.

Because this process is unique to each stone, the detailed history and analysis of the monuments is considered on a stone by stone basis in Volumes 2 and 3, together with the descriptions of the ornament. The evaluation and synthesis of the stylistic elements, which inevitably involves intra and extra regional comparisons, is separated from the detailed factual material of the Catalogue and is considered in Volume 1. This approach on two separate fronts allows in certain cases for the recognition that defined types of sculpture are found at specific types of site. It also establishes the carvings as field monuments, with the potential for defining settlement patterns, particularly if the ornamental repertoire or the form of the monument implies cultural contacts with historically documented, or deduced, population movements or political takeovers.

The historical data for this area is patchy and incomplete and has recently been surveyed in other works (Oram & Stell 1991; Brooke forthcoming a and b). But there are supplementary chapters on the administrative evidence for Hoddom and Whithorn, as these will be shown to act as major foci for the sculpture.
For similar reasons a decision has been taken not to discuss the Ruthwell cross, Dumfriesshire (RUTHWELL 1) in detail in this thesis. This piece, which has generated an enormous bibliography and is also the subject of co-operative research by a number of eminent scholars at present, has dominated discussion of sculpture in this region. To discuss RUTHWELL 1 properly in the present context would require an excessive amount of space at the expense of the rest of the sculpture, which has been comparatively neglected. In addition, little new can be said about this piece in the terms of reference of this thesis which have been set out above, although the detailed re-examination of the HODDOM material here clarifies the local context in which this cross was produced.

The Catalogue and Gazetteer

In Volumes 2 and 3 the material is presented in the form of a descriptive catalogue of the sculpture, and a gazetteer of the sites where the stones were found, based on previously published evidence, fieldwork, museum visits, and documentary research. The Catalogue and Gazetteer is divided into the three pre-1975 counties of Dumfries, Kirkcudbright and Wigtown (see Chapter 2), and each stone is described in detail following the terminology devised for the Corpus of Anglo-Saxon Sculpture (Cramp 1984a), which derived its analysis of interlace from the unpublished thesis of Gwenda Adcock (Adcock 1974).

Each entry is headed by the name of the site of discovery with its National Grid Reference, the modern Parish, the pre-1975 County, and the post May 16th 1975 District and Region. In a number of cases this differs from the name or names given to the stone previously, which may refer to the parish or the nearest town. Alternative names are given in brackets, and the reason for these is usually clear from the
Evidence for Discovery section below. The spelling of names follows current Ordnance Survey practice (i.e. Hoddom rather than Hoddam). The names of the sites where sculpture has been found are given in capitals throughout the thesis, i.e. HODDOM.

There is a brief classification of the monument type, and its dimensions are given in centimetres. If part of the stone is now concealed, the visible measurement is followed by a plus sign, with the full recorded measurement, if available, in brackets. The faces of the stone are then described following the sequence outlined in the General Introduction to the Corpus of Anglo-Saxon Sculpture (Cramp 1984a, xiii), with A being one broad face, and B, C, D the remaining faces, moving anti-clockwise around the stone. Description starts at the top of each face, and when subdivided, each panel is numbered i, ii, iii, etc. (loc. cit.).

The Descriptions are intended to be read in conjunction with the plates in Volume 4, in order to draw attention to details of the ornament and technique used that may not be apparent unless the stone itself has been seen and inspected in detail. Inevitably these sections are difficult to read, but it is shown in the Catalogue that a number of previously accepted illustrations and descriptions are either misleading or wrong.

This is followed by the Evidence for Discovery. This section tries to establish in detail the earliest known position of the sculptured stone and its subsequent movements, and comments on the results of fieldwork at the probable site. Supplementary evidence is discussed in footnotes. The Present Location of the stone is described finally, with its National Grid Reference if this differs from the site of discovery. For stones now in museums the accession number is given. All the published references consulted are listed in
chronological order. Unpublished and undated material is listed in a second column.

The Evidence for Discovery sections are the principal means of discussing the contexts of the sculpture, and include references to fieldwork, documentary and archive research (particularly in the National Monuments Record), early maps and air photographic coverage. It has not been possible to undertake either remote sensing or excavation on any site, but a list of sculpture sites identified as meriting further work is given in Table 1 and discussed in the Conclusions.

The main omission here is a petrological analysis of the stones, as undertaken for the Corpus of Anglo-Saxon Sculpture (Cramp 1984b, 13; Bailey & Cramp 1988, 7-9), recent Royal Commission volumes (RCAHMS), and in particular the work on Roman milestones by Sedgley (1975). The survey work for all these projects was undertaken by professional geologists. In the latter case samples were drilled from the stones themselves, and examined in hand specimen and thin section (Sedgley op. cit., 4-5). It was consequently decided that untrained guesswork or transcribing previously published opinions here was likely to be both misleading and out of keeping with the intended level of research elsewhere in the Catalogue (though some general identification of stone types is included in the descriptions). As a result, such a survey remains to be done in this region; but it is not clear whether it would be possible to locate quarry sites for the sculpture without a detailed reference collection for the area being available. Nevertheless this could be an interesting subject for further research.
1. Though see Davies 1982, 188.


3. See Chapter 5.

4. The Whithorn excavations, which have massively increased our knowledge of the sparsely documented growth of a major ecclesiastical centre, began the year after field work for this thesis was started.

5. See Volume 2, p. 103.

6. Major monuments affected by a change of name include the Nith Bridge cross, Thornhill, Dumfriesshire, which is referred to here as BOATFORD 1, as it is located on Boatford farm west of Thornhill; and the 'Petri Apystoli' inscribed stone found south of Whithorn, on MAINS farm. Stones are listed by their alternate names in the Index of Sculpture at the beginning of Volume 1 and at the start of each catalogue in Volumes 2 and 3.

7. All sculpture now in public museums is listed in Tables 13 to 17.
CHAPTER 2
Regional Background

Modern Administrative Terminology
The Dumfries and Galloway Region consists of the three pre-
1975 counties of Dumfriesshire, the Stewartry of Kirkcudbright and
Wigtownshire. The latter two counties are collectively known as
Galloway. Following the local government reorganisation on May 16th
1975, the region was subdivided into four districts with new
boundaries: Annandale and Eskdale, Nithsdale, Stewartry, and Wigtown.
The borders of the old counties and new districts are shown in Fig. 3.
The Catalogue and Gazetteer is divided into the three old counties to
simplify comparison with earlier work, but the modern districts are
also given. For the purposes of this thesis, Annandale and Eskdale
District is equivalent to the eastern part of Dumfriesshire, and
Nithsdale District to the western part. Stewartry District is similar
to Kirkcudbright, and Wigtown District to Wigtownshire. The only
sculpture site affected by the boundary changes is MINNIGAFF, which
was formerly in Kirkcudbright and is now in Wigtown District.

Location and Relief
Dumfries and Galloway stretches 93 miles (150 km) from east
to west and occupies an area of some 2400 square miles (6300 sq km).
It forms the south western peninsula of Scotland, flanked by the
sea to the south and west, facing English Cumbria across the Solway
estuary, and the Down and Antrim coasts of Northern Ireland, some 22
miles (35 km) to the west. There are approximately 210 miles (338 km)
of coastline. The northern border is a natural boundary formed by
the mountainous watershed of the Southern Uplands, which rises to
an average summit level of 1,600 to 2000 ft (490 to 600 m). Much of
the northern half of the region is moorland above the 400 ft (120 m) contour (see Fig. 4), which extends south to the coast at Cairnsmore of Fleet, forming a natural barrier east of the river Cree between the Wigtown district and the Stewartry. There is a further strip of coastal moorland around the Criffel granite outcrop east of Kirkcudbright. As a result, the parts of the region below 400 feet are largely confined to the southern and western coastal margins (Hare 1942a, 392-9).

The low lying coastal area between the rivers Esk and Nith in Dumfriesshire is nowadays good farmland, but it was formerly interspersed with ill-drained mosses, as at Lochar, which hampered agriculture and communications (McIver 1945, 229-30, 252-3). The fertile lowland area of Kirkcudbright is sandwiched between the moorland region of the Glenkens to the north-west and the Criffel granite outcrop along the coast. A greater proportion of Wigtownshire is low lying farming country, especially the Machars and the Rhins peninsula bordering Luce bay, but the upper reaches of the Tarf water and the northern part bordering on Ayrshire is moorland rising to 1000 ft (320 m) and covered with peat flows which extend to the coast west of Port William (Hare 1942a, 352; Hare 1942b, 410).

Communications

Behind the coastal plains the region is subdivided by a series of river valleys running north-south from the Southern Upland watershed to the Solway (Fig. 6). These provide the only means of communication with areas to the north other than by sea. They are also comparatively low lying and fertile, and by providing a focus for settlement, divide the region into blocks of territory that appear
in the earliest records (Barrow 1975, 127) and survive as local administrative districts to the present day. These valleys tend to restrict access and funnel communication northwards through the Southern Uplands. East-west travel is against the grain of the country and can only be attempted along limited routes, either through the exposed moorlands to the north, or in the south of the region, where it is complicated by the necessity of finding fords or ferries across the broader lowland beds of the rivers. It has been shown that the position of fords determined the road pattern in the medieval period (Barrow 1984, 60).¹ The river Cree and Wigtown Bay in particular form a natural barrier between Wigtownshire and the Stewartry, and this is reflected in the name of the river.²

As a result of this series of bottlenecks in either direction, and the long indented Solway coastline, the region is both dependent on the sea and partly isolated from the Scottish Lowlands to the north and east. This is reflected in the survival of the Lordship of Galloway within the medieval Scottish kingdom until 1160 (Barrow 1975, 129), and the probable incorporation of the area within the independent British kingdom of Cumbria or Strathclyde at an earlier period (Kirby 1962; Wilson 1966).

But this region of coastal plain and narrow valleys enclosed by moorland is situated at a prime site in the Western Seaways which link the region both north and south (Fig. 2). The long Solway coast, as well as adjoining Cumbria to the south, forms the northern perimeter of the Irish Sea basin which includes the Isle of Man, North Wales and the east coast of Ireland. The hammer-headed western peninsula of Galloway, the Rhins, faces onto the 22 mile (35 km) wide corridor of the North Channel which links the Irish Sea with the Western Isles.
of Scotland and the North Atlantic seaways, while providing sheltered
anchorages in Loch Ryan to the north, and Luce Bay to the south. The
coasts of Down and Antrim lie parallel with this peninsula, and the
Isle of Man is only 19 miles (30 km) south of Burrow Head on the east
side of Luce Bay near Whithorn. Both these areas, and the hills of
the Lake District, are easily seen on a clear day. Five of the
provenanced sculpture sites in Galloway, including ARDWALL ISLE and
ST NINIAN'S CAVE, lie within 100 m of the sea.

Dumfriesshire differs from Galloway to the west in view of its
pivotal position between England and Scotland. Because the central
region of the Border country is dominated by the Cheviots there are
a limited number of through-routes that can be used around the head of
the Solway. Therefore the Dumfriesshire valleys of the Esk, Annan and
Nith determined the line of Roman penetration into Scotland on the
west (Margary 1973, 455-66, nos. 7f, 89, 76, 77; Ordnance Survey
1978), and the same restricted through-routes have been followed by
the railways and modern motorways, though this obscures the use in
the medieval period of a number of fords at the head of the Solway
(McIntyre 1939, 152-70). But it is noticeable that it has been very
difficult to prove that any Roman road ran west from Nithsdale,
despite the forts discovered at Glenlochar (Richmond & St Joseph
1950-52, 1-16) and Gatehouse of Fleet (St Joseph 1983, 222-34), and
similarly the railway to Stranraer only ran for a short period from
east to west, and now loops up through Nithsdale and along the
Ayrshire coast.

There is a brief mention of a road in Annandale in a 12th-century
charter³ (Lawrie 1905, 162), but the main evidence for highways in the
later medieval period comes from the Lord High Treasurer’s accounts
for royal pilgrimages to Whithorn, which list the stopping-places on the route (e.g. Dickson 1877, 356; Balfour Paul 1901, 373-4). Probable medieval tracks, such as the Old Edinburgh Road running north-east from MINNIGAFF, or the pack road south of Carsphairn, near the cross-slabs on BRAIDENOCH HILL, only survive in short stretches (Anderson 1968, 215, 219). See Fig. 12.

Land Use and Economy

The relief map, Fig. 4, has been drawn following the principals outlined by McIver: "... the relief shown includes the use of two very important contours, 400 ft and 800 ft, which have been chosen because each seems to indicate a line of some geographical importance: the upper limit of arable farming and of woodland respectively. Indeed, altitude is the most important single factor affecting land use" (McIver 1945, 224).

Most of the upland areas in the region are of little agricultural value. To the east in Dumfriesshire the hills are gently undulating but reach altitudes of 2000 ft (600 m) or more. In the central and northern parts of Kircudbright there are mountains over 2600 ft (800 m). In Wigtownshire the terrain is generally much lower, but the high rainfall from the prevailing south-west winds has meant that much of the land above 300 ft (90 m) is covered by peat flows. These areas are only of use for rough grazing (Yates 1984, viii).

The more fertile agricultural land in the valleys and along the coastal plains is nowadays used for beef and dairy farming and there is also some arable despite the maritime climate (Hare 1942a; Hare 1942b; McIver 1945). At an earlier date this was restricted by difficulties of drainage, and in the 17th century sheep, goats and
cattle were the main stock (Mitchell 1907, 100-1). The limited area available for agriculture is shown on the Land Use Capability maps in Bown & Shipley 1982 and Bown, Shipley & Bibby 1982. It will be noted later that there is a close connection between the best soils and sculpture carved in relief.

Stone dykes were introduced to Galloway in 1720-23 with the increasing value of cattle breeding for the newly opened English market (Hare 1942a, 362-4), and it is likely that the re-use of sculpture in field walls dates from this period of enclosure.

But cattle breeding appears to have been of primary importance in the early Middle Ages, and a conspicuous source of wealth amongst the landowners who may have commissioned the sculpture. In the reign of William the Lion (1165-1214) the penalty fixed by the justices of Galloway for a breach of the King’s Peace was twelve score cows and three bulls, a fine that could only have been paid if the cattle population was extensive (Haldane 1971, 161; Innes 1844, 378). 6

Geology

The underlying solid geology of the region has had less influence on the economy, but it is worth examining this factor briefly as there appears to be an element of geological determinism in the distribution of certain types of sculpture in particular areas.

South of the Southern Upland Fault, which marks the northern limit of the region, are two broad bands of Ordovician and Silurian greywackes and shales, covering most of the region and lying on a north-east/south-west axis. These are interrupted by a number of igneous intrusions, in particular the three granite masses of Criffel, Cairnsmore of Fleet and Merrick within the Stewartry District. In the
west of the region the Rhins peninsula is separated from the area of Glenluce by a neck of alluvium overlying a Permian trough under Luce Bay and Loch Ryan. Along the Stewartry coast to the south of the granite intrusion is a narrow band of Paleozoic carboniferous limestone. This continues eastwards into Dumfriesshire in the area between Annan and Lockerbie, running parallel with the Ordovician and Silurian formations to the north. These bands are punctuated at several key points by beds of Permian and Triassic sandstone, in particular in the lowland area between Annan and Canonbie, in Annandale around Lochmaben and northwards towards Moffat, in the lower Nith valley around Dumfries, and around Thornhill in upper Nithsdale (Greig 1971). See Fig. 8.

It should be noted that these New Red Sandstone outcrops all fall within Dumfriesshire and coincide with the river valleys and low lying areas previously described as the main points of entry into the region. Conversely this material does not appear to be available in the Galloway strata, except in the narrow Permian trough between Glenluce and the Rhins. It may be suggested therefore that the limited distribution of certain styles of carving may have been governed by the availability of suitable stone in the area, and that there is a link between the beds of sandstone in the east and three-dimensional crosses carved in moulded relief, and a similar link is evident in the occurrence of two dimensional disk-headed slabs only in the area to the west dominated by greywackes and hard shales (Fig. 9).
1. See the farm-name BOATFORD near the Nith Bridge cross; and the Cumbrian name PENPONT, or ‘bridgend’ (Jackson 1963, 79; Barrow 1984, 61). Both sites lie on the route described below in note 4.

2. The river Cree, which divides the pre-1975 counties of Wigtown and Kirkcudbright, contains the Gaelic element ‘crioch’, meaning boundary. The name, however, is found in documents which predate the creation of the Stewartry of Kirkcudbright in 1369 (Nicolaisen 1966, 332). This early boundary appears to be discernible in the distribution of the sculpture (see p. 184).

3. A charter of David I (1124-53), issued at STAPLEGORDON in Eskdale, ordered travellers to keep to the ‘recta via nominata’ (Lawrie 1905, 162, no. 99; Barrow 1984, 51). This probably followed the line of the Roman road.

4. The medieval pilgrimage route from Edinburgh to the shrine of St Ninian at Whithorn entered the region via the Well Path at DURRISDEER, on the line of the former Roman road (Margary op. cit., no. 77), and ran west via PENPONT, St John’s Town of Dalry and MINNIGAFF to PENNINGHAME, WIGTOWN and WHITHORN (Dickson 1877, 356; Balfour Paul 1901, 373-4; M’Kerlie 1906b, 429; M’Kerlie 1916, 79-80; Graham 1979, 69-73; Stell 1986, 22). See Fig. 12. The sculpture at these places is clearly early, predating the apparent revival of the see in 1120 (see p. 53), but it is possible that a number of the plain wayside crosses in the uplands of the Stewartry were related to this traffic, as well as the LAGGANGARN stones, Wigtown, which stand near the Purgatory burn. This site appears to be on the other medieval route to Whithorn, down from Ayrshire via GLENLUCE or Kirkcowan.
5. The Talnotrie silver hoard, c. AD 875 (Maxwell 1912-13, 12-6; Graham-Campbell 1975-76, 118), was found on the line of this route (NX 487 716).

6. G.D.B. Jones has noted the lack of field systems associated with settlement sites north of the Solway in the pre-Roman and Roman periods (Jones 1983, 187-8). The sites are commonly surrounded by univallate enclosures, suggesting that stock rearing also predominated at an earlier date. See also Jobey 1971; Jobey 1972-74.
CHAPTER 3
Historical Background

Documentary evidence

The dearth of documentary evidence for this region in the pre-Norman period means that no proper historical review is possible. The references by Bede and other sources to the establishment of an Anglian bishopric at Whithorn are reviewed in detail below. The significance of this regional centre of administration and its continued influence will be discussed in Chapter 20. The evidence for Hoddom is much more circumstantial and only relates to that site. It is therefore discussed in Volume 2 as part of the review of evidence for that site (II, 180).

Place-names

Recent detailed reviews of the evidence for Northumbrian and Viking settlement in Galloway have been provided in papers by Daphne Brooke (forthcoming a; forthcoming b). This evidence will be referred to, but it is not proposed to summarise her unpublished work here.

Other work on place-names in the area has established a strong Scandinavian presence in Dumfriesshire (Fellows-Jensen 1985a), but it must be noted that there is no documentary evidence for this, or for the preceding Anglian settlement of the area. Since the prime evidence for this is the sculpture, such as the Ruthwell cross, aspects of Anglian control over the region cannot be discussed until the Conclusions. Similarly, assumptions of Scandinavian control of Galloway have been based on the distribution of a particular type of sculpture (Chapter 20), and an interpretation of the place-names that has now been challenged (see Oram & Stell 1991). These arguments
will be summarised at the appropriate points, as their implications cannot be discussed separately from the sculpture. The lack of close correlation between sculpture and place-names in most areas, and the palimpsest of different name-forms, means that the implications of the two types of evidence can only be discussed in a few very specific instances in the far west of the region (see Chapters 24 and 25).

The type of early ecclesiastical place-name identified by Flanagan in Ireland (1979; 1981-82; 1983; 1984) has not been recognised in this region, with the exception of the *eccles* name discussed under BOATFORD 1 (II, 23). The implications of *kil*- and *kirk*- type place-names have been subject to recent revision, and will again be discussed in the appropriate sections below (Macqueen 1956a; Nicolaisen 1960; Brooke 1983; Fellows-Jensen 1987a).

**Archaeology**

Work on the archaeology of the region is summarised in Chapter 5 below. The impact of the current excavations at Whithorn (Hill 1984 - Hill 1990-91) cannot be properly assessed here, but the relevance of this recent work for our understanding of the sculpture will be discussed in Part III below, although none of the sculpture from these excavations is included here.
CHAPTER 4
The Anglian Bishopric of Whithorn

Part I

No documentary evidence for the area of Dumfries and Galloway can be recognised which predates the two references to Anglian control of the bishopric of Candida Casa given in Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica*, III.4 and V.23 (Plummer 1896, I, 133, 351; Colgrave & Mynors 1969, 222, 558, 560). The first of these will be discussed below. The second names Candida Casa as one of the four sees of the province of Northumbria, and states that the bishopric is of recent foundation, with Pehthelm as the first bishop, and that its foundation was due to a recent increase in the number of believers (Colgrave & Mynors 1969, 558-61). It is not stated how the increase came about, whether through an expansion of political control over a region already Christian, or through conversion of a pagan rural population. In this passage it is apparent that unlike Hexham, Lindisfarne and York, there is some ambiguity in how the see is named, since Bede refers to "in ea quae Candida Casa vocatur". It is not clear if this name is also to be taken as that of the seat of the bishopric, or where the diocesan boundary fell between Candida Casa and Hexham, the next see to the E.

Leaving aside the references to the Picts, we can divide the other passage into the parts dependent on hearsay ("ut perhibent": see Plummer 1896, I, xlv; II, 128) and those which Bede provided himself as contemporary description. Therefore, regardless of the context of the passage, which has the appearance of a subsequent insertion (Chadwick 1948-49, 32; MacQueen 1961, 27; Fahy 1964, 36), it appears possible to accept the statements "... iam nunc Anglorum gens obtinet. Qui locus, ad provinciam Berniciorum pertinens, vulgo
vocatur Ad Candidam Casam..." as contemporary evidence, which in turn can be equated with the passage already discussed from H.E., V.23.

Thus the area, though still geographically undefined, can be taken as falling within the Northumbrian province of Bernicia. Because Bernicia and Northumbria appear in other records as political units, it appears that control by the English nation over the see can be read as political control, but it is not clear whether territorial occupation can be assumed on this basis. There is an ambiguity in the use of the term "Ad Candida Casa", referred to above, which makes it unclear whether the see (an administrative territorial concept) or the place (the seat of the bishopric) is being referred to (Chadwick 1948-49, 12-3).

It should be noted that nothing in Bede can be used to date Ninian other than the phrase "multo ante tempore". Boyle has shown by analysing Bede's use of this phrase elsewhere that the period of time referred to can be as little as twelve years (Boyle 1968, 67-8; see also Macquarrie 1986, 12, fn. 3; Macquarrie 1987, 3, 8). It must therefore be emphasised that the early date usually put forward for Ninian was initially derived from the supposed rendezvous with St Martin, which Levison has shown is only found in Ailred's 12th-century Life (Levison 1940; Forbes 1874, 137-57).

Indeed, there are elements in common with Benedict Bishop, notably the reference to Rome, and to the unusual construction of a stone church. It may also be noted that Ninian is always described as a bishop. Monastic training may be implied by the term "regulariter" but it is not specified, unlike the description of Columba a few lines before. At no point in Bede is Candida Casa described as a monastery (Grosjean 1958, 359; Fahy 1964, 37; Thomas 1966, 109). It is both
times referred to as the see itself or the place where the stone church was built.

In contrast to his reference to Martin of Tours in this passage Bede does not refer to Ninian as a saint. Sanctity is first ascribed in the 8th-century 'Miracula Nynie Episcopi' (Strecker 1923, 943-62; MacQueen 1959-60), which has been shown to derive its literary form from Bede's metrical life of Cuthbert (Levison 1940, 283, 290; MacQueen 1959-60, 32, 34). The text is included in a 10th-century manuscript of material possibly collected by Alcuin. A letter by Alcuin, apparently written from abroad shortly before his death in 804, refers to the gift of this poem and asks the recipients to pray for him (Haddan & Stubbs 1873, 8; Lawrie 1905, 3-4; Browne 1908, 301-2: see Levison 1940, 282; McQueen 1959-60, 21-2). The recipients appear to be the community of Whithorn, on the basis of references to "ecclesiasanctissimi patris vestri Nynia episcopi", though this is not stated. Alcuin is known to have been in correspondence at an unknown period with Ethelbert (Browne 1908, 137-9), who was bishop of Whithorn from 777 until he moved to Hexham in 789 (Chadwick 1948-49, 35; Fryde et al 1986, 217, 223). The evidence of both Bede and Alcuin's letter shows that the body of Ninian was believed to be preserved at Whithorn, as Alcuin sent a silk shroud.

As a hagiographical poem, the 'Miracula Nynie Episcopi', which Levison (1940, 283) demonstrated was almost certainly written at Whithorn, is principally concerned to establish Ninian as a saint (see MacQueen 1959-60, 34-5, 57). With the exception of a number of miracle stories, occurring both during the life of the saint and after his death, and references to monks (op. cit. 42), which are likely to reflect the existence of a community at the time of writing (Chadwick 1948-49, 13; Thomas 1966, 111), the historical basis of the poem
appears largely dependent on Bede (Levison 1940, 289-90). The principle interest is its evidence for the growth of a cult centre at Whithorn in the 8th century, and the implications of architectural splendour at the saint's shrine (Macqueen 1959-60, 38-9, 45-8): features which have been born out by the current excavations on the site (Hill 1988-90, 7-21; 1990-91).

Part II

With the exception of the 'Miracula' poem, discussed above, there are no surviving documentary records from the early medieval period which can be ascribed to Whithorn or to the adjacent area. We are therefore dependent on references in a number of sources that must be recognised as fragmentary, and not primarily concerned with recording events in this area. These chronicle sources all postdate Bede's 'Historia Ecclesiastica' of c.731 and terminate at the beginning of the 9th century. Thereafter until the evidence for a contemporary bishop-elect of Whithorn in 1125 (Haddan & Stubbs 1873, 24-5) we are faced with an undocumented period which can only be punctuated by extracting possible references to the area from material not concerned with recording historical information.

The primary sources for the first period are the annals added to certain manuscripts of the H.E. (Colgrave & Mynors 1969, 572-5), the recensions D, E, and F of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle (i.e. Cotton Tiberius B.IV, Bodleian Laud. 636, and Cotton Domitian A.VIII - see Thorpe 1861, I, 31-3, 89, 93, 99, 103; Earle & Plummer 1892, I, 19, 51, 55, 57; Classen & Harmer 1926, 17, 18, 20), and the lists of bishops of Whithorn in Cotton Vespasian B.VI, fol. 109r, col. 2, and elsewhere (Page 1966, 7, 12, 17, 20). In addition to these are the annals transcribed into the works of medieval historians and compilers
of the 12th century and later (see discussion in Whitelock 1979, 127-31). These include: Florence of Worcester (Thorpe 1848, I, 52, 54, 57-8, 59, 62), Roger of Howden (Stubbs 1868, I, 8, 10, 12, 15-6), Henry of Huntingdon (Arnold 1879, 116, 125, 126, 129, 130). Matthew Paris (Luard 1872, I, 336, 344, 349, 356), Roger of Wendover (Coxe 1841, I, 224, 236, 242, 251), the ‘Flores Historum’ (Luard 1890, I, 375, 384, 389, 395), and in particular, the first part of the ‘Historia Regum’ (Arnold 1885, 42-3, 46, 53, 58; Hinde 1868, 22, 25, 30, 34; see Hunter Blair 1963, 86-99), now ascribed to the 10th-century compiler Byrthferth of Ramsey (Hart 1982; Lapidge 1982).

There are also two relevant entries in the narrative ‘Historia Ecclesiae Dunhelmensis’ by Symeon of Durham (Arnold 1882, 52, 66-7).

It is apparent from direct comparison of the annals relating to Whithorn that most of these chroniclers derived their material from variants of the same source (e.g. the D and E recensions of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle), or simply by copying from the work of an immediate predecessor. In the same way the entries for the 8th-century period in the Chronicle of Melrose (Stevenson 1835, 2, 7, 9, 11, 12; Anderson et al. 1936, fols. 1, 3, 4, 5) can be shown to summarize the annals recorded in their fullest form in the ‘Historia Regum’.

But it is also evident that the continuation of Bede, the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle D/E texts and the ‘Historia Regum’ material are independent of each other, as there is no identity of phrasing (regardless of the difference in language). The relevant entries from these sources, together with an annal from Florence of Worcester and an extract from Symeon’s H.E.D., are therefore given in an appendix (see below). In a number of cases there is a difference of a year between the Latin authors and the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle. I have not tried to correct these.
In all these sources the entries for Whithorn are solely concerned with the episcopal succession, or the presence of the named bishop at a consecration. We can therefore produce a list of five bishops with their dates of succession and death for the period covered by the annals up to 802 (H.E.D.), although the last entry for a Whithorn bishop in both the Chronicle and the 'Historia Regum' is 796. Evidence for political history is less clear. Both Florence of Worcester (Thorpe 1848, 52) and the Chronicle of Melrose (Stevenson 1835, 2) quote the passage from Bede's H.E., V.23 (Colgrave & Mynors 1969, 558-61) which states that at the present day, c.731, the episcopal see known as Candida Casa is within the province of Northumbria, ruled by Ceowulf. At III.4 Bede more specifically stated that it was in the province of Bernicia, and under English rule. But it is not possible to deduce from this what territory was included, how long this control had lasted, or the political implications of this control in terms of settlement or population (see above).

However, sixty five years later, in 796, the bishop of Whithorn, Badwulf, assisted at the enthronement in York of Eardwulf as King of Northumbria, together with the Northumbrian bishops of York, Hexham and Lindisfarne (D/E). It would therefore appear that the bishop of Whithorn still owed allegiance to the ruler of Northumbria. In addition we know that Frithuwold was consecrated bishop of Whithorn in 735 by Egbert, archbishop of York (Bedae Continuatio) "on Ceastre/um" (D/E) - in the city. This is presumably York (see Whitelock 1979, 168, 178), although Anderson (1908, 58) translates it as "Chester", duplicating an error in the Chronicle of Melrose. Ethelbert was also consecrated bishop of Whithorn at York in 777 (D/E). He subsequently became bishop of Hexham in 789 (H.R.), but assisted at the consecration of his successor Badwulf in 791 (D/E and H.R.).
Badwulf was consecrated at a place called Hearrahalch (H.R.), and a predecessor, Pehtwine, was consecrated in 762 at another unidentified place, Aئlfet ee (D/E), which may possibly be identified with the monastery called Act Laete (H.R.) where archbishop Eanbald (I) of York died in 796 (H.R.). In addition to assisting at the enthronement of king Eardwulf on 26 May 796 at York (D/E), Badwulf met with the other Northumbrian bishops for the consecration of archbishop Eanbald (II) on 15 August the same year at Sochaburg (H.R.; see Hart 1982, 581), and for the consecration of Egbert, bishop of Lindisfarne, at Biguell in 802 (Symeon H.E.D.).

Taken together, this evidence shows that the bishop of Whithorn was a suffragen of the archbishopric of York throughout the 8th century, and the assistance at the enthronement suggests that the political allegiance of the see of Whithorn was still to the king of Northumbria. This orientation towards Anglo-Saxon England can also be seen in the inclusion of Ethelbert as a signatory to the decrees of the northern council at Pincanheale / Wincanheale in 788 (Thorpe 1861, I. 97; Haddan & Stubbs 1871, 460), during his period as bishop of Whithorn between 777-790 before moving to Hexham (Dowden 1912, 353; Whiting 1946, 151).

Despite the isolated position of Whithorn "on the extreme borders of England close to Scotland" (William of Malmesbury: see Hamilton 1870, 256; Anderson 1908, 7), it should be remembered that the first bishop of Whithorn, Pecthelm, is named as the source of two of Bede’s miracle stories (H.E., V.13 & 18) and is described as a former pupil of Aldhelm of Malmesbury (H.E., V.18). He was also the recipient of a letter, together with a towel and a garment decorated with white spots, from Boniface in Germany, 730x735, asking for theological advice (Haddan & Stubbs 1871, 310). In addition there is the letter.
sent with a gift of a robe of white silk, from Alcuin to the community of Whithorn, that has been mentioned in the previous section (Haddan & Stubbs 1873, 8). Alcuin also addressed a letter to bishop Ethelbert after he had moved to Hexham (Browne 1908, 137-9).

Part III

As stated previously, the O/E text of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle makes no mention of Whithorn or its bishops after 806, and the northern annals in the 'Historia Regum' end in 802 (Hunter Blair 1963, 86). The death of bishop Baldwulf is not recorded. But the last recorded event, his participation at the consecration of the bishop of Lindisfarne in 802 has already been mentioned. Our only source for this is not the annals, but a reference in the 12th-century 'Historia Ecclesiae Dunelmensis' of Symeon of Durham (Arnold 1882, 52). But as P. Hunter Blair pointed out (1939, 97) it cannot be therefore be concluded that the see came to an end at this point. The same five bishops mentioned in the annals appear in a list recorded in the 9th-century manuscript Cotton Vespasian B.VI, fol. 109 r, col. 2, with the addition of one more name in a different hand (Page 1966, 7). The original part of the list can be dated to 812 (Hunter Blair 1939, 36; Page 1965, 74) and since the five bishops are recorded in the same hand it is likely that this part of the list in derived from the annals. A similar list is appended to the 'Chronicon' of Florence of Worcester (Thorpe 1848, 246), but with the addition of Trumwine the ejected bishop of Abercorn (H.E., IV.12, 26) before the name of Pethelmus. The real problem arises with the last name on both these lists, 'Heaðored' in B.VI, 'Heathoredus' in Florence. The entry in B.VI is in what R. Page called the second hand, dated c. 833, responsible for additions subsequent to those made by the original
writer (Page 1965, 75; id. 1966, 3). Unfortunately in his main historical text Florence refers to a bishop of Lindisfarne, 819-828, between Ecgbertus and Ecgredus, by this name (Thorpe 1848, 65, 68); though in his list of bishops of Lindisfarne (Thorpe 1848, 246) there is a lacuna between Ecgberhtus and Eardulfus. But in Cotton Vespasian B.VI (Page 1966, 7) there is a Lindisfarne list in which Ecgberht is followed by 'Eadmund', in the same secondary hand that wrote Heathored in the Whithorn list. In other words the lists in Florence are not derived from B.VI, yet Heathored appears as a Whithorn bishop in both sources.

This problem was first discussed by K. Sisam (1932, 326 n. 10), who believed that Heathored was the bishop of Lindisfarne and Eadmund the bishop of Whithorn, but it is apparent that the 9th-century evidence of B.VI should be taken more seriously than the 12th-century chronicles, which as Sisam said, appear to be derived from a single source of information (loc. cit.), yet provide the basis for the assumption by Page (1965, 87) and the 'Handbook of British Chronology', 2nd edition (Powicke & Fryde 1961, 290) that the presence of an extra bishop in the Cotton Vespasian B.VI Whithorn list is simply a mistake that does not need to be discussed.

The argument for the extinction of Whithorn as a bishopric is commonly reinforced (see Sisam 1932, 326; Radford 1948-49a, 96, 102; Page 1965, 87) by a quotation from the 'Gesta Pontificum' by William of Malmesbury (Hamilton 1870, 257) which states: "(Pecthelm's) successors were Frithwald, Pehtwine, Ethelbert, Baldwulf. And beyond these I find no more anywhere, for the bishopric soon failed since it was as I have said the farthest shore of the Angles, and open to the raidings of Scots and Picts..." (trans. Anderson 1908, 53). It should be clear that this is guesswork, to some extent contradicted by two
passages copied from Florence of Worcester (Thorpe 1848, I, 279-80) in William of Malmesbury’s own ‘Gesta Regum’ (Stubbs 1887, I, 101, and see also II, 352-3), for example: "The Kings of Northumbria governed all the country which is beyond the river Humber, as far as Scotland; and there were the archbishop of York, the bishops of Hexham, of Ripon, of Lindisfarne, and of Candida Casa. Hexham and Ripon are no more; that of Lindisfarne is translated to Durham" (trans. Stevenson 1854, 82). The other passage is similar, but refers to "illum de Candida Casa, quae nunc Witerne dicitur" (Thorpe 1848, I, 279; Stubbs 1887, II, 353). In neither section does he mention the present state of Candida Casa. Florence died c.1118; Malmesbury was writing in the 1120s.

Part IV

In December 1125, Pope Honorius II wrote to the bishop-elect of Candida Casa (Haddan & Stubbs 1873, 24), in part saying: "... And therefore by the present writings we command thee to go to be consecrated, to our dearest brother, Thurstan, archbishop of York, as to thy proper metropolitan ..." (trans. Anderson 1908, 159). This evoked the following profession of obedience (Haddan & Stubbs 1873, 25): "To his revered lord and father Thurstan by Gods Grace archbishop of York, Gilla-Aldan, humble bishop-elect of Whithorn, greetings and obedience. I have learned both in publicly authenticated documents and in the truthful testimony of ancient men that the bishop of Whithorn from of old owes respect to his mother the metropolitan of York, and submission to her in the things which pertain to God. Wherefore I Gilla-Aldan, the elected of Whithorn, promise to preserve henceforth due subjection as appointed by the holy fathers, and canonical obedience to the holy church of York; and to thee, archbishop Thurstan and to thy successors canonically appointed"
These two letters suggest that local knowledge of the history of Whithorn was available in the 1120s, and that the bishopric existed for Gilla-Aldan to be elected to it (since there is nothing to imply that the see was being revived after three hundred years). But it is possible that the "publicly authenticated documents" refer to Bede or the Chroniclers we have been discussing, where the connection with York is very evident (see Brentano 1953, 144-6; McRoberts 1973, 69-71). Gilla-Aldan is listed as the first medieval bishop of Whithorn in later documents (see Donaldson 1948-49, 139; Watt 1969, 129; Fryde et al. 1986, 310) and it should be noted that the adjacent see of Glasgow was apparently revived c.1115 (Brown 1895, 37; Watt 1969, 143). But as is discussed under HODDOM (see Vol.II p. 187), John, the first bishop of Glasgow, claimed to be reviving the see of Kentigern. Yet Kentigern was a semi-legendary figure (Jackson 1958), unlike the historically documented bishops of 8th-century Whithorn.

The only reference to Whithorn that might be ascribed to the period between 802 and 1125 is the reference in Symeon's 'Historia Ecclesiae Dunelmensis', book II ch. xii (Arnold 1882, 67), to the presence of the Cuthbert community in the neighbourhood of Whithorn c.882. Symeon was writing in the 12th century, and the mention of Whithorn occurs in the context of a miracle story, the rediscovery of an ornamented volume of the gospels which had been lost at sea. As has been pointed out by B. Colgrave (1950, 322-3; see also Craster 1954, 178) the voyage during which the gospels are said to have been lost in Symeon's version is also referred to in the earlier 'Historia de Sancto Cuthberto' (Arnold 1882, 207-8) and ch. 2 of the Miracles of Cuthbert (Arnold 1882, 235-7); but the story of the loss and recovery of the book is exclusive to the H.E.D. A similar story can

(trans. Anderson 1908, 159-60).
be found in the Life of St Moling (Miles 1898, 129; Plummer 1910, II, 190-205), but Symeon includes the names of the participants, and the mention of Whithorn appears as circumstantial detail: "Per id quippe temporis, in locum qui Candida Casa, vulgo autem Huuiterne vocatur, devenerant" (Arnold 1882, 67). But given the context, this reference can hardly be accepted as an argument for the survival of the monastery or bishopric in an otherwise undocumented period. Ironically, most of the sculpture from Whithorn appears to date from this period.

2. "Namque ipsi australes Picti, qui intra eosdem montes habent sedes, multo ante tempore, ut perhibent, relicto errore idolatriae fidem veritatis acceperant, praedicante eis uerbum Nynia episcopo reuerentissimo et sanctissimo viro de natione Brettonum, qui erat Romae regulariter fidem et mysteria ueritatis edoctus: cuius sedem episcopatus sancti Martini episcopi nomine et ecclesia insignem, ubi ipse etiam corpore una cum pluribus sanctis requiescit, iam nunc Anglorum gens obtinet. Qui locus, ad provinciam Berniciorum pertinens, uulgo uocatur Ad Candidam Casam, eo quod ibi ecclesiam de lapide, insolito Brettonibus more, fecerit" (Plummer 1896, I, 133; Colgrave & Mynors 1969, 222).

3. But see Hill 1990-91, 4, 16, which refers to the discovery of lime waste, plaster and cement in a 5th-century context at Whithorn.

4. Though it is not stated that he was the first bishop (Thompson 1958, 19).

5. This is one of the additions found in the 'Miracula' (MacQueen 1959-60, 25, lines 73, 74): see Fahy 1964, 37; though Chadwick takes Bede's use of the word 'locus' to mean a monastic settlement existing in his own day (1948-49, 10 n. 6; 13).

6. In addition, see the digest of Whithorn bishops, in Latin but evidently derived from a variant of the Chronicle, transcribed in two 12th-century manuscripts of Bede's H.E. (Brentano 1953, 144-6; McRoberts 1973, 69-71). This includes interpolated anachronistic references to Durham and Chester-le-Street (instead of York). For the 12th-century context of this digest, see note 19.

7. Though see Hunter Blair 1939, 92-3.
8. Apart from the entries for AD.764 and 777 in the H.R., which appear to paraphrase the D/E annals for AD.762, 776 and 777. In particular the day of the month of Pehtwine's death, which Hunter Blair singled out (1963, 92), is clearly based on the Chronicle. But the subsequent entries in D/E and the H.R. are independent.

9. Pehthelm ? x 731 - 735
Frithuwold 735 - 762 x 764
Pehtwine 762 x 764 - 776 x 777
Ethelbert 777 - 789 (to Hexham)
Badwulf 790 x 791 - (802+)

See also Fryde et al. 1986, 222-3. The question of Heaðored / Heathoredus is discussed below. Florence of Worcester also included Trumwine (Thorpe 1848, I, 246), the ejected bishop of Abercorn, 681-5, who retired to Whitby (Colgrave & Mynors 1969, 428). Similarly, Richard of Hexham claimed that following Acca's exile from Hexham c.732, "sunt tamen qui dicunt quod eo tempore episcopalem sedem in Candida (Casa) inceperit et praeparaverit" (Raine 1864, 35; see Miles 1898, 268-9; Anderson 1908, 53; MacQueen 1960-61, 138). Both these sources are Anglo-Norman.

10. But it should be noted that the northern annals used in the H.R. terminate in 802, and those in the Chronicle in 806 (Hunter Blair 1939, 96). As Hunter Blair stated, this cannot be taken to mean that the see of Whithorn (or York, Hexham, and Lindisfarne) failed at this date (op. cit., 97). See below, and also the Northumbrian coin evidence in Hill 1984-86, 5, which extends to c.840.

11. "Ego Aedilberchus Candensis casae Episcopus supplex, signo sanctae crucis subscripsi" (Haddan & Stubbs 1871, 460).

13. See now the 3rd edition (Fryde et al., 1986, 219, 223) which includes Heathored in both lists.

14. It may be noted that the date of c.833 suggested by Page for the secondary entries in Cotton Vespasian B.VI, which include the Whithorn Heathored, corresponds closely with the coin evidence mentioned in note 10 (c.840).


17. "... Ideoque per presentia scripta tibi mandamus. ut ad karissimum fratrem nostrum T(urstinum) Ebor. Archiepiscopum tanquam ad proprium metropolitanum tuum consecrandus accedas" (Haddan & Stubbs 1873, 24; Lawrie 1905, 53-4).


19. These letters should be seen against their background, the dispute generated by the claim of the archbishop of York to act as metropolitan over the bishops of Scotland (Donaldson 1948-49, 129-34). The papal delegate was in England and Scotland in 1125, returning to Rome in late September with the archbishop of York and others (Haddan & Stubbs 1873, 23, note a).
20. Though see also Haddan & Stubbs 1873, 8, 9, 24; Jones 1910, 104-5; Anderson 1922a, 270, 541, 585; Radford 1948-49a, 97-9, for possible references to Galloway in this period. But Cowan (1991) has shown that most of this evidence is no longer acceptable.
Appendix: The Anglian Bishops of Whithorn. AD.731-802

(AD.731) [Florence of Worcester] "... Pectelmus in ea quae Candida Casa vocatur" (Thorpe 1848, I, 52; see H.E., V.25).

(AD.735) [Florence of Worcester] "... Pectelmus Candidae Casae praesul obiit, cui Frithowaldus in pontificatus regimen successit" (Thorpe 1848, I, 54).


(AD.750) [Bedae Continuatio] "... Eadberth (Eadberctus) campum Curt* cum aliis regionibus suo regno addidit" (Plummer 1896, I, 362; Colgrave & Mynors 1969, 574).

* Plummer identified this as Kyle, a district of Ayrshire to the N.W. of Dumfries and Galloway (Plummer 1896, II, 346).

(AD.762) [D] "7 FrOuweald biscop aet Hwiterne forôferde. on Nonas Maius. se waes gehalgod on Ceastre on XVIII. K[1]. September. þam VI. (wintra) Ceolwulfes rices. 7 he waes biscop XXIX. wintra. Pa man halgode Pehtwine to biscop aet AEelfetee on XVI. K[1]. Agustus. to Hwiterne" (Thorpe 1861, I, 89; Classen & Harmer 1926, 17-8).

(AD.776) [D] "Her forôferde Pehtwine biscop. on XIII. K[1]. Octob. se waes biscop XIII. winter" (Thorpe 1861, I, 93; Classen & Harmer 1926, 18).


(AD.777) [H.R.] "And py ilcan geare man gehalgode AEÆelberht to biscope to Hwiterne in Eoferwic. on XVII. K[1]. Iulii." (Thorpe 1861, I, 93; Earle & Plummer 1892, I, 51).

(AD.790) [H.R.] "... Eodem anno Baduulf ad Candidam Casam ordinatur episcopus in loco qui dicitur Hearrahalch, quod interpretari potest, locus dominorum. Anno vero priori Ethelberht episcopus sua sede relictâ, [sancta]* Tilberhto episcopo jam obeunte, praedictus praesul episcopatum Haugustaldensis ecclesiae acceptit in propriam dominationem" (Hinde 1868, 30; Arnold 1885, 53).

(AD.791) [D] "Her waes Baldwulf gehalgcod to biscop to Hwiterne. on 
XVI. Kl Agustus. fram Eanbalde arcebiscop. 7 fram AE6elberhtes biscop"
(Thorpe 1861, I, 99; Classen & Harmer 1926, 20).

(AD.795) [E] "7 Eardwulf feng to Noñahymbran cinedome. on II. Idus 
Mai. 7 he waes syðdan gebleston. 7 to his cinestole ahofen on VII. Kl. 
Iunii. on Eoeferwic. fram Eanbalde arceb. 7 AE6elberhtes. 7 Higbalde. 7 
Badewulfe"
(Thorpe 1861, I, 103; Earle & Plummer 1892, I, 57).

(AD.796) [H.R.] "... Et pau7o post, id est, iiii. Idus Augusti, 
Eanbalus archiepiscopus obiit in monasterio quod dicitur AEtlaeete, 
corpusque ejus magno comitante agmine ad Eboracam civitatem portantes, 
in ecclesia beati Petri apostoli sepultum est honorifice. Statim vero 
alter Eanbalus, ejusdem ecclesiae presbyter, in episcopatum est 
electus, convenientibus ad ordinationem ejus Ethelberto et Hygbaldo 
atque Badw7fo episcopis, in monasterio quod dicitur Sochaburg,* xviii. 
Kal. [Septemb.]* die Dominica"

(AD.802) [H.E.D] "... A cujus ecclesiae depopulatione, nono anno, 
Higbald, completis in episcopatu xxii. annis, defunctus est viii kal. 
Junii, et Egbertus in locum ejus electus et consecratus, Eanbaldo 
archiepiscopo, et Eanberto, et Baldulfo (Badulfo), aliis quoque 
episcopis in locum qui dicitur Biguell, iii. idus Junii, ad ejus 
ordinationem convenientibus, septimum tunc annum imperii agente filio 
Eardu7fi Eardu7fo, qui occiso regi Ethelredo successerat ..." 
(Arnold 1882, 52).
Appendix: The Anglian Bishops of Whithorn. AD.731-802

(AD.731) [Florence of Worcester] "... and Pectelm in that which is called Candida Casa (Whiterne)"
(Stevenson II/i 1853, 198; see H.E., V.25).

(AD.735) [Florence of Worcester] "... Pectelm, bishop of Whitherne, died, and was succeeded in the bishopric by Frithowald"
(Stevenson II/i 1853, 198).

(AD.735) [Bedae Continuatio] "Nothelm was consecrated archbishop and bishop Egbert, having received the pallium from the apostolic see, became archbishop, the first after Paulinus. He consecrated Frithuberht and Frithuwold bishops"
(Colgrave & Mynors 1969, 573).

(AD.750) [Bedae Continuatio] "... Eadberht added the plain of Kyle and other lands to his kingdom"
(Colgrave & Mynors 1969, 575).

(AD.762) [D] "And Frithuwold, bishop of Whithorn, died on 7 May. He had been consecrated in the city on 15 August in the sixth year of Ceolwulf's reign, and was bishop 29 years (734). Then Pehtwine was consecrated bishop of Whithorn at (Elvet) on 17 July"
(Whitelock 1979, 178).

(AD.764) [H.R.] "... Also in these times Frithuwold, bishop of Whithorn, departed from this world, and Pehtwine was appointed bishop in his place"
(Whitelock 1979, 267).

(AD.776) [D] "In this year Bishop Pehtwine died on 19 September; he had been bishop for 14 years"
(Whitelock 1979, 178).

(AD.777) [H.R.] "Pehtwine, bishop of Whithorn, departed this life on 19 September, to the joy of eternal salvation. He had had charge of that church for 14 years. Ethelbert succeeded him"
(Whitelock 1979, 269).

(AD.777) [E] "And that same year Ethelbert was consecrated bishop of Whithorn at York on 15 June"
(Whitelock 1979, 179).

(AD.790) [H.R.] "... In the same year Badwulf was consecrated bishop of Whithorn at the place which is called Hearrrahalch, which can be interpreted 'place of lords'. For in the preceeding year on the death of the holy bishop Tilberht, Bishop Ethelbert left his own see and received under his own rule the bishopric of the church of Hexham" 
(Whitelock 1979, 272).
(AD.791) [D] "In this year Badwulf was consecrated bishop of Whithorn by Archbishop Eanbald and by Bishop Ethelbert on 17 July" (Whitelock 1979, 181).

(AD.795) [E] "... and Eardwulf succeeded to the kingdom of the Northumbrians on 14 May; and he was afterwards consecrated and enthroned on 26 May in York, by Archbishop Eanbald (I), and Ethelbert, Higbald, and Badwulf" (Whitelock 1979, 182).

(AD.796) [H.R.] "... And a little while after, that is on 10 August, Archbishop Eanbald died in the monastery which is called 'At Laete', and his body was conveyed to the city of York, with a large multitude attending it, and honourably buried in the church of the blessed Apostle Peter. And immediately another Eanbald, priest of the same church, was elected to the bishopric, the bishops Ethelbert, Higbald and Badwulf meeting for his consecration at the monastery which is called Sockburn, on Sunday, 15 August" (Whitelock 1979, 274).

(AD.802) [H.E.D.] "... In the eleventh year from the pillaging of this church (Lindisfarne) died Higbald, on the eighth of the kalends of June (25 May), after having completed twenty two years in its episcopate; and in his stead Egbert was elected, and upon the third of the ides of June (11 June) he was consecrated at a place called Bigwell (Bywell), by archbishop Eanbald, and by bishop Eanbert and Badulf, and others, who met there for his ordination. This occurred in the seventh year of the reign of Eardulf, son of Earulf, who had succeeded to the throne upon the slaughter of king Aethelred ..." (Stevenson 1855, 652).
CHAPTER 5
Previous Work on Sculpture in the Region

The Reformation of 1560 led to the abandonment of at least 43 former church sites in Dumfries and Galloway, following the amalgamation of 62% of the 121 medieval parishes in the region (Scott 1917; Cowan 1961; Cowan 1967. See Table 3 and Fig. 10). The medieval pilgrimage to Whithorn was forbidden in 1581, and the Sheriff of Galloway was ordered to "search out and seek the persons passing in pilgrimage to any kirks chapels wells crosses or sick other monuments of idolatory" (Thomson 1814, 212; Agnew 1864, 202; Maxwell 1932b, 2).

The Reformation (see MacRoberts 1959; Hughes 1980b; Cowan 1981), and the construction of stone dykes in Galloway in 1720-3 (Hare 1942a, 362-4; see above), are likely to have been the major factors leading to the deconsecration of sculpture, and subsequent damage or reuse as building material.

Sculpture in Dumfries and Galloway is undocumented before the beginning of the 17th century, when the Ruthwell cross (RUTHWELL 1) was first mentioned in an unpublished manuscript of additions to Camden's 'Britannia' dated c. 1601 (Page 1959a). But following an act of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland in 1642, the cross was broken up, and the pieces lay in the church and churchyard until 1802, where they were noted by various travellers (Duncan 1833; Willett 1956-57, 122-4; Meyvaert 1982, 3-7).

The first antiquary to take an interest in other sculpture in the region appears to have been Robert Riddell of Friars Carse in lower Nithsdale, Dumfriesshire, a friend of the poet Burns, who at the end of the 18th century compiled a series of manuscript notebooks on the
history and genealogy of the district (RMS/SAS MSS 581-590: see Irvine 1864-66; Reid 1895-96; Gladstone 1913). In these he refers to a number of crosses, some of which were already lost (i.e. AUCHINLECK MOOR, PENPONT 3, and UPPER BOATFORD), some he removed to Friars Carse from their original sites (i.e. DRUMCORK and LAUCHMOOR), and others he recorded in situ (i.e. BOATFORD 1, RUTHWELL 4, and parts of a cross at HODDOM).

Of these, his references to the cross on BOATFORD farm, near Nith Bridge, Thornhill, are by far the most important. He encouraged the antiquaries Francis Grose and Adam de Cardonnel to draw the cross in his notebooks, and he published a paper on it in 1793 (see Fig. 34). He also noted the earliest published reference (Maitland 1757, I, 216).

A number of other crosses in Dumfries and Galloway were first recorded in the contributions of the local ministers to the 'Statistical Account of Scotland' published in twenty one volumes (Sinclair 1791-1799). Each of these crosses was either standing in a prominent place (i.e. MAINS, KIRKCLAUGH, LAGGANGARN 1 and 2), or was large enough to attract attention when prone (i.e. STROANFREGGAN). None were built into walls.

In the far west of the region, William Todd, schoolmaster at Kirkmaiden, Wigtownshire (see Donaldson 1924), drew the three inscribed chi-rho crosses standing in the churchyard at KIRKMADRINE in about 1810, some thirty years before their reuse as gateposts (not 1822, see Catalogue). Again in lower Nithsdale, Thomas Johnstone, a friend of Riddell, recorded the FOREGIRTH cross in considerable detail in 1826. Both these early records led to the missing crosses
FOREGIRTH and KIRKMADRINE 3 being searched for and recovered in the 20th century.

At the same period as the 'New Statistical Account' (NSA IV 1845) was published, which recorded one or two crosses such as KILMORIE that had been discovered since 1799, the Ordnance Survey was working in Galloway on the 6-inch map, first series, and subsequently in Dumfriesshire on the 25-inch series (Wigtown 1846-8; Kirkcudbright 1849-50; Dumfries 1856-7). The manuscript Name Books (NMRS and SRO microfilms), which were used to record the spelling of place-names in the field, also refer to a number of antiquities (see Prevost 1980; Davidson 1986). Stones recorded here for the first time and marked on the early OS maps include HIGH AUCHENLARIE 1 and 2, CUMNOCK KNOWES, WAMPHRAY, and ORCHARD. These books also act as a source of background information about other sites, such as CHAPEL DONNAN, CRAIGLEMINE, and Kildonan (DRUMMORE), where sculpture was discovered subsequently.

The first stone from the region to be donated to a public museum was HODDOM 22 in 1851. A second stone from Hoddom, also given to the National Museum of Antiquities in Edinburgh at the same time, was thought to be unprovenanced until 1988, when it was identified by the present writer (HODDOM 23). Both stones came from the collection of another Dumfriesshire antiquarian, C.K. Sharpe. In the 1860s Dr T.B. Grierson of Thornhill, Dumfriesshire, made a local museum collection which he opened to the public, which included CLOSEBURN 1, DURRISDEER, GLENCAIRN 1, and PENPONT 1 and 2. The collection was eventually dispersed to Dumfries Museum in 1965 (see Truckell 1966a), but his manuscript 'Running Catalogue of My Museum' survives, and records the accession of two of these stones. Around 1862 the Dumfriesshire and Galloway Natural History and Antiquarian Society started to
publish reports of its transactions and field meetings, and a number of early contributors took an interest in sculpture (i.e. Jardine 1863-64; Jardine 1864-65; Starke 1866-67; --- 1876-78; --- 1886-87; Starke 1887-90a; Wilson 1887-90; Dickie 1887-90; etc.).

Also in about 1860, Dr A. Mitchell rediscovered two of the KIRKMADRINE stones reused as gateposts. He consequently visited Todd who was then in his eighties and was shown the earlier drawing (Mitchell 1870-72, 568-70). He also appears to have brought these stones to Stuart’s attention (see below), as well as the inscribed St Peter stone from MAINS farm, then standing by the road south of Whithorn. This had been mentioned briefly in the first Statistical Account and subsequently drawn by the architectural historian T.S. Muir. Muir made a tour through Galloway in October 1864, and published a pamphlet under the pseudonym ‘Unda’ (Muir 1864; reprinted in Muir 1885, 206-49) in which he records a number of stones not previously described (i.e. KIRKINNER 1, KIRKMAIDEN 1, MONREITH, and WIGTOWN 1).

The first watershed in the study of sculpture in the region, however, are the two volumes published by J. Stuart in 1856 and 1867, which cover the whole of Scotland. Stuart listed 6 stones from Dumfries and Galloway in the first volume and another 17 in the second. He recorded the first pieces from WHITHORN. Each stone is illustrated, usually with some information about where it was found and a general discussion, not always relevant to the stone. He provides detailed information about a number of sites, such as HIGH AUCHENLARIE and CRAIGLEMINE, but in other cases, such as MAINS and MONREITH, what he says must be qualified by other accounts, from people with more local knowledge. His illustrations vary in quality,
between BOATFORD 1 and KILMORIE (very accurate), and HIGH AUCHENLARIE 1, where he muddles the grooves with the outline, and KIRKINNER 2, where he gives a misleading impression of bifurcating interlace. But it will be apparent from the bibliographies of the stones that a sudden interest in sculpture was sparked c. 1870, and most of the writers refer to Stuart's "great work."

In particular, two local figures in Galloway, P. M'Kerlie and M. Harper, published books which include references to sculpture. The five volumes by M'Kerlie (1870; 1877a; 1877b; 1879) are mainly concerned with local history and genealogy, and Harper's is a travel book entitled 'Rambles in Galloway' (1876), but both writers record original information about sculpture, as well as referring back to Stuart. These two writers are also of value because they published subsequent revised editions of their works (Harper 1896; 1908; M'Kerlie 1906a; 1906b), which in a number of cases, such as KIRKINNER 1 and KIRKMANDRINE, show that the writer went back three times to inspect the same stone (Harper 1876; 1896; 1908), or else recorded recent discoveries, such as ANWOTH (Harper 1896), or WHITHORN 1 (M'Kerlie 1906b). M'Kerlie also used his local knowledge to correct Stuart, as in the case of the original position of MAINS.

But both these writers also derived information from the original researches of a third local figure, the Rev. George Wilson of Glenluce, Wigtownshire (see Lebour 1923). Wilson's manuscript notebook, now in the Royal Museum of Scotland (RMS/SAS MS 578), and his loose manuscript notes, now in the National Monuments Record (NMRS/SAS MS 457), are a major source of information on the archaeology of Wigtownshire in the period between c. 1870 and his death in 1899. He also records in detail his discovery, or the
discovery by his correspondents, of a number of stones in western Wigtownshire, including AIRYLICK, CASSENDEOCH, CHAPEL DONNAN 1 and 2, CRAIGNARGET, DRUMMORE, GLENLUCE 1, GLENLUCE ABBEY, LAGGANGARN FARM, LONGCASTLE 2, MAINS OF PENNINGHAME, PULTADIE, SINNINESS, and WEST CROSERIE (although he does not seem to have realised what this was). I have therefore transcribed material from his notebook in detail, as in all cases it is the major source of information about the stone.

The Ancient Monuments Protection Act of 1882 included five monuments from the west of the region in its schedule, KIRKMADRINE 1 and 2, LAGGANGARN 1 and 2, and MAINS (45 & 46 VICT., ch. 73, p. 442), and it is probable that this was due to the influence of Sir Herbert Maxwell of Monreith, the M.P. for Wigtownshire (and later chairman of the Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical Monuments of Scotland), since the BOATFORD cross in Dumfriesshire was not included. Maxwell conducted the first controlled excavation on an early medieval site in the region, at ST NINIAN'S CAVE in 1884 and 1886. Two cross-slabs and a number of rock-cut crosses had been found in the cave from 1871 onwards, and his attention seems to have been drawn to the site as a result. This use of sculpture finds to pinpoint an unknown early medieval site suitable for excavation will be noted again at ARDWALL ISLE. Ten more sculptured stones and three more rock-cut crosses were discovered during Maxwell's excavations in the cave. A similar ratio may be observed on the only other sites with this sort of evidence where excavation has taken place: ARDWALL, WHITHORN, KIRKCONNEL, and BARHOBBLE. See Fig. 13.

Despite this experience of excavation, the stones from elsewhere in Wigtownshire that Maxwell donated to the National Museum in Edinburgh are given no provenance other than a place-name (i.e. CRAIGLEMINE 1
and 2. KNOCK 1 and 2, MAINS OF PENNINGHAME, and MOCHRUM), and this has led to one stone, KNOCK 2, being referred to as 'Glasserton' in all subsequent literature. The reasons for altering this provenance are given in the Gazetteer. Two other stones, CRAIGLEMININE 1 and MAINS OF PENNINGHAME, were fortunately also recorded by more diligent figures, namely Stuart and Wilson, so their provenance is clearer.

Maxwell's draughtsman for the ST NINIAN'S CAVE excavations was a local architect, William Galloway of Whithorn (Maxwell 1885, 5). Galloway was subsequently employed by the Marquess of Bute, an antiquary whose zeal was inspired by his Catholicism, to undertake restoration work on a number of ecclesiastical sites in the area, including Cruggleton church and WHITHORN Priory. As Galloway himself noted, one effect of Maxwell's excavations at ST NINIAN'S CAVE was to stimulate interest in the local tradition of St Ninian (Stephens 1901, 36), and his restoration work at WHITHORN seems to have included cutting a number of trenches at the eastern end of the Priory and through the crossing and north transept. Unfortunately Galloway died in about 1900, and his work at Whithorn was not published, but his notebooks apparently survive in the Bute archives (information from Peter Hill), and a plan of his trenches has been made available recently (Hill 1984a, 1-2, ill. 1). There are also a number of published references to Galloway's work here from 1889 onwards, which mention the sculpture he discovered (see Dickie 1887-90, 162-6; Rhys 1891, 201; Allen 1891-92, 252, 258; Harper 1896, 337-8; M'Kerlie 1906b, 395, 433-5, 470; Harper 1908, 409-10), as well as his unpublished correspondence with General Pitt-Rivers, then Inspector of Ancient Monuments, which is included in the Scottish Record Office file SRO/MW.1/17.
Galloway’s excavations at Whithorn in the area of the Priory produced a total of ten new stones, all but two (WHITHORN 1 and 3) of a type later known as the Whithorn School (see Collingwood 1922-23, 218). These broad disk-headed crosses are found on a number of sites in the eastern half of Wigtownshire known as the Machars, and as will be discussed below (see p. 212) most are associated with known church sites which became parish churches in the medieval period. They are not found outside this limited area. But it is also notable that crosses of this type have not been found during the current excavations at Whithorn in the field south of the Priory (Hill 1984a, etc.). It is therefore possible that the site was zoned in some way, as Galloway’s trenches were confined to the crossing and east end of the Priory itself.

Although a provincial architect, Galloway was in correspondence with two international experts on early medieval inscriptions as a result of finds from the site and the town. Maxwell’s excavations at the cave had produced an inscription in Anglian runes (ST NINIAN’S CAVE 1), and this led to a second runic inscription, WHITHORN 6, being recognised and removed from the garden wall of a house in Whithorn. Galloway’s description of the circumstances is quoted by G. Stephens of Copenhagen in his corpus (1901, 36-7). He also appears to have written to E. Hübner of Berlin in c. 1890, following the discovery during the excavations of WHITHORN 1, a stone carrying a sub-Roman inscription, and a Constantinian chi-rho that has not been noted subsequently (SRO/MW.1/17).

Galloway was also responsible for restoring the ruined chapel at KIRKMADRINE c. 1889, and found two more crosses there (SRO/MW.1/1060). He also supervised the transfer of the MAINS St Peter stone to the
Priory from the side of the road south of Whithorn at Enoch farm (SRO/MW.1/17). It is shown in the Gazetteer that this was not the original location, despite being accepted as such by most writers who have discussed this stone subsequently.

There appears to have been little interest in sculpture in Dumfriesshire at this period, as Grierson had died in 1889, though J.R. Wilson noted the KIRKCONNEL 8 cross-base. But in Kirkcudbright, F.T. Coles, in addition to a comprehensive survey of the mottes, earthworks, and hillforts of the Stewartry (Coles 1890-91b; 1891-92; 1892-93), published a survey of the known early medieval stones in this area (Coles 1894-95, 80-2), though all except AUCHENSHINNOCH had been noted before (i.e. KIRKCLAUGH, HIGH AUCHENLARIE 1 and 2, MINNIGAFF 1 and 2, DALTALLOCHAN, CUMNOCK KNOWES, and STROANFREGGAN). It is remarkable that such a comprehensive survey at this period should fail to add to such a minimal total of sculpture, even though Coles was not investigating church sites, and also that all the known Kirkcudbright sculpture was concentrated either on the south-west coast or the northern uplands. Only four pieces have subsequently been added in the east.

However, the second watershed in the study of sculpture in the region and in the whole of Scotland was the survey undertaken by J. Romilly Allen for the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland from 1890 to 1900. He published three preliminary reports relevant to this region, the first detailing the results of his literature search (Allen 1889-90), the second reporting on his fieldwork (Allen 1891-92), and the third dealing with photographs and measurements (Allen 1893-94). Together with his work on the analysis of the forms of ornament found on sculpture, these surveys formed the basis for the final catalogue.
and analysis, 'The Early Christian Monuments of Scotland' (ECMS 1903). This work is the first attempt at comprehensive description, accurate illustration, and classification of ornament in any discussion of early medieval sculpture in Britain and Ireland. Before taking up archaeology Allen's background was as a civil engineer, and he built the docks at Leith amongst other places. As a result he brought a scientific precision to the study of sculpture that has set a model ever since.

But the accuracy of his work and the reliability of ECMS is hampered by two factors, the difficulty he faced in co-ordinating diverse published references, and the very short time available to him on the Gunning Fellowship to deal with the massive amount of work needed to cover the whole of Scotland. He appears to have visited Dumfries and Galloway in June and July 1891 only (Allen 1891-92, 251-2, 258), and to have depended otherwise on published information. As a result there are a number of flaws in his work on the sculpture in this region. For instance, he records one of the WHITHORN stones three times under separate numbers (see WHITHORN 16); he also lists HODDOM 23 as two separate stones, a mistake that gave the impression until recently that the stone was lost. He omitted the KNOCK 2 stone in the National Museum of Antiquities, although it carried the 'Celtic ornament' that was his main criterion for inclusion. He also omitted the two WHITHORN cross-heads donated to the National Museum in 1875 (28 and 29), and the figural shaft WHITHORN 2, found before 1891. His drawings of the BOATFORD and CLOSEBURN crosses are inadequate, as they completely ignore certain details that are difficult to see unless the sun is slanting across the face of the stone. This is not to undermine his achievement, but to point out that there are occasional
dangerous flaws in ECMS that will inevitably mislead the reader unless the material is known intimately from first hand research.

Allen lists 13 pieces from Dumfriesshire, 8 from Kirkcudbright, and 47 from Wigtownshire (ECMS iii 1903, 436-51, 476-504). That total has more than trebled in the past eighty five years. Some sculpture, like the HODDOM material in the summer-house wall at Knockhill, Dumfriesshire, he refused to discuss as a matter of principle until it was removed from its ignominious position (op. cit., 441). On other occasions he let his wrath at such mistreatment show, as in the case of the WIGTOWN 1 slab, which "had been used by some ignorant mason to mix his mortar on" (op. cit., 494). Unfortunately he died in 1907, before the Knockhill stones were removed.

The Royal Commission volumes for the region were published in 1912, 1914, and 1920. These were mainly based on the researches of one man on a bicycle, A.O. Curle, who visited the sites in Wigtownshire in 1911, Kirkcudbright in 1911 and 1912, and Dumfriesshire in 1912-13, with an additional visit from J.G. Callander in 1915 (Stell 1983; see NMRS MS 36/3-6; dates from inventory visits).

It is therefore clear that these volumes are not comparable to a modern Royal Commission publication. Indeed, many of the descriptions of sculpture silently transcribe the exact words of Romilly Allen from ECMS 1903, and are therefore not an independent witness. In addition, four of the major stones in Dumfriesshire, DURRISDEER, GLENCAIRN 1, and PENPONT 1 and 2, are omitted altogether, possibly because they were in the Grierson Museum, yet so was CLOSEBURN 1, which is included (RCAHMS 1920, no. 514). A number of new stones are also described, such as MOSSKNOW, WAUCHOPE, KILTERLILTIE, BRAIDENOCH HILL 1 and 2, GLASSERTON, KIRKMAIDEN 2, and KNOCK OF LUCE. Some of these are recent
finds; others, such as BRAIDENOCH HILL, suggest vigorous fieldwork or
detailed local inquiries.

The Commission also appears to have encouraged the removal of the
HODDOM stones from Knockhill summer-house (RCAHMS 1920, no. 273), and
initiated excavations at HODDOM old church (RCAHMS 1920, no. 271),
although it is not clear from the brief inventory entry whether the
two early medieval stones, HODDOM 24 and 25, were found during the
excavation or lying in the churchyard (RCAHMS 1920, no. 274).

In all a total of 37 pieces from Dumfriesshire, 10 from
Kirkcudbright, and 70 from Wigtownshire are listed and described.
The number is slightly swollen by errors in the material from WHITHORN,
where several stones are described twice or three times (RCAHMS 1912,
os. 467, 487, 488), in one case the original ECMS description being
split into two separate stones (RCAHMS 1912, nos. 489, 490).

W.G. Collingwood came to the region with a background of work on
the Anglian and Viking Age sculpture of northern England. His first
publication on the region, at the age of 64, was principally concerned
with the Ruthwell cross, though he noted the fragments at HODDOM
and attempted a reconstruction based on Allen's photographs of the
summer-house wall. He also noted the BOATFORD, CLOSEBURN, and
GLENCAIRN crosses (1916-18a, 45, fig. 19). His HODDOM reconstruction
was unfortunately based on the belief that there were three separate
cross-heads rather than two; he also misplaced the Lamb head on the
narrow face of the same shaft that he placed beneath the two sides of
the Christ in Majesty head. This mistaken reconstruction has been
reproduced by later writers such as Radford.

His next paper, on Norse influence in Dumfries and Galloway
(1919-20), has given rise to a belief in an largely undocumented Norse takeover of Galloway, and a Norse influence on the sculpture that has influenced later commentators such as Radford (1948-49a, 97-101), Stevenson (1958-59, 50), and Bailey (1980, 228; 1984, 18). But it should be noted that his argument fundamentally depends on the idea of Picts in Galloway (op. cit., 98-9), which is a medieval myth (McQueen 1960-61, 39-45). The sculpture he mentions, in particular the 'dragon' slab at WAMPHRAY, has insular parallels predating the Viking period (see p.160) and no clear Scandinavian characteristics.

In 1923 he published a paper which attempted to review all the known sculpture in the western half of the region, approximately 98 pieces. This paper on Galloway (Collingwood 1922-23) is the first discussion of the sequence and chronology of the sculpture, rather than concentrating on individual pieces. He also classified a number of pieces as 'Anglian', and on the basis of comparison with material in Cumbria identified a Whithorn school of sculpture, which included such Cumbrian features as 'stopped-plait' interlace. The Whithorn School, which will be discussed more fully below, is the only group of sculpture in the region to appear mass-produced to a standard formula, though Collingwood's series can be broken into three slightly different groups (see p.209,223,Tables 5, 6 and 7).

Collingwood emphasised the Anglian and Norse influence on the Galloway sculpture as a result of his background of work in northern England, but consequently ignored the Welsh and Irish parallels to an extent which now seems misleading. Despite this, his article was reprinted in 1988, and exerts a continuing influence. He also wrote the first guide to the Whithorn Museum collection (Collingwood & Reid 1928), which summarises the material from his article. His drawings
of the sculpture, reproduced in both these works and in his general
survey (Collingwood 1927) make the ornament easier to understand,
but a number of them, such as his illustrations of WHITHORN 2 and 3,
KILMORIE, KIRKINNER 1, MONREITH, WHITHORN 6, WHITHORN 10, MAINS OF
PENNINGHAME, MINNIGAFF 1, CRAIGNARGET, DRUMMORE and SINNINESS are
inaccurate in detail.

He published a second article on the sequence of sculpture in
Dumfriesshire in 1925 (Collingwood 1924-25), but he was then over
70 and it is not clear whether he actually saw the sculpture he
described. Except for HODDOM 2 and CLOSEBURN 2 his drawings appear
to be based on the illustrations in ECMS 1903, and he reproduces the
same omissions of detail on the BOATFORD and CLOSEBURN crosses that
were noted above. He discussed 19 crosses here.

Apparently inspired by this article, which called for research
excavation (op. cit., 61) and included a drawing of the KIRKCONNEL 8
cross-base, in 1926 the Rev. C. Forbes Charleson commenced to excavate
the site of the pre-Reformation church at KIRKCONNEL in upper
Nithsdale, Dumfriesshire. The site had been recorded in 1912 by the
Royal Commission, who had noted various carved stones in the enclosure
wall (RCAHMS 1920, no. 332). Three cross-slabs were discovered in
this wall in 1926 and four more during clearance of the interior of
the church, though no plan was made or stratigraphy observed
(Charleson 1928-29; 1929-30).

Shortly before Collingwood’s Galloway article was published,
another minister, the Rev. R.S.G. Anderson, of the Isle of Whithorn
manse, began a series of articles from 1920 onwards on new discoveries
of cross-slabs in the area of Whithorn, most of which he donated to
Whithorn Museum (SRO/MW.1/39). These included BRIGHOUSE, ELRIG, BARMORE, CRAIGLEMIN 3, BOGHOUSE 1 and 2, and WHITHORN 32 (Anderson 1922-23; 1924-25; 1925-26; 1926-27; 1929-30). In 1927 he moved to Castle Kennedy manse near Stranraer and recorded a number of crosses in this area, including KILNCROFT and the GLENLUCE material, and two new crosses from the Rhins, INCH and GLAIK (Anderson 1935-36; 1936-37). It is noticeable that after he moved from the Isle of Whithorn to Castle Kennedy, discoveries of crosses in the Whithorn area ceased.

In the 1930s, major articles on the KIRKMADRINE, MAINS and WHITHORN 1 inscriptions were published by R.G. Collingwood (son of W.G.), and R.A.S. Macalister. Collingwood brought a detailed knowledge of Roman epigraphy, Macalister a detailed knowledge of comparable material in Wales and Ireland (Collingwood 1936-38; Macalister 1935-36; 1945). At the same period O.G.S. Crawford and G. Baldwin Brown fortunately photographed the HODDOM material, which had been taken from Knockhill to Hoddom Castle. The majority of this sculpture was subsequently used as road metalling to widen the drive at Hoddom Castle during the Second World War.

In 1940 C. Curle published a paper which attempted to establish the sequence and chronology of early medieval sculpture in Scotland (Curle 1939-40). In the course of this (op. cit., 71-2) she classified a number of cross-slabs in western Wigtownshire as 'Primitive Irish' (DRUMMORE, LAGGANGARN, CRAIGNARGET, and KIRKMADRINE 7), and placed them early in the sequence of development. This refreshing acknowledgement of the influence of Ireland in an area 22 miles from the Ulster coast was later dismissed by R.B.K. Stevenson, who followed Collingwood's lead in seeing all these slabs as
Norse influenced and late in the sequence of Strathclyde sculpture (Stevenson 1958-59, 50, 52).

From 1948 onwards, through the influence of R.C. Reid and the local archaeological society, C.A. Ralegh Radford undertook a series of excavations in the region. This included work at WHITHORN, HODDOM, ST NINIAN'S CAVE, Isle of Whithorn, Chapel Finnian and Castle Loch (Radford 1948-49a; 1952-53, 1949-50d; 1955-56b, 152-70; 1949-50a; 1949-50b). Despite this intensive campaign of excavation, no sculpture was found, except a 13th-century portable altar at Castle Loch, and ST NINIAN'S CAVE 5 which is not mentioned in Radford's reports on the excavation. Radford's visits to the region were part of a pan-Celtic monastic campaign and some of his pronouncements now seem over-confident. His belief that he had found St Ninian's 'Candida Casa' at Whithorn (1948-49a, 119) is no longer accepted. He seems unaware of earlier work in the region and believed the GLAIK and BOGHOUSE stones to be unpublished (1948-49b, 193; 1949-50b, 51). His belief that the GLAIK and LARG LIDDESDALE stones marked a route across the Rhins (1948-49b, 196) is belied by the topography. His early dates for STAPLEGORDON and RUTHWELL 2 seem questionable, and his drawing of STAPLEGORDON is misleading (1949-50e, 160; 1954-55, 180, fig. 1). In his catalogue of the lost HODDOM material he makes no reference to a number of stones that had been published previously (1952-53a, 184-97). However, he conducted the major campaign of excavation in the region, and produced corrected readings of the WHITHORN 1 and MAINS inscriptions (1955-56b, 170-8). He also suggested the possibility of a lost site in the area of the sculpture finds at AIRYLLICK, ELRIG, HOUSE OF ELRIG, and MAY in Wigtownshire (1949-50b, 52), a prediction subsequently confirmed in 1984 by W.F.
Cormack's discovery and excavation of the church site at BARHOBBLE (see Cormack 1984; 1984-85).

He also wrote a new guide-catalogue to the Whithorn Museum collection (Radford & Donaldson 1953). The second edition of this (Radford & Donaldson 1957) established a numerical sequence for this material which has unfortunately had to be abandoned here, as it includes a number of pieces not found at Whithorn itself, and excludes the material in the Royal Museum of Scotland (see III, 283). A revised, shortened version of this guide was published in 1984. There are minor errors in the guide, which are noted in the Gazetteer, the most conspicuous of which misplaces CRAIGLEMINE 3 at the same site as BRIGHOUSE, to the north-west of Whithorn. The draft revisions and additions to this guide can be seen in the closed SRO files SRO/DD.27/819 and 820. Material relating to a number of other sites also in the guardianship of the Ministry of Works and subsequently the Scottish Development Department, such as KIRKMADRINE, LAGGANGARN, ST NINIAN'S CAVE, HODDOM, and KIRKINNER, can also be seen at the Scottish Record Office in the series SRO/MW.1 and SRO/DD.27. Most of the latter files are closed to public inspection and require special permission.

In 1958 the Archaeology Branch of the Ordnance Survey was established (Rivet 1958, 41-2), and its card index, which includes unpublished material noted by the Field Investigators, made available to the public (see NMRS/OS Record Card entries in the Catalogues). Sculpture first recorded here includes GLENCAIRN 2 and WIGTOWN 2. Since 1983 this source has been incorporated into the National Monuments Record under the auspices of the RCAHMS, together with
a growing collection of air photographic coverage since 1977. Air photographs dating from the 1940s onwards are also held by the Air Photographs Unit of the SDD, including MOD coverage, and material from this source has also been consulted, as well as the Ordnance Survey and Cambridge University collections (see under HODDOM, BOATFORD, CLEUCH, KIRKCONNEL, ORCHARD, WAMPHRAY, KILTERLILTIE, HIGH AUCHENLARIE, CHAPEL DONNAN, CRAIGLEМИNE, BRIGHOUSE, LONGCASTLE, and DRUMMORE).

Within the region in the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s, new discoveries such as LUCE, rediscoveries such as FOREGIRTH, museum acquisitions such as CLEUCH, and losses such as HODDOM, were noted in TDGNHAS and Discovery and Excavation in Scotland by A.E. Truckell, the curator of Dumfries Museum; and subsequently J. Williams continued this tradition (CUMNOCK KNOWES, KILTERLILTIE, GLENCAIRN 2, MOSSKNOW, WAMPHRAY) and also published articles on RUTHWELL 3 and the rediscovered KIRKINNER 2 cross. But the first article to discuss individual sculptures in detail was by R.J. Cramp (1959-60), which took the Anglian influenced material in Dumfriesshire and related it to English and Continental parallels. She drew attention to the iconography of the HODDOM crosses, and manuscript parallels for the WAMPHRAY slab. She also provided photographs which showed details of the BOATFORD and CLOSEBURN 1 crosses omitted by Allen and Collingwood. She also pointed to the relationship between the CLOSEBURN 2 and KIRKCONNEL 6 slabs, which can be shown to belong to a group of sculpture in upper Nithsdale extending northwards into Ayrshire and Lanarkshire (see p. 169). However, her 10th-century dates for the BOATFORD and CLOSEBURN crosses (op. cit., 17), accepted by Gwenda Adcock (1974, 207), seem a century too late in comparison with Mercian material (see p. 141).
Three further crosses (WHITHORN 5, 15, and 35) were found at Whithorn in 1967 during excavations directed by P.R. Ritchie at the east end of the Priory, immediately south-west of Galloway's trenches. Unfortunately these excavations remain unpublished and the context of the crosses remains unclear (though see Cruden 1967, 56). A further cross-slab, WHITHORN 11, was found earlier built into the nave wall of the Priory.

More responsible excavations were undertaken by A.C. Thomas in 1964 and 1965 on ARDWALL ISLE, Kirkcudbright. As with Maxwell at ST NINIAN'S CAVE, Thomas' attention was drawn to ARDWALL by the discovery in the 1920s of two cross-slabs on the island, and his subsequent excavations led to the discovery of a previously unknown early medieval chapel site surrounded by an enclosure and a cemetery of dug graves, a number of which were marked with crosses and cross-slabs of varying size (Thomas 1959-60b, 79-82; 1966; 1967). On the basis of comparison with the sequence at Church Island, Co. Kerry (O'Kelly 1958), Irish influence at the site was predicted and a monastic background assumed. The Phase I to III levels at Ardwall were dated 6th to 11th century, despite the lack of evidence for five centuries of occupation. The swollen-stemmed crosses of Anglian type were dated 8th to 11th century following Collingwood's late dating of the ANWOTH slab, which seems an improbably long timespan for the sequence of graves revealed. The evidence for the slab shrine and corner-post shrine, and for the postulated Irish connections of the site also seem inadequate.

Thomas' discussion of the sculpture shows a new interest in the carving techniques employed (1967, 152-3, 158), though his use of this to construct a chronology can be questioned, as in the case of ARDWALL 1,
which he dates to the 11th century despite the use of his Phase II ‘early’ incised technique. However, Thomas did locate a previously unknown ecclesiastical site on the basis of two cross slabs found there, and there was a massive increase in the quantity of sculpture (27 pieces) as a result of the excavation, as at ST NINIAN’S CAVE. This is the only group of sculpture in the region to be found associated with burials, and in addition there appears to be a relationship between the larger slabs and burial within the chapel, while the graves west of the chapel seem to be unmarked.

More difficult to understand is the context of the incised cross-slab found unstratified during the 1973 excavations at the MOTE OF MARK, Kirkcudbright (Laing 1973a, 124). On the basis of the quantity of jewellery-making debris found on this defended site during Curle’s excavations in 1913 (Curle 1913-14a), it appeared to be a princely stronghold or even an industrial site. Considerable quantities of bone were also found, including cattle, sheep, and pig (Laing 1975a, 101). The cross, and the two fragments with Anglian runes showing evidence of literacy, though also found unstratified (loc. cit.), seem out of context with present interpretations of the site.

Recent field work in the region has included re-surveys by the Royal Commission of Eskdale in Dumfriesshire and the Rhins area in Wigtownshire (RCAHMS 1980; 1981; 1985; 1987), but no new sculpture has been found in either area. New or partly new finds in the 1980s include the previously unnoticed cross-head at HODDOMCROSS church, Dumfriesshire, the Anglian shaft-fragment from RASCARREL bridge, Kirkcudbright, which was previously thought to be medieval, and the rediscovered Whithorn School slab at WEST CROSHIERE, Wigtownshire.
All these were built into walls. Excavations by W.F. Cormack at BARHOBBLE, Wigtownshire, a site partly discovered through sculpture evidence (see above), have produced six pieces in the context of a church site, but reused in paving or walls (Cormack 1984-85; 1986; 1987; 1988; 1989). Ten more pieces have been discovered to date in the current excavations at WHITHORN directed by P. Hill (Hill 1984a; 1984-86; 1984-87; 1988a). As noted above, no slabs of the Whithorn School type have been found in the area presently being excavated. As at BARHOBBLE the pieces discovered have been found reused in paving rather than in association with the extensive cemetery. But at last there is stratified evidence for Northumbrian and Norse contact with the area.

Recent discussions of sculpture in the region have included G. Adcock’s analysis of the interlace of the RUTHWELL 3, CLOSEBURN 1, BOATFORD 1, and WHITHORN 14 pieces (Adcock 1974, 200-7), which introduced the terminology used in this thesis; and E. Coatsworth’s discussion of crucifixion iconography on the WHITHORN 3, HODDOM 2, KILMORIE, and RUTHWELL 1 crosses (Coatsworth 1979, 28-30, 52-3, 133-4, 188-96). On the basis of the decorative treatment of interlace known as ‘stopped-plait’ first described by Collingwood (1922-23, 217), R. Bailey has argued for a direct link between Galloway and south-west Cumbria, avoiding Dumfriesshire and the head of the Solway (Bailey 1980, 226). But in Cumbria this is found in association with other decorative features such as ‘spiral-scroll’, which do not occur in Galloway. He also seems to accept Collingwood’s Norse background to the sculpture, though noting that a Gaelic element predominates in the place-names of Galloway (Bailey 1974, I, 389-91; id. 1984, 9, 18). Subsequently Bailey made clear that Whithorn School characteristics
apart from stopped-plait are not found in Cumbria (Bailey 1984, 18), though in his summary of this passage J. Graham-Campbell unfortunately reversed Bailey's original argument, so that he claims that Bailey has identified Whithorn School characteristics in Dumfriesshire rather than Galloway (Graham-Campbell 1987, 48). On the other hand Bailey, as a result of misplacing the site of KIRKCONNEL 1 on his map (Bailey 1974, I, map 11; id. 1980, fig. 65) made the mistaken claim that stopped-plait is not found in Dumfriesshire. 7

The use of template analysis (Bailey 1980, 242-53) and fine gridding (Lang 1984b, 37-57) has not been found appropriate in this region, due to the dearth of figure sculpture, although careful measurement of the CLOSEBURN 1 and WAMPHRAY shafts has shown that the same width to depth ratio of 1.68 was used in both cases. Similarly the MOSSKNOW hogback is identical in size to the destroyed bone casket of similar shape from Cammin, Germany (Wilson & Klindt-Jensen 1966, 126, Pl. LV a, b). 8

The Corpus of Anglo-Saxon Sculpture (Cramp 1984b; Bailey & Cramp 1988) has demonstrated a concern with carving techniques, classification of ornament, accurate description and illustration, regional groupings and influence, and relating motifs and iconography to a historical context, but there is less interest shown in relating sculpture to its physical context, on the assumption that this is of little importance unless the stone has been found during controlled excavation (see Cramp 1983c, 2).

About 260 pieces of early medieval sculpture have been recorded piecemeal from the Dumfries and Galloway Region over the past 200 years. Existing catalogues only represent about half this material.
and are flawed by the pressures under which they were compiled, as well as changes in the approach to sculpture over the past century. At present there is no coherent list of sculpture in the region, and a number of the stones have never been illustrated. No distribution map of the sculpture in any part of the region has ever been published (except for Bailey 1980, fig. 65, discussed above), and as a result it has been difficult to recognise local groupings. Detailed information about the provenance of many pieces is hidden in unpublished manuscripts or else depends on co-ordinating divergent sources of published material. Important groups such as the lost HODDOM fragments have not been described or illustrated adequately, and elsewhere there has been a tendency to reproduce the same descriptions, illustrations and opinions over and over again, in homage to the perceived authority of earlier writers such as Allen, Collingwood, and Radford. Statements made on little evidence or mistaken evidence have become dogma, such as the supposed provenance of several important stones or the supposed Norse takeover of Galloway. A critical review of the existing material shows this approach to be inadequate, and in consequence the ground needs to be cleared for a new analysis of the sculpture to be made. The way forward appears to lie in an analysis of the local groups in their regional context, and the example of those sites where the presence of sculpture has acted as a trigger for excavation. In all the cases quoted above excavation on the site chosen has massively increased the existing quantity of sculpture, and in a number of cases this has been found in association with structures that appear to date to the early medieval period.
1. Detailed references to the sculpture mentioned in this summary are given in the Catalogues. See also Fig. 1 and the Index on p. 20.

2. Another of Riddell's manuscript notebooks is apparently in the library of the Society of Antiquaries of London (see King Hewison 1914, 173).

3. Though Muir had referred to two unidentifiable "broken pillars topped by an oval disc at Whithorn in October 1864 (Muir 1864, 48; id. 1885, 236)

4. They were still in the summer-house wall when first noted by Curle on 2nd October 1912 in his RCAHMS manuscript journal, 'Dumfries 3' (NMRS MS 36/47, p. 44-5). By September 1915 they had been removed (RCAHMS 1920, 101-3).

5. The thesis of a Norse takeover of Galloway is mainly based on place-name studies (see McQueen 1956; Nicolaisen 1960; McQueen 1973). But the evidence for this has been refuted by Brooke (1983) and Cowan (1991). See Oram & Stell 1991.

6. The only other slab directly associated with a grave was the lost inscription from LOW CURGIE, noted by Todd in 1861.

7. Bailey puts the symbol at the site of Kirkconnell, Kirkcudbright, 53 km to the south (Bailey 1980, fig. 65; see also Bailey 1974, I, map 11).

8. MOSSKNOW: L. 61 x H. 24.5 x W. 33
Cammin: L. 63 x H. 26 x W. 33
9. And see note 7. There are other maps in Stevenson 1955, 124, map 5; Radford 1962b, 129, fig. 14; Thomas 1968, 98, 101; Thomas 1971, 124, fig. 60. None of these deals with more than four or five stones each.
Unless sculpture has been found during controlled excavation, it is almost impossible to recognise whether it is in situ, and even then in the majority of cases the sculpture has been found reused in a secondary context. However the value of sculpture as a potentially dateable indicator of early medieval activity at a particular site or in a limited area, suggests that in all cases an attempt to establish the provenance should be made. A number of entries in the Evidence for Discovery sections of the Catalogue show that the sculpture has been moved several times, but that it may still be possible to indicate the earliest findspot or circumstances of discovery. The detailed evidence for each site and each stone is given in the Catalogue, but a number of generalisations may be made.

The majority of the sculpture has been found at church sites, whether in current use or abandoned, and most pieces have been moved from their original locations into museums. Those that remain are usually built into walls of fairly recent date. In certain areas such as Kirkcudbright this link between sculpture and churches is less apparent. There also appears to be a difference in the type of sculpture found at church sites and that found elsewhere. This may indicate a difference in function and suggests a link between form and function that will be analysed later.

The difficulty of single finds of sculpture from a site are that apart from the possibility that it may have been brought from elsewhere, it is not clear whether it represents a single period of activity at that site or whether it is the only evidence yet known because of its comparative bulk, in contrast to smaller objects or unexcavated stratigraphy. However their potential value is in
focussing research at a specific location or area, in the same way as objects found in fieldwalking.

In addition, the number of stones found at each site is directly related to its value as locational evidence. In several cases this has been through controlled excavation, as at Ardwall and Barhobble (II, 270; III, 19), and it is noticeable that on each of these occasions the sculpture has been found in association with a previously unknown church site. In other cases as at Kirkmadrine (p. 248), the discovery of sculpture in the area of the church indicates the continued function of the site over a period of time, rather than pinpointing a single phase of activity. In a few cases as at St Ninian's Cave (III, 220), the sculpture appears to be unrelated to any recognisable activity at the site, yet despite the lack of an archaeological context, indicates that the site was a focus of activity over a period of time. At St Ninian's Cave it is not clear whether this activity should be seen as burial, pilgrimage or manufacture (III, 226).

Sculpture finds at church sites appear to be more clear cut, and even without the supporting evidence of burials or early church foundations, suggests use as funerary monuments, architectural sculpture, or devotional display, as in the freestanding crosses. Less speculatively, the sculpture can, as is shown at Ardwall, be related to particular areas of the site (II, 270). In this case, though found in disturbed contexts, almost all the sculpture was found in relation to the burials on the south side of the chapel, apart from the largest pieces which were related to graves within the chapel. Evidence has been put forward elsewhere (Herity 1983, 256-7; Thomas 1967b, 45; id 1978, 76) to suggest that crosses which do not appear to serve a funerary function, unless they mark the founder's grave, are generally
found at the south-east end of the church; but in this region no cross has been recorded in situ in this position.

The best evidence for the original position of a cross comes from the position of its base (Russell 1977, 302), since this is the part least likely to be removed at a later stage. Unfortunately only seven are known from this region, and of these only the socket of the BOATFORD cross is likely to be in situ (II, 25). It is to be expected that freestanding crosses are more frequently found fragmented than cross-slabs, because of their size and for reasons of iconography, and this may be one reason for the dearth of sculpture in the east of the region.

The principal value of all the sculpture for later periods was as building stone, and even before the Reformation sculpture no longer in fashion or with no sentimental associations appears to have been freely incorporated into the fabric of churches or to have been used in field walls. But the contempt for idolatry and the abandonment of a number of medieval churches with the amalgamation of parishes at the Reformation appears to have acted as the main spur to the desecration or secular use of sculpture as building stone. The majority of sculpture found at church sites appears to have been found during 19th century restorations of churches built at the Reformation, the remainder during grave digging. In the area of Dumfries and Galloway there are very few church sites which preserve their medieval fabric, and none of the sculpture has been found built into medieval walls, either as rubble or as architectural furnishing. With the exception of RUTHWELL 3 [Plate 36] and possibly ARDWALL 12 [Plate 74a], architectural sculpture is almost unknown in the region, in contrast to Northumbria to the east and south, and it must be assumed that it was never common or fashionable.
It is possible that stones have been moved to churches from their original location, either for reuse as graveslabs (there are a number of examples defaced with later inscriptions), or to use as building material (since they are discovered in the course of demolition), or even for safekeeping. Equally there are known examples where stones have been moved from churches to private houses (i.e. KIRKINNER 2, III, 111). A church setting for the sculpture can be seen as either the best chance of preservation, or as a focus for destruction during periods of iconoclasm. But the disturbances of the Scottish Reformation seem to have had less influence than we might expect. As pointed out by Bailey (1980, 81) and Henderson (1978, 49), sculpture is hard to destroy totally, other than by using it as building rubble or hardcore, and Hoddom, one of the most ruthlessly vandalised sites in the region, provides one of the highest known figures for sculpture from any one centre (II, 128).

Whether a cross has been moved is not easy to determine. Romilly Allen provided a list of stones associated with church sites (ECMS ii 1903, 17-20), but he does not include those moved to a museum at the time of writing, and in other areas lists those which had been moved to churchyards in recent times for safekeeping. As a result his table of the relative proportions of stones on church sites can be revised on the basis of fieldwork to show that a total of 170 stones out of 260 are associated with known churchyards or burial grounds in this region. The problem is to know whether these figures have any statistical significance, and can therefore be used not simply to pinpoint early ecclesiastical centres, but also to link associated sites using similar motifs.

In the east of the region, a sharp distinction can be drawn between
freestanding crosses, decorated with figural and abstract ornament apparently arranged in a theological programme, and the recumbent monuments or small headstones, which appear to be predominantly funerary. To the west this distinction disappears, and the predominant monument is a freestanding cross slab ornamented in relief with interlace, with no evidence of a didactic function. In both east and west there are plainer monuments, usually incised in outline, but these unlike the other categories are rarely found at church sites. It will be shown below that the geographical grouping of monuments in this region is quite sharply defined, and that there are recognisable foci and boundaries between the different types of sculpture.

The final question concerns the purpose of crosses, and the implications of their original location. The context and function of crosses are not often discussed, but their purposes are likely to range from use as gravestones or memorials through to dedication stones, devotional foci, and boundary markers (see Thomas 1967b, 98-9; Bailey 1980, 82; Herity 1983, 256, 270). They can also be personal or institutional. It is probable that crosses not directly associated with graves but set up close to a church served a dedicatory function or carried a theological message; those further away were possibly associated with its territorial boundaries and area of sanctuary, or may have marked pilgrimage routes or served as memorials.

But it is also probable that the carving of each cross was in itself an act of personal devotion, a prayerful activity that was to some extent an end in itself, with the finished product intended as an offering to God. This aspect should not be forgotten in the more straightforward search for workshops and provenance.
1. Cross-bases in the region include: BOATFORD 2; DALGARNOCK; HODDOM 29; KIRKCONNEL 8; ORCHARD; KIRKINNER 3; WHITHORN 36.

2. Out of the 91 sites which have produced sculpture in the region, 34 are church sites.
CHAPTER 7

Dating

Possible criteria for dating early medieval sculpture have recently been outlined by Bailey (1980, 45-75) and Cramp (1984a, xlvii). The primary method, of dating by inscription, is of limited use in this area. A maximum of 15 stones out of 260 in Dumfries and Galloway carry inscriptions (see Table 12 and Fig. 32), and 4 of these are lost or doubtful.

The two texts on the RITHWELL 1 cross have been discussed exhaustively in connection with the figures and the Vercelli Book text of the Dream of the Rood (Badwin Brown 1921; Okasha 1971, 108-12; Howlett 1976) and have contributed to the currently favoured date of c. 750. It is not clear whether the lost HODDOM 30 stone carried a genuine runic inscription (see II, 257), and there is no evidence to suggest that it was decorated and could therefore be compared with any of the other sculpture from the site.

These are the only known inscriptions from Dumfriesshire. From Kirkcudbright there are only the inscriptions from ARDWALL Isle. One of these (8) consists only of two letters (Thomas 1967a, fig. 33.8), the other two occur on the same stone (6) [Plate 72a-b], and appear to be variants on a personal name (Thomas 1967a, 153-5). The slab itself is decorated with a saltire cross of a type not found elsewhere at the site or in the region. The name however appears to be Anglian, and together with the letter forms discussed by Okasha (1971, 48, no. 3) can possibly be given a terminus post quem by association with the known historical event of Anglian penetration into Galloway prior to 720, as recorded by Bede (H.E., III.4, V.23). But at WHITHORN, where Bede specifies Anglian control (see Chapter 20), there are two stones only with Anglian inscriptions (5 and 6). These and the neighbouring
stone from ST NINIAN'S CAVE (1) carry fragmentary runic staves, which
ironically have been dated by Page (1973, 21-2) following the
art-historical dates assigned to the sculpture by Radford & Donaldson
(1957, 40-1, 44-5). Page also suggests that the lettering on WHITHORN
6 may be secondary (1959b, 385-6), and this possibility is reinforced
by the evidence presented here in the Catalogue (III, 304) that this
stone has been recut, and that the lettering occurs on a later edge. 3

The only other sculpture where the inscriptions appear to provide a
date are WHITHORN 1, KIRKMADRINE 1-3, and MAINS [Plates 171a, b; 130a,
131a, 132a; 150a]. But it is suggested in the Catalogue that these
stones, which have been dated over a period of three centuries
(Collingwood 1936-38; Radford & Donaldson 1957, 38-9, 46-7) are in
fact rather more closely linked by the use of similar letter forms,
such as the ligatured ET, which occurs on all three of the KIRKMADRINE
stones and also on the MAINS stone (III, 117, 127, 130, 188). All
four of these stones carry chi-rhos, and the principal reason for the
7th-century dating of the MAINS stone is the occurrence of the
personal name Petri, which has been linked with the historical
evidence for an Anglian presence at Whithorn, and the triumph of the
Roman party at Whitby (Collingwood 1922-23, 211-15; Macalister
1935-36, 320). This dating by association with a known historical
event appears rather too simplistic, but despite the ligatured ET,
the letters on the MAINS stone are seriffed, unlike the KIRKMADRINE
stones, and appear to be related to such Welsh inscriptions as
Aberdaron, Caernarvonshire (Nash-Williams 1950, 84, no. 77, fig. 62,
pl. VIII). But unfortunately the date for this has in its turn
been based by Nash-Williams on the historical inferences about the
MAINS inscription noted above. It should therefore be born in mind
that dating by inscription is not an independent discipline, and that
in several cases crude historical inference or stylistic arguments have been used in their turn to date the inscriptions.

As noted above, very few stones have been found in stratified contexts, and all of these appear to have been in a secondary position. No stones, other than possibly CLOSEBURN 1 (II, 28), have been found reused in standing walls earlier than the 16th century. In consequence, none of the stones a-e directly context-dated. However the stones found in secondary contexts during the excavations at Whithorn, Ardwall and Barhobble at least have a terminus post quem through virtue of having been found in controlled excavations. At Ardwall unfortunately the stratigraphy did not permit the crosses to be dated independently, and instead the crosses were used in part to provide a phasing for the site (Thomas 1967a, 174, 176-7). The stratigraphy at Whithorn and Barhobble appears to be clearer, but so far neither excavation is complete and only a few pieces have been found in the Whithorn campaign. However these two sites appear to represent the best hope of context-dated sculpture in the region.

Bailey has shown that in England, sculpture with external affinities to the monastic network of Northumbria is far less common that the mass-produced secularised sculpture of the Viking age (Bailey 1980, 80-4). This is partly true in Dumfries and Galloway, but there is also a strong regional split. In Dumfriesshire there is no early inscribed sculpture of the type found at Whithorn and Kirkmadrine, or at Liddlewater and elsewhere (Macalister 1945, 486, 491-501) just outside the region to the north east (see Thomas 1968, 102, map). Instead the greatest concentrations are the Anglian influenced material around Hoddom and up into Nithsdale. But while this material appears to run on into the 10th century, there is no explosion of later sculpture, and this is only found at a few sites in the same two areas.
as the earlier sculpture. In the west around Whithorn there seems to be a gap after the inscribed sub-Roman sculpture, with little evidence of the Anglian influence seen over to the east, until the emergence of the Whithorn school, which is found at a number of sites in a limited area (p. 212), but appears to have little chronological development or recognisable ancestry in the region. In Kirkcudbright and the Rhins peninsula to the west, there is evidence of the type of cultural fragmentation noted by Bailey (1978, 175), as well as a lack of technical skill, which makes it difficult to relate the sculpture chronologically.

Typology and style are useful in defining internal groups and in linking the sculpture to external influences, but depend either on borrowing dates put forward elsewhere or in estimating a lapse of time before a motif is likely to be disseminated to an outlying region. However the quality of some of the sculpture in this area, particularly the Ruthwell cross, suggests that present day notions of centre and periphery may not be valid here in the early medieval period.
1. Though see WHITHORN 4 [Plate 173c] and ST NINIAN'S CAVE 3 [Plate 162a].

2. WHITHORN 7 is doubtful and only recorded in a drawing [Plate 176b].

3. It is also possible that the inscription ran round all three narrow faces of the slab, and that two faces were recut.
PART I

Dumfries
CHAPTER 8
Dumfriesshire - Locational

The Roman background

Dumfriesshire is divided into a coastal zone at the head of the Solway, with access in the east to English Cumbria, and to the west with the coastal zone of Kirkcudbright beyond the estuary of the river Nith. The upland zone to the north and west is divided by three valleys running south to the Solway, with Annandale and Eskdale to the east, and Nithsdale to the west. The principal Roman road ran inland parallel to the coast, with extensions northward up both Annandale and Nithsdale (Ordnance Survey 1978). These gave access to the Borders region and Clydesdale respectively, and a number of fort lie at even distances along each route (Maxwell 1977). Just south of Thornhill in Nithsdale the Roman road appears to have branched westwards to Kirkcudbright, but traces of this road have been recognised only recently (Wilson 1989) and only the forts of Glenlochar and Gatehouse of Fleet have been identified and excavated over to the west (Richmond & St Joseph 1951-52; St Joseph 1983). There is no evidence that the road continued into Wigtownshire despite the possible evidence of place-names, which may indicate coastal exploration by sea (Rivet & Smith 1979, 426, 447, fig. 7). The route up Nithsdale continues northwards to the Antonine forts in Clydesdale, possibly linking with the recently discovered fort at Girvan, on the Ayrshire coast to the north of Wigtownshire (St Joseph 1978). The Nithsdale route branched eastward north of Thornhill, and the road and a small fort are still visible near Durrisdeer (Miller 1952, 49, 50, 124-6, Pl. XX). This route ran north-east, linking the area with the Lothians and the east coast. Consequently from Roman times onwards, there is evidence of a route running on a north-west line, linking Cumbria and Clydesdale,
and a second, south-west route linking Lothian and the Borders with the area towards Whithorn.

The map of the region's geology (Fig. 8) shows interesting links between the coastal zone and Nith valley, the Roman road running north-west, and isolated pockets of sandstone suitable for relief carved sculpture. It is noticeable that the bulk of sculpture found in Dumfriesshire is carved in relief from sandstone, and found on the line of this route, in clusters which partly relate to the pockets of sandstone, and partly to junctions in the Roman road system. There may be a relationship between the two types of evidence, since the bulk of sculpture from Dumfriesshire comes from the area of Hoddom, which is 5.75 km (3.5 miles) from the Roman fort at Birrens, which would have provided a source of ashlar for both building and sculpture. Four inscribed Roman stones have been found in association with the Anglian sculpture at Hoddom (Fig. 39), and the foundations of the church have reutilised dressed Roman masonry (Radford 1952-53a, 181). Alternatively it is possible that the earlier quarries were reopened. Discussion of the geology of the Ruthwell cross has shown that the stone type, with variations in colour between adjacent beds of sandstone, is found in a limited local area (Barbour 1899-1900), and that it is therefore unlikely that the cross has been moved far from its place of manufacture, despite the folklore recorded by Nicholson in the 17th century (Ware 1902, 196). Rough Scar, the site he suggests that it was moved from, now lies 2 km (1.25 miles) from the coast, in the mud flats of the Solway (NY 104 633).

It is difficult to know if any direct link should be made between some of the sculpture from Hoddom and the preceding Roman sculpture from the area. There is a similarity of pose between the robed mother goddess figures found at Bewcastle and Housesteads and the Christ in
majesty figures on the cross head HODDOM 1, as Saxl pointed out in connection with the Bewcastle cross (Saxl 1943, 18, Pl. 7a). In addition, the most distinctive feature of the plant scroll found at Hoddom, the use of rosettes, is found on a fragment from Birrens, of 1st or 2nd century date (Keppie & Arnold 1984, 14, no. 34, Pl. 13). It is therefore possible that in addition to ashlar masonry, the strong classicism seen on HODDOM 1 and on HODDOM 3, which may be its shaft, should be ascribed to the influence of Romano-British models available in the immediate area, in addition to the Mediterranean influence and models documented at Monkwearmouth and Jarrow in the 7th century (Plummer 1896, I, 368-70, 373), and shown to permeate throughout Northumbria (Cramp 1965a). See below, p. 122.

Analysis

Sculpture in Dumfriesshire falls into a number of groups, which can be distinguished both stylistically and geographically. The bulk of the sculpture is concentrated in three clusters, in lower Annandale around Hoddom, in Nithsdale in the area of Thornhill, and around Kirkconnel in upper Nithsdale. These three areas represent most of the sculpture which is decorated in relief, but there are a number of outlying pieces. Some of these are incised, others are late or of uncertain date. The outlying relief sculpture appears to represent expansion from the known centres.

With the exception of Hoddom and Kirkconnel, no site in Dumfriesshire has produced more than two pieces of sculpture. Hoddom and Kirkconnel are both church sites. About 30 free standing crosses, cross-slabs, and a possible inscription have been recorded from the vicinity of Hoddom, but not from controlled excavation. Kirkconnel was excavated in 1926, and 7 fragments were found, though not in
stratified contexts. There is no pre-conquest documentary evidence for any Dumfriesshire site, though Hoddom is recorded as a possession of Glasgow in the 12th-century Inquest of David (see II, 180).

The predominant influence of Hoddom upon the region appears to have been in the use of plantscroll. This is found on twelve stones from Hoddom itself, predominantly in the form of alternating scrolls. Figure sculpture is confined to this site, Ruthwell 1 and to Closeburn 1 in Nithsdale. Inhabited vinescroll is again confined to these three sites, and to Durrisdeer in Nithsdale, but differs sharply in the type of plant and the competence of execution (see Chapter 9).

The use of plant scroll on the Wamphray slab, 24 km up Annandale to the north, at a possible chapel site otherwise entirely isolated from other sculpture in the area, may suggest a link to Hoddom since plant scroll in spiral form is found uniquely at Wamphray and Hoddomcross [Plates 39a and 28a]. It is possible to imagine that this site was a dependency (cf Cambridge 1984, 73-4) of the monastery at Hoddom, whose existence has now been demonstrated by excavation (Lowe 1991). Plant scroll has also been found on the miniature hogback stone from Mossknoy, discovered 7 miles (11 km) to the east of Hoddom, and on two cross shafts from the coastal zone between Nithsdale and Kirkcudbright to the west (Rascarrel and Kilterliltie). But though it is tempting to link these to Hoddom, the use of medallion scroll on all three stones suggests that they belong to the Kendal 1 and Lancaster B group (Collingwood 1904, 330c; idem 1927, fig. 46), with links to Hexham (Cramp in Edwards 1966, 148-9). Medallion scroll has not been found on any of the sculpture from Hoddom itself, but there is spiral scroll on Hoddom 7 comparable to Hexham 2D (Cramp 1984b, Pl. 173.917) and on Rascarrel, face B, comparable to Lancaster A (Collingwood 1927, fig. 74).
Architectural sculpture is unknown in the area, apart from RUTHWELL 3 and possibly 4 [Plates 35a & b]. Inscriptions are only known on the Ruthwell cross itself (RUTHWELL 1) and possibly HODDOM 30, which is recorded as a lost runic text, though Page has shown that the description is unreliable (see II, 257). No pre-conquest stone church is known from the area, except for the Ruthwell evidence, and the undated reuse of Roman masonry in the foundations at Hoddom (Radford 1952-53a, 181). But a stone building described as possibly a church was identified in the 1991 rescue excavations to the north-east of the graveyard at Hoddom (Lowe 1991; Lowe forthcoming).

Elsewhere in Northumbria, it has been shown that pre-Viking age sculpture is usually found at monastic sites or their dependencies (Bailey 1980, 81-4; Cambridge 1984, 68-75). However, since there is no documentary evidence for any pre-conquest site in Dumfriesshire, including Hoddom (see II, 180), no site in the region can be identified as monastic on any basis other than the sculpture, apart from the recent excavated evidence from Hoddom (see above). Nor, as shown above, is there evidence for literacy or building in stone, both of which have been used to identify monastic culture in other areas.

In consequence, all the pre-Viking age sculpture from Dumfriesshire is without the evidence for context recognised elsewhere. As a result, the cluster of sculpture in central Nithsdale is without any clear foci, and no more than two pieces of sculpture have been found from any site in this area. But it is noticeable that the sites are either close to the Roman road leading southwards to Hoddom and northwards towards Clydesdale, or are on the other route which runs south-west between DURRISDEER and GLENCAIRN. All the pre-Viking age sculpture in central Nithsdale is found within a radius of 5 miles (8 km) of the junction between these two roads. It is therefore tempting...
to see the sculpture as associated with these long standing lines of communication, and as pointed out elsewhere, the medieval pilgrimage route to Whithorn recorded in the royal accounts links a number of the sculpture sites along the east-west route (see Fig. 12). It is also noticeable that the two incised crosses from southern Nithsdale, CLEUCH and FOREGIRTH, were found outside this cluster of relief-carved Anglian sculpture around Thornhill, in the area between it and the group to the south-east centred on Hoddom.

It is apparent however that the concentrations of sculpture shift northward over a period of time. The earliest group of relief carved sculpture, with figures and plant scroll is found at Ruthwell and Hoddom, in the coastal area nearest to England. Although later sculpture is found at Hoddom, the focus shifts north-west, up the Nith valley to the group around Thornhill, which includes the free-standing crosses BOATFORD, CLOSEBURN 1, GLENCARN and DURRISDEER. These appear to be succeeded by a group of cross-slabs, some of which, such as CLOSEBURN 2 and PENPONT 1 and 2, are found in the same area, but others are found further north in upper Nithsdale, from the church site at KIRKCONNEL and also two sites to the north-west beyond the Dumfriesshire border, at Cairn and Mansfield (Hewat 1899-1900; Stuart 1867, 67-8, Pl. CXXI). These sites are linked together by the use of similar closed-circuit knots and plain twist patterns, but also copy the Pattern C knots found on BOATFORD 1 and CLOSEBURN 1. Despite the change of form from free-standing cross to slab, there appears to be a link in the decorative tradition, although on the cross-slabs the only ornament is twist or interlace, with no reference to the figure sculpture or plant scroll found on the free-standing crosses.

Of these, the CLOSEBURN 1 cross refers back more clearly to the Hoddom tradition of figure panels and plant scroll, but the rosette
motif is found in the centre of the damaged BOATFORD head. This cross is notable for its emphasis on symmetrical animal ornament, in a style related to Mercia rather than any earlier sculpture in this region, but this ornament has some of its closest parallels in manuscripts and worked bone (see p. 145), and could thus be based on portable models that could be scaled up on a grid (Adcock 1974, 203). It is also notable as the only cross in the area that may be in situ, since it is standing in a stone base sunken below ground level, which is recorded in the earliest references to the cross. Its location close to a crossing of the river Nith, which is recorded as a ford ever before the bridge was built (Ramage 1876, 333-4), and the proximity of an 'eccles' place name (see II, 20), together with the possible evidence of timber buildings adjacent to the cross on the aerial photograph [Plate 9], suggests that despite the lack of excavation this may be the focal site in central Nithsdale. It is possible despite the secular appearance of the ornament on this cross that it is following an Apocalypse scheme, with beasts "with tails like unto serpents" adoring Christ in the form of the Morning Star in the rosette at the centre of the cross head (p. 141). If so, it is hard not to see such sculpture emanating from a monastic background. Though the field is at present under pasture, this appears to be a site that would repay further investigation.

On the other hand the two pieces of sculpture from CLOSEBURN, 3 miles (5 km) to the south-east, are both from a known church site, though the evidence for the provenance of CLOSEBURN 1 has not previously been demonstrated (see II, 35). This church was of a number of phases and the sculpture appears to have been recovered from the walls, but apart from the place name 'Kyl-osbern' (Watson 1926, 167; Nicolaisen 1976, 129) there is no evidence for the original
foundation of the church. The two cross-slabs from PENPONT also appear to have been found during the reconstruction of a church in the 19th century (II, 90). The original plan of the churchyard, before the new church was built, is shown to have been circular on early maps [Plate 34]. O'Sullivan (1980b) has shown in Cumbria that churchyards of this type need not necessarily be seen as 'Celtic', as the greater number in that area have Anglian names, but at Perpont the name is clearly British (Watson 1926, 180; Nicolaisen 1976, 165), though there appears to be no reason why it should not date to the period of the expansion of Strathclyde in the 10th century (Jackson 1963, 72, 79). The decorated cross-heads GLENCAIRN and DURRISDEER were also discovered reused in the fabric of later churches, and both have been recut for the purpose, but there is no evidence to show if they were on their original site.

The sculpture from KIRCONNEL is exceptional in that seven pieces were found on the same site (Charleson 1928-29). But this was during archaeological excavation, though the method and recording seem to have been poor even for 1926 (II, 61). The sculpture from this site underlines the lack of evidence for continuous or intermittent occupation of any one site in the area other than HODDOM, as it all appears to have been produced within a single generation. The other sculpture in this region seems to suggest brief episodes of activity at each site, though this may be a distortion in consequence of the lack of excavation. But at KIRKCONNEL this greater quantity of sculpture may also be related to its apparent late date, since as Bailey has shown elsewhere, this would be typical of the explosion in quantity of sculpture in the Viking age after the decline of monastic culture (Bailey 1980, 80-1). The lack of a complex didactic scheme on any of the sculpture from this site or on the other late cross slabs in upper Nithsdale or at HODDOM would bear out the theory of an
increased secularisation of sculpture at this period.
1. Sculpture has recently been removed from the graveyard wall at Hoddom, and turned up by the plough, but only one piece was excavated from a stratified context (see Lowe 1991, 12, and Craig forthcoming).
Dumfriesshire - Stylistic Introduction

Up until the Viking age the stylistic elements of the sculpture in the east and the west of the region are entirely distinct, with only free armed cross-heads carved in relief in the east and in outline in the west to show a relationship between the two parts of the region. It is noticeable that the series of Early Christian Latin inscriptions found at WHITHORN and KIRKMADRINE to the west, and reflected outside the region at Liddelwater, Yarrowkirk, Manor Water and Peebles¹ in the Border uplands to the east (Thomas 1968, 102, fig.), is absent in the intervening area of Dumfriesshire, where no inscribed memorial stones have yet been found (see Fig. 32 and Table 12).

In Dumfriesshire the predominant type of monument is the free-standing cross with cusped arms, carved in relief and decorated with plant scroll in one or more long panels. The two cross-shafts found at KILTERLILTIE [Plate 85] and RASCARREL [Plates 93, 94] in Kirkcudbright further to the west follow the scheme found at Hexham, Kendal and Lancaster (Collingwood 1927, 36-7; Cramp in Edwards 1966, 148-9), of long panels on all four faces of the shaft filled with medallion scroll on the broad faces and undulating scroll on the narrower. The shafts found at HODDOM, in contrast, have short figure panels on the broad faces and long plant scroll on the narrow [Plates 50, 52, 53]. The same scheme is found at RUTHWELL (Collingwood 1927, fig. 101) but here the plant scrolls are inhabited, a motif only found elsewhere in this region on one side of the CLOSEBURN 1 cross [Plate 12a], and possibly at DURRISDEER [Plate 17]. The single biped caught in tangled scroll on one fragment at HODDOM [Plate 54a] shows little kinship with the rythmic layout of the RUTHWELL sides.
The later crosses in Dumfriesshire, BOATFORD and CLOSEBURN 1, use the same layout as Hoddom and Ruthwell, of short figure panels on the broad faces and long panels on the narrow, and as is shown below (p. 155), this appears to be a regional tradition, regardless of the decorative motifs used.

1. Liddelwater, Roxburghshire - Macalister 1945, 494, no. 514; RCAHMS 1956, 88-9, no. 78; Yarrowkirk, Selkirkshire - Macalister 1945, 491-3, no. 515; RCAHMS 1957, 110-13, no. 174; Manor Water, Peeblesshire - Macalister 1945, 486-8, no. 511; RCAHMS 1967, 175, no. 376; Peebles, Peeblesshire - Steer 1968-69, 167-9, fig 1, Pl. 9A.
CHAPTER 10
Hoddom: Figural Ornament

Introduction

Outside Dumfries and Galloway figural sculpture is associated in its early stages with monastic culture in its use of images of Christ or haloed saints, either singly, in pairs or occasionally, as at Rothbury, in larger groups (Cramp 1984b, Pls. 213.1218 and 214.1221). In almost all cases these follow a classical mediterranean model, with styles of dress and portraiture based on late Roman examples (Cramp 1984b, 20-22). On the other hand, in the Viking age the classical haloed figures are replaced or at least outnumbered by secular figures in lay dress apparently based on contemporary fashions, and in a number of examples carrying weapons (Cramp 1982). Haloed figures, although still appearing, are stylised, and no longer appear to be based directly on imported models.

Within the region itself this distinction is not found. Almost all the figural sculpture carries robed or haloed figures, with the single exception of the small figure beneath the crucifixion on the KILMORIE slab in Wigtownshire [Plate 124]. The principal contrast across the region is in the degree of stylisation, varying from the modelled drapery at RUTHWELL and on HODDOM 1, 3, and 22 [Plates 45-9, 50, 58], to the flat featureless bodies of the figures on MINIGAFF 1 and WHITHORN 2 over in the west [Plates 89b, 172e]. Out of the forty pieces of sculpture from Whithorn this is the only example of ornament other than interlace or fret pattern.

HODDOM 1, 3, and 22

The contrast between the Hoddom sculpture and RUTHWELL 1 appears to
be in scale. At Ruthwell the surviving figure panels vary between 69 and 123 cm in height, and contain full length portraits. At Hoddom, in contrast, there is only one surviving full length panel, on HODDOM 22, face A, which is 55 cm high [Plate 58a]. The other figure panels on this shaft are portrait busts. On the HODDOM 3 shaft the figures in all four of the known panels are paired [Plate 50a, c]. On one face of the cross-head HODDOM 1 there is a full length seated figure within a medallion [Plates 48-49], but on the other side and in the outer panels of the cross-arm there are again small scale portrait busts [Plates 47a, b, 49b]. From the estimated measurements of this head and the shaft HODDOM 3, as well as the surviving shaft HODDOM 22 (see Table 20), it is clear, as Professor Cramp pointed out (Cramp 1971, 61-2), that the known Hoddom sculpture followed a fashion for delicately worked miniatures in contrast to the broad hieratic style of RUTHWELL 1, and can be dated to a slightly later period, contemporary with Collingham in Yorkshire, which follows the same fashion for portrait busts in panels on the shaft (Collingwood 1927, 70, fig. 87), and Easby, which also has a portrait medallion in the centre of the head (Longhurst 1931, Pl. XXVII, 3, 4; Pl. XXVIII).

Both the seated figure in the centre of the head and the medallion bust on the opposite face show strong links with late imperial portraits, as found on the Theodosian silver dish (Delbrueck 1929, Pl. 62), and in particular the consular diptychs (Delbrueck 1929, PIs. 63, 64, 65). This use of imperial or majestic imagery, which is also seen in the finger gesture common to all these portraits, had become by the seventh century an accepted feature of the iconography of Christ as ruler. See for example the Vatican silver reliquary cover showing Christ between Peter and Paul (Schiller 1971b, abb. 638). Parallel examples are found in Northumbrian culture on RUTHWELL 1 (Wilson 1984, ills. 69, 70) for the upright gesture of blessing seen
on HODDOM 1 c (i), and the apostles on the Cuthbert coffin for the various gestures on HODDOM 1 b (i) and HODDOM 22 with the fingers crooked and crossed (Kitzinger 1956, Pl. IV, fig. 2, Pl. VIII).

The contrast between the two types of gesture, as well the contrast in position between the larger single figure in the centre of the head and the figures on the shaft, suggests that a clear distinction is being made between the imperial figure of Christ in majesty and the company of saints or apostles.

HODDOM 1

The seated figure of Christ at the centre of the head of HODDOM 1 c (i) [Plate 49a] has some resemblance to Romano-British mother goddess figures dating to the 2nd and 3rd centuries found at Housesteads and Bewcastle (Coulston & Phillips 1988, nos. 167, 180), but a reintroduction of classical styles from the continent seems necessary to explain the high quality modelling of the drapery on the figure at Hoddom. A seated figure of Christ within a mandorla holding a book is seen on the 7th-century sarcophagus of Agilbertus at Jouarre (Schiller 1971b, abb. 680), but this figure is surrounded by evangelist symbols, unlike Hoddom 1 c (i). The closest parallel in gesture, style and dress is the Christ figure on the Vatican silver reliquary (Schiller 1971b, abb. 638). In sculpture the same type of Christ in Majesty is seen at Easby, Dewsbury, Halton and Rothbury (Collingwood 1927, figs. 53, 90, 92, 94), but in these cases the figure is in a panel on the shaft rather than placed at the centre of the head (Longhurst 1931, 44, 45).

All the figures on HODDOM 1, 3 and 22 are haloed, but unlike RUTHWELL there is no evidence that Christ's halo was rayed. The figures in the outer panels on either side of the cross-arm HODDOM
la/d are treated in the same formalised way, as half turned busts, but the paired figures on 1 a (iii) appear to be the apostles Peter and Paul [Plate 47a], and the single figure on 1 d (iii) is shown as a winged angel with a floriated sceptre [Plate 49b], as on the Fletton frieze (Clapham 1927, 231, Pl. XL, figs. 2, 4) and also the Cuthbert coffin (Kitzinger 1956, 275, Pl. VI, fig. 2; Pl. IX). Busts of paired saints can be seen on Norham 9 (Cramp 1984b, Pl. 206.1188), and one of these has a rod on his shoulder, but the same type of object as on 1 a (ii) is seen with the St Peter figure on the Cuthbert coffin and clearly shown as a key (Kitzinger 1956, 266, Pl. V, fig. 4; Pl. VIII).

HODDOM 3

There is less distinctive detail visible on the paired haloed figures on the shaft HODDOM 3 [Plate 50], but it is possible that those on 3 a (ii) and 3 c (ii) represent the Annunciation on one face and Paul and Antony on the opposite. This pairing is found locally at Ruthwell. On 3 a (ii) the heads differ in size, and the smaller appears to be veiled [Plate 50a]. The figure of the virgin at Ruthwell is haloed, and Annunciation scenes with the heads at the same level and the angel on the right are seen on an 8th-century Byzantine silk (Beckwith 1970, Pl. 147). Alternatively this panel may be juxtaposed with that above, 3 a (i), which possibly represents a Fall scene (Cramp 1959-60, 15). If so, the figures may represent the meeting of Christ with the woman at the tomb. This link is made by Gregory the Great, who contrasts the two events (Minge 1865, col. 1194: Ward 1987, 14).

"Venit Maria Magdalene annuntians discipulis quia vidi Dominum, et haec dixit nihii'. Ecce humani generis culpa ibi abscidit unde processit. Quia enim in paradiso mulier viro propinavit mortem (Genes. III. 6), a sepulcro mulier viris annuntiat vitam;

"Lo, the guilt of the human race is cut off whence it proceeded. For in paradise a woman gave death to man; now from the tomb a woman announces life to men and tells the words of the Life-giver just as a woman told the words of the death-bearing serpent."

(Ward 1987, 14).

Fall scenes are rare in early medieval sculpture (Bailey 1977, 63), but the feet enmeshed in plant scroll in panel 3 a (i) have some resemblance to the depiction on the Newent cross, Gloucestershire (Kendrick 1938, Pl. LXXVII.1), which also has stylised flowers underfoot. This parallel seems closer than the examples of Dacre and Tynemouth cited by Cramp (1959-60, 15-16; 1984b, 226, Pl. 225.1265; Bailey & Cramp 1988, ill. 239), where the figures are not juxtaposed. The same form of tilted feet are found both on the opposite panel 3 c (i) and in the figure panel on Hoddom 22 A [Plates 50, 58a]. The contrast between bare and robed legs on 3 c (i) led Cramp to suggest that the scene showed the healing of the blind man (1959-60, 15), and this proposal can be reinforced by comparison with several continental ivories (Volbach 1961, Pls. 88, 223; Schiller 1971a, fig. 470) and a silver vase in the British Museum (Volbach 1961, Pl. 121). The roundels under foot which Cramp saw as rocky ground (1959-60, 15), and Romilly Allen suggested might indicate wheeled cherubim, as in Ezekiel 10, 8-22 (Irving 1900-05b, 201), resemble the stylised flowers shown in the Stuttgart psalter, fol. 107 (Schiller 1971a, fig. 389) and the vault fresco at Tarrasa, Spain (Grabar & Nordenfalk 1957, 63, plate).

Blank panels are found both on HODDOM 3 and HODDOM 22, and while these may have carried painted inscriptions, they emphasise the lack of evidence for writing from a site which might have been expected to
reflect the level of literacy shown on RUTHWELL 1, found 8 km to the S.W. It may be though, that these panels are a development from the broad margins which carry the inscriptions at RUTHWELL, and reflect a regional tradition of providing a surface for inscription, whether this was done at the time the cross was carved, or later (see Meyvaert 1982, 26). But it is likely, as at Ruthwell, that such inscriptions would have identified the scenes in the figure panels (Okasha 1971, 108-12).

HODDOM 22

The predominant Hoddom figural motif of a haloed figure gesturing at an open book is found in its most repetitive form on HODDOM 22 [Plate 58]. The full length robed figure under an architectural frame on 22 A [Plate 58a] is echoed on the narrow faces of the shaft by simplified busts separated by plain panels [Plate 58b, d]. Unlike the full length figure the busts are carved almost in outline, but with slight distinguishing features, and it seems probable that these figures were derived from a single model. As with the figures of Christ on the cross-head HODDOM 1, the full length figure under an arch holding a book is a common Mediterranean type, with examples in manuscripts such as the 6th-century Rabbula gospels (Cecchelli et al 1959, fol. 10a), on a wooden mensola at Bawit, Upper Egypt (Beckwith 1963, Pl. 100) and in stone on the 7th-century closure slab at Metz (Hubert, Porcher & Volbach 1969, ill. 291).

Similar sources also provide models for the various architectural frames around the figures themselves. For example the building on Face A has parallels in a mosaic at St Maria Maggiore (Morey 1953, Pl. 163), a column at St Marks, Venice (Volbach 1961, Pl. 83) which also includes a standing figure, and the Codex Purpureus, Munich, Nat. Lib. (Morey 1953, Pl. 194). The form of the central finial pyramid on Face
B is also found in the Rabbula Gospels, fol. 14r (Cecchelli et al 1959), and the Etchmiadzin Gospels, fol. 6r (Harbison 1985, Pl. IIa). The Rabbula gospels also include leaf sprouts in the corners of the arch (op. cit., fols. 12v and 14r), as on Face D.

As a result of following these standardised Mediterranean models, the layout and details of this shaft have close parallels with other Anglo-Saxon carving, in particular the haloed figures under arches found on Otley 1 and Collingham in Yorkshire (Collingwood 1927, figs. 52, 87) and Halton and Heysham in Lancashire (op. cit., figs. 92, 89). The figures on these crosses have been discussed in detail by Cramp (1971, 61-2), who also showed that triple slab capitals were found in the architectural frames on all three crosses except Heysham (op. cit., 60). Full length saints under arches with tilted feet are seen at Fletton, Huntingdon (Cramp 1977, fig. 55a, b) and Castor, Northampton (op. cit., fig. 57b). Heads flanking a central figure as on Face A occur on Easby, Yorkshire (Longhurst 1931, Pl. XXV.1); the squared forehead ornament on Face B is worn by a figure at the base of Auckland St Andrew 1 (Cramp 1984b, Pl. 5.13); the leaf sprouts in the corners of the arch on Face D appear on Otley 1, cited above, and on Dewsbury, Yorkshire (Collingwood 1915, 165, fig. d). The slightly different finger gestures on Faces B and D can be seen amongst the various forms of blessing used by the saints and angels on the Cuthbert wooden coffin panels (Kitzinger 1956, Pls. VI.2 and IX; Pls. IV.2 and VIII). All these elements look back to Mediterranean models, as shown above, but the detailed Northumbrian parallels suggest that this shaft should be dated to the late 8th century, when the monastic network was still closely interlinked and connected with the continent.

It is clear therefore that the Hoddum sculptors were following
universally available models for the depiction of their ecclesiastical figures, and that the scheme of a cross could be constructed from these standardised types. It is possible though that the HODDOM 22 shaft is using these repetitive figures to represent the Heavenly Jerusalem of Revelation 21, 12-14, as sculpture with this iconography is described in 'De Abbatibus' (Campbell 1967, 51; Henderson 1982, 4). An Apocalyptic symbolism behind these figures would reinforce the possibility that the Lamb read HODDOM 2 formed part of the same cross (see II, 207).²

**HODDOM 2**

At the centre of the cross-head is a Lamb without attributes in a medallion [Plate 5.a] The head is damaged, but it breaks the beaded circumference of the medallion in the same way as the figures of Christ on HODDOM 1a and 1b also in the centre of a cross-head. That this creature with scalloped fleece represents Christ as the Lamb is shown by its position on the cross. This Lamb in majesty contrasts with the image found on RUTHWELL 1, which is held by a standing figure and placed in a panel on the shaft of the cross. In patristic commentary the Lamb of Sacrifice (John, 1.29) and the Lamb of Judgement (Revelation, 5.6) were combined (see Coatsworth 1979, I, 50-3; Okasha & O'Reilly 1984, 39-41).

Ó Carragáin and others have shown that the 'Agnus Dei' chant was introduced into the Mass by Pope Sergius (687-701), in rejection of the eighty-second canon of the Trullan Synod of 692, which forbade representation of Christ as the Lamb (Howlett 1974, 333-4; Ó Carragáin 1978, 134-5; Davis 1989, 86-7), and that the inclusion of this chant led to an increase in popularity of the iconography of the Lamb which spread to England (Coatsworth 1979, I, 51). The Good Friday
liturgical hymn 'Pange Lingua', which has been shown to influence the 'Dream of the Rood', contains the line "Agnus in crucis levatur immolandus stipite" (see Simpson 1965, 213), and the passage from John, 1.29: "Ecce Agnus Dei, ecce qui tollit peccata mundi", was mentioned six times by Bede in his 'In Lucae Evangelium Expositio', published 709x715 (Howlett 1974, 334; see Hurst 1960, 57, 89, 161, 279, 350, 373).

Early images of the Lamb are less frequent. The best known example is found on RUTHWELL 1, which as has been shown above follows a separate development of the type. The HODDOM 2 Lamb was therefore included by Dolley (1971, 337) in his Group A (9th and early 10th century), together with the Tower cross, Kells, Co. Meath (Henry 1967, Pl. 74); the Durrow cross, Co. Offaly (Henry 1967, Pls. 98, 109); the St Cuthbert stole embroidery (Battiscombe 1956, Pls. XXXIII, XXXIV); and a ring from Aberford-Sherburn, Yorkshire (Wilson 1964, 117, no. 1). But both the last two examples are haloed. On the Irish crosses the Lamb stands in a medallion, but is raised above the figure of Christ in Majesty at the centre of the cross-head.

Dolley does not mention the earliest English representation, the Lamb within a medallion in the Codex Amiatinus, fol. VIv (Bruce-Mitford 1969, 17, Pl. IX; Alexander 1978, 33, cat. 7, ill. 24). This is dated to the late 7th century, and is closer than any other Insular example to HODDOM 2. Similarly, Coatsworth, who dates all the early images of the Lamb in England to the 9th century (1979, I, 64-5), does not refer to the Codex Amiatinus painting. It is therefore possible that HODDOM 2 is the earliest sculptural representation of the Lamb in this country, perhaps of 8th-century date. Unlike Hart 7 A, which Cramp compares with Hoddom (Cramp 1978b, 123, Pl. XV), neither the HODDOM 2 Lamb nor the Codex Amiatinus Lamb are shown in
the company of the four apocalyptic Beasts. But it is possible that
the rosettes in the arms of the cross are the sun and moon of the
apocalypse, and therefore linked to the Lamb as an image of judgement
(see Raw 1967, 391).

HODDOM 23

The cross-arm HODDOM 23 has not often been discussed, as it was
thought to be lost until recognised in the course of this research
(see II, 161). The surface is worn and damaged, and quite crudely
carved, but there appears to be a winged or horned figure on Face A
[Plate 59b]. Collingwood saw this as the winged ox of St Luke
(1924-25, 56), and suggested therefore that there were evangelist
symbols in all four arms. Such a scheme is found on the cross-head
Hart 7, Durham (Cramp 1978b, 122, Pl. XV; idem 1984b, Pl. 82.417),
and the four beasts also appear on a shaft at Ilkley, Yorkshire
(Collingwood 1927, fig. 63). But all these beasts are haloed. Winged
facing oxen with human bodies and no halo occur in manuscripts such as
the Macdurnan gospels (London, Lambeth Palace MS. 1370), fol. 1v
(Henderson 1987, 47, ill. 50), and Poitiers, Biliothèque de la Ville
MS. 17, fol. 31r (Friend 1939, Pl. XXIII). However, the figure also
appears to have a lower pair of wings broken off near the body,
and double winged cherubim or seraphim are found on Shelford,
Nottinghamshire (Kendrick 1949, Pl. LI), Durham 5, Durham (Cramp
1984b, Pl. 43.205), and Moone, Co. Kildare (Henry 1964, Pl. 14).
There is also a horned figure without wings but with raised hands at
Dewsbury, Yorkshire (Collingwood 1927, fig. 73). The identification of
the figure on HODDOM 23 therefore remains uncertain, but Collingwood’s
suggestion of an evangelist symbol is probably the most acceptable.

The crude basket plait on Face D [Plate 59d] is a common 10th-to
11th-century type (Cramp 1984b, 18) found on Barwick-in-Elmet in Yorkshire (Collingwood 1915, 136, fig. c), and Brigham 2, Cross Canonby 1, and Workington 3 in Cumbria (Bailey & Cramp 1988, ills. 135, 220, 589 and 591), as well as sites in Wales and Ireland (Nash-Williams 1950, nos. 188, 190, 303; Lacy 1983, no. 1539). The spiralled Half Pattern A on Face D [Plate 59e] is again a late type seen on Lindisfarne 6 and 11 in Northumberland (Cramp 1984b, Pls. 192.1070, 193.1074), Chester le Street 2 and Sockburn 8 in Durham (op. cit., Pls. 22, 23, 136.736), and Ripon in Yorkshire, as Collingwood pointed out (1915, 234, fig. f; 1924-25, 56). It is therefore possible that crosses with a symbolic scheme were still being carved at Hoddom two or three centuries after the erection of the Lamb head, HODDOM 2.
1. The other Hoddom figural motif, the paired haloed heads on HODDOM 3 aii and 3cii [Plate 50a, c] may also have been used in the defaced panel on Face C of HODDOM 22 [Plate 58c]. See II, 240.

2. Painted Apocalypse scenes were on the panels brought back by Benedict Biscop to Wearmouth from Rome, 4th journey, c. 680 (see Meyvaert 1979, 66, 77).

3. This occurs together with a bust of God the Father also in a medallion (Bruce-Mitford 1969, 16-17, Pl. XI, 1), resembling the bust in the cross-head HODDOM 1 b (i) [Plate 47b].
Rosettes

The most distinctive motif on the HODDOM shaft fragments 3b, 4 and 5 is the use of rosettes in the plant scroll [Plates 50, 52, 53]. While rosettes and marigolds are found in manuscripts such as the Lindisfarne gospels, the St Chad gospels, and the Canterbury psalter, and in the centre of cross-heads (see below), the use of these motifs on shafts appears to be unusual outside Hoddom. The only examples are those cited by Cramp (1959-60, 14. fn 13) and Bailey (1980, 83), at Kirkby Stephen, Cumbria (Bailey & Cramp 1988, 122, ill. 394) and Wycliffe, Yorkshire (Collingwood 1927, fig. 48). The scheme shows relationships with Hexham (see Cramp 1984b, Pl. 174.922), but as demonstrated in the Catalogue (II, 208), all the shaft fragments from Hoddom with this motif belong to a single cross, HODDOM 3 [Plate 50], with figure panels on the broader faces, unlike Hexham (Cramp 1965a, 8). As suggested above, it is possible that this motif derives from a local Romano-British example, as fragments with rosettes and plant scroll are known from Birrens, 5.75 km to the north (Keppie & Arnold 1984, 14, no. 34, Pl. 13). However, the rosettes on these fragments have central bosses, unlike the Hoddom examples.

Rosettes are also found on the Lamb head, HODDOM 2 [Plate 51a], and HODDOM 15, an arm fragment which may belong to it [Plate 51b]. As demonstrated in the Catalogue (II, 206), this head does not belong with any of the rosette shaft fragments, despite Collingwood's drawing (1916-18a, fig. 19; 1927, fig. 51); in addition there are eight petals on the head fragments and only six on the shaft. On the cross-head and the arm the rosettes are carved in relief with scooped petals, unlike the shaft. It is possible that the motif is being used
here symbolically, as an image of the Morning Star adjacent to the Lamb (see p. 125). In the later use of this motif on the BOATFORD cross a 13-petalled rosette is placed in the centre of the head [Plate 3a] and thus appears to be an image of Christ in its own right. The possible Apocalypse imagery of this cross is discussed below (p. 141).

The use of rosettes on cross-heads is comparatively widespread outside the region, for instance on the Hexham and Carlisle heads (Cramp 1984b, Pls. 172.910, 178.944; Bailey & Cramp 1988, 85, ill. 196), but in almost all cases the motif is placed like BOATFORD at the centre of the head. The only exceptions are the Monkwearmouth fragment, Durham, which Cramp noted (1984b, 122, Pl. 107.590); the Rothbury cross, Northumberland, on the underside of an arm (Cramp 1984b, Pl. 212.1212); and the Bath fragment, which Kendrick noted (1941b, 76, fig. 1), in two rectangular panels on the end of the arm. All these examples take a different form to HODDOM 2 and 15, though Rothbury and Hexham 8 also have scooped petals.

**Plant-scroll**

In addition to the use of rosettes, the plant scroll on either face of this Hoddom shaft takes two distinct forms, again not duplicated on any other cross (see Cramp 1976, 267-9, figs. 2-5). On HODDOM 3b/4 [Plate 52] each rosette offshoot branches through a drop spiral which terminates in a large spear shaped leaf. This motif is seen at Bewcastle, Cumbria, but in tree-scroll form in a single panel (Bailey & Cramp 1988, ill. 102). A closer parallel is the badly damaged fragment from Edlingham 1, Northumberland (Cramp 1984b, Pl. 164.870), but not enough of this survives to show whether the plant scroll here followed the same alternating pattern as Hoddom. But in this case, and on the Lechmere slab, Worcestershire (Baldwin Brown 1937, 254,
side not illustrated), there is only a single turn to the spiral.
The motif of a rosette, or berry bunch on a long stem passing through scroll is also found on Hexham 3 A (Cramp 1984b. Pl. 174.992), but not in the undulating form found at Hoddom.

In contrast, on the opposite face [Plate 53] the rosettes alternate with berry bunches and are enclosed by the scroll. The offshoots end in budded leaves, counterpointed in pairs and looped around the stem. The motif of berry bunches enclosed by scrolls is found on Hexham 3 D (Cramp 1984b. Pl. 175.926), but more specifically enclosed rosettes are found on Kirkby Stephen (Bailey & Cramp 1988, ill. 394) and Wycliffe (Collingwood 1927, fig. 48), as noted above. The bud between two leaves again appears on Hexham 3, on face A (Cramp 1984b. Pl. 174.992), but is also found at RUTHWELL, centre of W. face (Bailey & Cramp 1988, ill. 687) and Bewcastle 1 D vii (Bailey & Cramp 1988, ill. 107), as well as sites stretching from Croft in Yorkshire to Norham in Northumberland (Collingwood 1927, fig. 59; Cramp 1984b, Pl. 206.1181). The looped stem is considerably more unusual, but appears once more at Hexham on 1db and D (Cramp 1984b, Pl. 174.907 & 908) and Abercorn, West Lothian (ECMS iii 1903, fig. 435 D) in a slightly different form.

Animal ornament

In the inner panels on both sides of the surviving arm of the cross-head HODDOM 1 are symmetrically placed animals, placed between the haloed figures in the outer panels and the medallion of Christ in Majesty at the centre. Apart from the Lamb on HODDOM 2 and the biped in plant scroll on HODDOM 6, these are the only animals in the Hoddom repertoire, yet they appear to influence later sculpture in the region such as BOATFORD and CLOSEBURN 1.

The winged affronted cat beasts in HODDOM 1 c/d (ii) [Plates 48.
49a, b] have their prototype in Mediterranean carvings of winged lions such as the relief on a door architrave at Hetra (Aberg 1945, fig. 60), and a relief at Athens cathedral (op. cit., fig. 62.1). Winged cat beasts appear in the late 8th-century Cutbercht gospel book (Vienna, National Bibl., Cod. 1224), fol. 18 (Alexander 1978, 62-3, cat. 37, ill. 182), but the closest parallels in sculpture are to be found in the Breedon friezes, Leicestershire, as Clapham (1927, 231, 237), Radford (1952-53a, 187), Cramp (1959-60, 14; 1977, 207), and Jewell (1986, 101) have all pointed out. There are winged centaurs in the friezes on the N. and S. walls of the chancel (Clapham 1927, Pl. XXXIII, fig. 1 & 2), and beasts with cat-like faces in the S. porch (op. cit., Pl. XXXI, fig. 2; Pl. XXXII, fig. 1), though the former are enclosed in trumpet scroll and the latter are not winged or paired.

Animals within a scroll are seen on the opposite face, in HODDOM 1 a/b (ii), which shows backturned kneeling dogs within a plant frame [Plates 46, 47a, b]. Single backward-looking dogs in foliage are seen at Breedon in one frieze (Cramp 1977, figs. 50, 54a, b). Paired dogs within a plant frame but affronted occur closer to Hoddom at Nunnykirk, Northumberland (Cramp 1984b, Pl. 207.1192) and Irton, Cumbria (Bailey & Cramp 1988, ill. 361). But the closest parallel is in metalwork, on the Rupertus cross, Bischofshofen, Austria (Campbell 1982, Pl. 101), which has similar backward-looking dogs in a plant frame. The leaf and cherry terminals of the plant are a type found at Masham and Croft in Yorkshire (Collingwood 1927, figs. 59, 133), and Penrith in Cumbria (Bailey & Cramp 1988, ill. 476), as well as on the Stonyhurst gospels cover (Wilson 1984, ill. 20). The pointed leaves in the corner of the panel, and in the shaft panel 1 b v below the bust of Christ [Plate 47b] occur again on the cross-arm HODDOM 13 [Plate 56c] and at Norham, Northumberland (Cramp 1984b, Pl. 206.1186).
These panels are of interest in that they are considerably more susceptible to analysis than the figure sculpture in all the other panels on this head, which as has been shown above, follow classical models with considerable skill. The animals and plant scroll give this head a less didactic air than the HODDOM 22 shaft with its devotion to haloed saints, and foreshadow the later developments of sculpture in this region and elsewhere in Northumbria and Mercia.

The judicious use of plant scroll also suggests that the Royal Commission (RCAHMS 1920, fig. 75) were correct in reconstructing this head together with the HODDOM 3 shaft, with its panel of enmeshed human feet [Plate 50a]. As it has been shown in the Catalogue that the plant scroll which Collingwood placed beneath the Lamb head HODDOM 2 (1916-18a, fig. 19; 1927, fig. 51) is in fact part of this shaft (II, 216), it therefore seems more likely that the Lamb head was part of the figural shaft, HODDOM 22, since both have been argued to follow an Apocalypse scheme. It is less probable that it went with the plain shaft HODDOM 28 [Plate 63]. This is of a type with cable moulding edges also found at Dewsbury, Yorkshire (Collingwood 1927, fig. 106), and has a cusped lower arm, like HODDOM 2, but since there is no rosette on this arm, it is likely that the rest of the head was plain, like the crosses found at Whitby, Yorkshire (Peers & Radford 1943, 35-7, figs. 1, 2, Pl. XXIXa), as Radford (1952-53a, 189) and Cramp (1959-60, 16) have pointed out.

Other plant forms

The bush scroll with paired leaves in the cross-arm HODDOM 13 [Plate 56c] resembles the plant frame of HODDOM 1 a/b (ii), as has been noted above, and also the bush scroll enmeshing the feet in HODDOM 3 ai [Plate 50a]. The double pointed leaf with bud is found in
the plant scroll on HODDOM 3 d / 5 [Plate 53]. But in type it is more formal than any of these. Cross-arms with plant scroll and pointed leaves are found at Hart, Durham (Cramp 1984b, Pl. 82.418) and Crayke, Yorkshire (Sheppard 1938-39, fig. VIIa), but not in bush scroll form. Bush scrolls are found on Carlisle 2, Cumbria (Bailey & Cramp 1988, ill. 203-5) and Staindrop 1, Northumberland (Cramp 1984b, Pl. 147.769) but with leaves absent or of a different type. The extreme formalism of the HODDOM 13 bush scroll, which seems awkwardly placed in a cross-arm, is closer to examples in metalwork, like the Komnes mount, Norway (Bakka 1963, fig. 44, 45c, d), or manuscript, like the Canterbury Bible (London, B.L., Royal 1.E.VI), fol. 43 (Wilson 1984, ill. 114).

A metalwork background may also lie behind another cross-arm, HODDOM 12, which has a central roundel enclosing a quadrant arm knot [Plate 56b]. Although this type of knot occurs in sculpture, for instance Skinnet, Caithness (ECMS iii 1903, fig. 29) and Glencolumbkille, Co. Donegal (Lacy 1983, fig. 158b), there is no other example placed in a cross-arm. However this motif is also found in Insular metalwork, on the Kaupang mount (Wamers 1985, taf. 27.10) and the Kvistad mount (op. cit., taf. 27.9), both found in Norway. In addition, the same type of squared tapering cross-arm with a central roundel can be seen on the Rupertus cross, Bischofshofen, Austria (Campbell 1982, Pl. 101). It is therefore possible that this cross-arm is based on a metalwork original, such as the Rupertus cross, with enamelled roundels resembling the two Norwegian mounts in the arms.

The tangled plant scroll with trilobed berry bunches on HODDOM 16 [Plate 56d] is found in sculpture on Norham 1 D in Northumberland (Cramp 1984b, 208-9, Pl. 203.1159), which Cramp dates to the second
quarter of the 9th century, and Masham, Yorkshire (Collingwood 1907, 361, fig. a). The same form is found both in manuscripts, such as the Barberini gospel book (Rome, Vatican, Bibl. Apostolica, Barberini Lat. 570), fol. 125 (Alexander 1978, 61-2, cat. 36, ill. 172), dated to the late 8th century, and in metalwork, for instance the Windsor sword pommel (Hinton 1974, 63-5, no. 36, Pl. XVIII, XIX), which also has flowers or berry bunches looped round the stem. Another metalwork parallel of considerable significance for any assessment of Hoddom will be discussed further below.

This type of tangled plant scroll is also found at two other sites in the immediate area, HODDOMCROSS [Plate 28a] and LUCE [Plate 28b-c], though there appear to be flowers rather than berry bunches on the HODDOMCROSS cross-head. These are arranged in a whirling pattern around a central boss, and thus have some resemblance to the WAMPHRAY foliate spiral [Plate 39a], or the spiral on the adjacent face of Norham 1 (Cramp 1984b, Pl. 203.1157). Hanging flowers of this type are also found on Hexham 3 (op. cit., Pl. 174.924) and Falstone 1 (Collingwood 1927, fig. 44; Cramp 1984b, Pl. 165) in Northumberland. This is also a type found on metalwork, including the Windsor sword pommel cited above. The LUCE fragment appears to be closer to HODDOM 16, and has the tangled scroll and triple buds of Norham 1 D and the scroll spiral and offshoots of Norham 1 A (Cramp 1984b, 208-9, Pls. 203.1157, 1159), as well as the looped berry bunches of the Windsor pommel.

But the most important metalwork parallel for this group of sculpture are the unprovenanced gilded copper-alloy fragments in the Royal Museum of Scotland (FC 179), recorded as having been found in Dumfriesshire before 1905 (--- 1905-06, 342-3, fig. 1; de Paor 1960-61, 184-95, fig. 1, Pl. XII; Webster & Backhouse 1991, 173-5.
Two fragments of this carry embossed plant scroll with trilobed berry bunches looped around the stem, of identical form to those found on HODDOM 16 [Plate 56d]. These fragments were originally thought to have come from a 6th-century continental helmet (de Paor 1960-61, 193), but very recently they have been convincingly reinterpreted as coming from a shrine or cross, and dated to the second half of the 8th century (Webster & Backhouse 1991, 174-5).

It is therefore possible that these pieces, like HODDOM 22 and 23, and the crozier drops RMS KC 3 (Radford 1953-54, 115-9, Pl. I; Michelli 1986, 380, ills. 7, 8) and BM 51.7-15.5 (Michelli 1986, 381, ills. 9-11), may have been discovered during the demolition of Hoddom church in 1815 (see II, 166), and were therefore part of Charles Kirkpatrick Sharpe's collection, dispersed at his death in 1851 (II, 162).

Later animal and plant ornament

The single biped caught in tangled scroll on HODDOM 6 [Plate 54a] resembles the type of creature in the centre of RUTHWELL, E. face (Cramp 1965a, Pl. 6), but this fragment does not share the rythmic layout of the inhabited scrolls on RUTHWELL or CLOSEBURN 1, Face D [Plate 12a]. It appears closer to Jarrow 2, Durham (Cramp 1984b, Pl. 90.478), though the details of the plant ornament are difficult to distinguish on the only available photograph. But the possible triquetra beneath the animal is paralleled on a late shaft from Gargrave, Yorkshire (Collingwood 1915, 176, fig. m), so in date it may be closer to the bird in foliage on the DURRISDEER cross-head [Plate 17a].

HODDOM 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11 all appear to be part of the same cross, with broad-band spiral plant scroll on both shaft and head [Plates 54b, c; 55a, b; 56a]. This type of flat plant scroll is found on
shafts at Ilkley, Yorkshire (Collingwood 1927, fig. 62) and Lancaster A (op. cit., fig. 74), though the HODDOM 8 face [Plate 54c] resembles the ornament on the head of Otley 1, Yorkshire (Cramp 1971, taf. 45.1). A similar cross-head to HODDOM 9 and 10 [Plate 55a, b] occurs at Kirkdale, Yorkshire (Collingwood 1911, 286, fig. i). But the tangled interlace on HODDOM 10 suggests that the complete cross may have been of 9th or 10th-century date.

Interlace

Interlace is unknown on the early pieces from Hoddom, but all the remaining sculpture from the site is decorated in this manner, apart from HODDOM 25 [Plate 61a, b], a round headed cross-slab which may be part of a composite monument (Bailey 1980, fig. 14) or else the sort of head and foot stone found at Whitby (Cramp 1984b, Pl. 263.1424). A cross of this type found at the Hirsel, Roxburgh, has been compared with this slab (Cramp & Douglas Home 1977-78, 230, Pl. 14b), but the closest parallel is probably Burton in Kendal 4, Cumbria, dated by Bailey as 10th to 11th century (Bailey & Cramp 1988, 84, ills. 193-7). There are minor differences in the stepped ring and incised outline, and the lack of a boss on one face. Collingwood saw wedge-shaped arms as a late pre-Norman feature (1927, 142), as on the slab from Lythe, Yorkshire (Collingwood 1911, 288, figs. f, g: 294, fig. ee).

The HODDOM 24 cross-head with interlace on one face and incised mouldings on the other [Plate 60] is almost identical to Brigham 7, Cumbria, as Bailey has said (Bailey & Cramp 1988, 77, ills. 152-5), but Brigham has a broad squared ring and HODDOM 24 has a double trail of interlace around the boss. The Brigham head was dated 10th to 11th century. The interlace on Face A [Plate 60a] occurs at several sites in Yorkshire, including Gargrave and Kildwick-in-Craven (Collingwood
1927, figs. 156, 174), Lythe (Collingwood 1911, 287, fig. c) and Northallerton (Collingwood 1907, 373, fig. m), and the crosslet rosette at the centre of the head is paralleled in the same area, at North Frodingham (Collingwood 1927, fig. 151). Relief and incised carving on opposite faces is found on a number of slabs in the Whithorn area (p. 210), as well as on the GLENCAIRN 1 cross-head [Plate 19].

The flat-band Pattern E knot on HODDOM 17 [Plate 56e] is a type found at Brigham 2, Cumbria (Bailey & Cramp 1988, ill. 135) and Thornhill, Yorkshire (Collingwood 1915, 247, fig. g), but is too fragmented to be diagnostic. It is similar in type to the Closed Circuit Pattern A knots on HODDOM 26 and 27 [Plate 61c, d]. Plain ring-chain is found at Brigham 2, Cumbria (Bailey & Cramp 1988, ill. 133), but all the examples of this form of closed-circuit interlace in the Whithorn area are either median-incised or else carved in outline (see p. 210). Thus while this is recognisable as a 10th-to 11th-century period type, there appears to be no direct connection with the styles used in the western part of the region.

The only recumbent monuments at Hoddom considered here to be pre-Norman are HODDOM 18, 19, and 20. These are fragments of a slab with twist borders and a plain central panel [Plate 57a-c]. This type is found elsewhere in the region at CLOSEBURN 2 [Plate 15d], though that slab has closed-circuit interlace rather than twist ornament. Twist is used on a slab from Liberton, Mid Lothian (Stuart 1867, Pl. LXXVII.1).

Miscellaneous lost fragments

The missing fragment with chequer pattern, HODDOM 32 [Plate 65b],
which Baldwin Brown recorded (1921, 171, fig. 13.3), is paralleled on
an architectural piece at Hexham, Northumberland (Cramp 1984b, Pl. 184.1003) and on the Bewcastle cross, Cumbria (Bailey & Cramp 1988, ill. 105), as Cramp has pointed out (op. cit., 66), though too little
of it is shown in Baldwin Brown's drawing to be certain that it is not
Roman. But it may have been the only known architectural fragment from
Hoddom.

Similarly, the only recorded inscription from Hoddom, HODDOM 30, is
also lost, but without any surviving drawing, and the difficulties of
accepting this as a genuine runic inscription are discussed in the
Catalogue, following Page (1969, 31, 40). The blank panels on HODDOM 3 [Plate 50a, c] and 22 [Plate 58b, d] may have carried painted
inscriptions, as Cramp has suggested for Otley 1, Yorkshire (1971,
59-60, taf. 41 A, C; taf. 42.1, 3), and examples of explanatory
inscriptions are found at Dewsbury, Yorkshire (Okasha 1971, 66-7, no.
32) and more immediately on RUTHWELL 1 (Saxl 1943, Pls. 1a, 1b). The
panels on HODDOM 3 are more likely to be explanatory, as on RUTHWELL,
while those on HODDOM 22 may have carried litanies of saints, apostles
or evangelists (see Cramp 1971, 60). RUTHWELL 1 and HODDOM 30 are the
only recorded inscriptions in the whole of this eastern part of the
region, despite the presumption of literacy evidenced in the
iconography of these Anglian-influenced crosses.

It is clear however that the sculpture at Hoddom ranges in date
from the 8th to the 11th century and later, and thus provides unique
evidence in this region for the intermittent or continuous occupation
of a site throughout the early medieval period, only paralleled by the
excavated evidence from Whithorn. The possible administrative reasons
for this are examined in Volume 2 (II, 180).
1. Lindisfarne gospels (London, B.L., Cotton Nero D.IV), fol. 26v (Nordenfalk 1977, Pl. 19); St Chad gospels (Lichfield, Cathedral Lib., Gospel Book (St Chad)) p. 218 (Nordenfalk 1977, Pl. 25); Canterbury Psalter (London, B.L., Cotton Vespasian A.I), fol. 30v (Nordenfalk 1977, Pl. 32).

2. Cramp has also noted a link between the rosettes found on the sculpture at Hexham and a panel there which may be Roman (Cramp 1984b, 186, Pl. 182.972).


4. It appears that the missing fragment HODDOM 31 also had a rosette at the centre of the head (Cramp 1959-60, 16, fn. 19); see II, 259. Other examples include High Hoyland, Yorkshire (Collingwood 1927, fig. 99), St Mary Bishophill 5, York (Lang 1991, ill. 235), and Abercorn, West Lothian (Calder 1937-38, figs. 1, 3). Most have eight petals, but York has four, like STEWARTRY MUSEUM [Plate 96b].

5. The Lamb and Flag slab, HODDOM 55 [Plate 44b] appears to be medieval (Radford 1952-53a, 197, no. 27).

6. The Lamb head HODDOM 2 and the figural shaft HODDOM 22 are also both of an appropriate miniature scale. The Christ in Majesty head HODDOM 1 and the HODDOM 3 shaft appear to have been rather more massive in size. See the discussion of the measurements of the lost Hoddom stones in II, 153, and Table 20.

7. But most of the cross-arms from Hoddom (see also 1a-d, 12, 13, 15 and possibly 16) appear to be cusped (Cramp 1984a, fig. 2, types D.9 or 10). That this type also appears on several cross-slabs discovered at Hoddom in 1991, including one which appears to show
a free-standing cross of this type in a base (Craig forthcoming) suggests that there was a major influential monument at Hoddom. This is likely to have been HODDOM 1.

8. Excluding the arm knot on HODDOM 12, which is otherwise plain.

9. The recumbent grave slabs from Hoddom listed by Radford (1952-53a, 190-6, nos. 8-20) appear to be a medieval type (see p. 264). Slabs of 8th- or 9th-century date as well as a plain cross-shaft were discovered by ploughing E. of the graveyard in 1991, and will be discussed separately in the appendix to the excavation report (see Craig forthcoming).
CHAPTER 12
Boatford and Closeburn

BOATFORD 1

At first sight the use of animal ornament in stone carving appears to be an expression of secular culture, but its use on sculpture in Dumfries and Galloway appears in several cases to draw on the language of Christian iconography. The clearest example is the cross-head, HODDOM 2, which shows a Lamb without attributes in a medallion [Plate 51a], but this use of apocalyptic imagery may also be found in the animal ornament on the BOATFORD 1 cross. In the centre of the head is a 13 petalled rosette [Plate 3a], which appears to be a development of the most distinctive Hoddom motif (Cramp 1959-60, 17). But its position in the centre of the head rather than the arms suggests that this rosette should be seen as an image of Christ, the "bright and morning star" (see Revelation, 2.28, 22.16). This iconography is explained by Bede in his 'Explanatio Apocalypsis', lib I, caput II: "'Et dabo illi stellam matutinam'. Christus est stella matutina, qui nocte saeculi transacta, lucem vitae sanctis promittit et pandit aeternam" (Minge 1862, col. 140 B. C; see Bonner 1966, 9).

It is possible therefore that the animal types on this cross, all with looped or spiralled tails [Plates 1a, 1b], are intended to represent the 'locusts' from the bottomless pit, described in Revelation, 9.3-10 and 17-19, as having the bodies of horses and "tails ... like unto serpents" (cf. Bailey 1980, 171; ECMS i 1903, xlvi); see also Isaiah, 14.21-22. Alternatively the paired creatures may be intended to evoke the passage from the Greek version of the Canticle of Habbakuk, 3.2 (footnote in the Jerusalem Bible, not in the Authorised Version): "Between two animals you will make yourself
known; when the years draw near, you will be recognised; when the time comes, you will appear". See Ó Carragáin 1987, 118; Lucas 1987, 95-6, with reference to Ireland. But the absence of any central human figure makes this less likely, unless the position of the rosette on the cross-head is taken to imply that it is an image of Christ, as suggested above. But in that case such iconography would be more suited to an Apocalyptic scheme (see Revelation, 2.28, and 22.16).

In a purely decorative context, such tails are found on late 8th-century Anglo-Saxon metalwork in the style exemplified by the Witham pins (Wilson 1964, 132-4, no. 19, Pl. XVIII), though it should be noted that the reference to "Thornhill" in Wilson's discussion (idem, 11-12) in fact applies to CLOSEBURN 1, since he cites Kendrick’s mistitled illustration of this in his footnote (Kendrick 1938, Pl. XCIII.4). Wilson also drew attention to the "sharply everted, pointed wings" found on the pins, and linked them stylistically with the Gandersheim (Brunswick) ivory casket (idem, 12), which as is shown below, is one of the closest parallels in any medium to this cross, although it is only 12.6 cm high.

Apart from the rosette in the cross head, there are some further links between this cross and Hoddom in the use of short figure panels on the broad faces and long panels on the sides, as well as a possible link between panel A iii and the back-turned animals on HODDOM 1 a/b, and panel C iii and the cat-headed winged beasts on HODDOM 1 c/d. But on BOATFORD 1 there are animals and interlace only, with no figures and no plant scroll, although the limbs of the animals in panels A i and A iv have floral terminations. The petalled flowers behind the heads of the ‘sea-horse’ creatures in panel A iv [Plate 4a] resemble those on the HODDOMCROSS plant spiral [Plate 28a], but those beneath the birds in panel A i [Plate 3b] are closer to the bell-like
flowers found on RUTHWELL 1 (Cramp 1959-60, 17-18; see Bailey & Cramp 1988, fig. 5, Fi).

But the strongest connection is with Mercian art of the late 8th and early 9th centuries. The animal types within each panel have close parallels in sculpture, manuscripts and ivory carving, as will be demonstrated in detail. In addition, the paired mirror image form of the animals, the lower limbs terminating in interlace, and the type of head found on either face are characteristic period details. The sculpture in this region with clear Anglo-Saxon connections, such as this cross and CLOSEBURN 1, discussed below, demonstrate the widespread distribution of stylistic elements throughout the monastic network in the pre-Viking period (Bailey 1980, 83). This cross in particular is without strongly defined local characteristics, to the extent that there appears to be no reason why it could not have been carved at any centre exposed to Mercian art in the 9th century.

Face A

As pointed out in the catalogue, all the creatures on Face A are of similar type, with high foreheads and low beaks [Plate 1a]. In contrast, on the opposite face all panels contain animals with large oval heads and lip lappets [Plate 1b], yet the layout on both faces is similar, based on paired confronted creatures with looped and knotted tails.

The long-necked birds in panel A i [Plate 3b] closely resemble one at Glastonbury, Somerset (Cottrill 1935, 145, Pl. XVIII.1). Animals of similar head type are also found at Auckland St Andrew, Durham (Cramp 1984b, 38, Pl. 5.14), St Alkmund’s, Derby (Kendrick 1938, Pl. XCVII) and Cropthorne, Worcester (Baldwin Brown 1937, Pl. CVI.1), as well as in the Leningrad Gospels (Leningrad, State Public Lib., Cod. F.v.I.8), fol. 18r (Alexander 1978, 64, cat. 39, ill. 192), the Canterbury Bible
(London, B.L., Royal 1.E.VI), fol. 4r (Alexander 1978, 58-9, cat. 32, ill. 162), and on the Gandersheim ivory casket, Brunswick, front face, lower right panel (Beckwith 1972, 19, 118, cat. 2, ill. 10). It is therefore clear that the sculptor was following a ubiquitous period model, that could be used in several different media.

The vertical mirror-image animals in panel A ii [Plate 3c] are unusual, though comparable with those in panel A iv [Plate 4a], but the raised leg is found at Collingham, Yorkshire (Collingwood 1927, fig. 31 f), and the spread feet at Croft, Yorkshire (idem, fig. 59). Raised leg and hooked tail are found together on the Gandersheim casket, rear face, lower right panel (Beckwith 1972, ill. 13). Mirror-image animals of different type occur in fours in panel C ii [Plate 5b], and at Aberlady, E. Lothian (Kendrick 1938, Pl. LI), and in twos at Otley 2 and Melsonby in Yorkshire (Collingwood 1927, figs. 20 and 60). The same motif is found in manuscripts such as the Durham Cassiodorus (Durham, Cathedral Lib. B.II.30), fol. 81v (Nordenfalk 1977, Pl. 27) and St Chad Gospels (Lichfield, Cathedral Lib., Gospel Book (St Chad)), p. 220 (idem, Pl. 26).

The affronted animals in panel A iii [Plate 3d] could derive from HODDOM 1 a/b (ii) [Plates 46, 47a-b], but their positions are reversed. Closely similar paired animals are found on the cross-base at Jedburgh, Roxburgh (see Cramp 1983a, 276, fig. 117, b & d), and also at Crofton, Yorkshire, but there the necks are crossed and the legs not enlaced (Collingwood 1927, fig. 64; Cramp 1978a, fig. 1.1 g). However, such loops around the legs can be seen at Ilkley, Yorkshire (Collingwood 1927, fig. 62; Cramp 1978a, fig. 1.1 j). In a different medium there are paired quadrupeds enmeshed by their tails on an ivory plaque in the Victoria & Albert Museum (Beckwith 1972, 24, 119, cat. 8, ill. 23), and back-turned down-biting animals in affronted pairs on
the Insular gilt bronze mounting from Borhaug, Norway (Petersen 1940, 28, no. 24, fig. 21), though these are ribbon animals, not quadrupeds.

The confronted winged beasts on panel A iv [Plate 4a] could derive from HODDOM 1 c/d [Plates 48, 49a-b] and are similar to those on panel C iii [Plate 5c]. This type of animal appears to have a Mediterranean origin, for instance the slab in the church of Virgin Gorgoepekoos, Athens (Aberg 1945, 59, fig. 62.1), but the present type appears to derive more closely from the upper pair of confronted winged creatures with long curled tails in a tree-scroll at Jedburgh, Roxburgh (Cramp 1983a, fig. 120a).

In sculpture the developed type of confronted beasts with spiralled tails is also found on the Hedda stone, Peterborough (Smith 1923-24, fig. 4; Baldwin Brown 1937, Pl. CXIII; Cramp 1977, 211, fig. 57, c), but the winged 'sea horse' animal type is most closely duplicated on the Gandersheim casket, Brunswick, rear face, lower left panel (Beckwith 1972, 19, 118, cat. 2, ill. 13; Cramp 1978a, fig. 1.1 n).

This casket, 12.6 cm long, which is carved in ivory and divided into a series of panels containing winged and unwinged bipeds with spiralled tails, paired on one face, single on the other, is one of the closest parallels in any medium to the layout of the BOATFORD cross, and has been dated to the late 8th century (Webster & Backhouse 1991, 177-9, no. 138). It also suggests that the cross may be a direct copy of an ivory model, since its panels appear to have been laid out on a grid (see Adcock 1974, 203) rather than derived from a template or pattern-book, like the distorted creatures on the upper surface of the Hedda stone or the damaged panel on Waberthwaite 2 A, Cumbria, which bungles the crossing of the diagonal legs so that there is only one limb, the other being confused with the tail knot (Bailey & Cramp...
Creatures with lobed tongues crossing in pairs also occur on the Mavourne disc, Bedford (Smallridge 1969, 13, fig. 1), reinforcing the close parallels between this cross and animal ornament in other media. Hooked feet are also found on the chain of paired animals on Face B [Plates 2a, 6a-b], which as is shown below, possibly derived from a manuscript drawing.

The Gandersheim casket, rear face, upper left panel (Beckwith 1972, ill. 13; Cramp 1978a, fig. 1.1 o) again provides a parallel to the stance of the addorsed winged animals in panel A v [Plate 4b], but the same type of creatures are seen on the Ilkley museum cross, Yorkshire (Collingwood 1915, 195, fig. j), and these also have neck loops as on panel C iv [Plate 5d].

Face C

In contrast to the creatures on Face A, with high foreheads and low beaks, on the opposite face of the BOATFORD cross all panels contain animals with large oval heads and lip lappets [Plate 1b], yet the layout is similar, based on paired confronted creatures with spiralled tails. On this face the panels are arched, resembling those at St Alkmund's, Derby (Kendrick 1938, Pl. XCVII) and Collingham, Yorkshire (Collingwood 1927, fig. 87).

In the upper surviving panel [Plate 5a] the looped animals with large round heads linked by scrolls are a type found in the Canterbury Bible (London, B.L., Royal 1.E.VI), fol. 4a and 6 (Alexander 1978, 58-9, cat. 32, ill. 162, 164). Round heads linked by scrolls are also found in Mercian sculpture at Cropthorne, Worcester (Cramp 1977, 225, fig. 61b) and on Insular metalwork found in Norway such as the Kaupang cross (Bakka 1963, fig. 12) and the Lunde disc fragment (idem, fig. 7).
Panel C ii [Plate 5b] with its vertical mirror-image animals x 4 resembles panel A ii [Plate 3c], and is placed in a similar position on the shaft. It is best paralleled on a frieze at Fletton, Huntingdon (Clapham 1927, 224, Pl. XL, fig. 3) and in the Flavingy Gospels (Autun, Bibliothèque Municipale, MS 4), fol. 15r, left hand column (Hubert, Porcher & Volbach 1969, ill. 191). Cramp has compared the BOATFORD cross with that at Tynemouth, Northumberland (Cramp 1984b, 32, 226), though without specifying details, but the confronted animals with lip lappets in this panel are similar to those on Tynemouth 1 B (idem, Pls. 223.1261, 225.1264).

The confronted winged beasts with spiralled tails in panel C iii [Plate 5c] are the same type as those on panel A iv [Plate 4a], but have the Face C head type with lip lappets, and the legs do not cross.

The confronted canines in panel C iv [Plate 5d] are a standard Mercian type, with examples at Gloucester (Brøndsted 1924, fig. 116; Cramp 1978a, fig. 1.1 t) and Elstow, Bedfordshire (Smallridge 1969, Pl. 1 b; Cramp 1978a, fig. 1.1 s), and a single animal at Breedon, Leicester (Clapham 1927, Pl. XXV b; Cramp 1978a, fig. 1.2 h). The type is found as far north as Meigle 2, Perth (ECMS iii 1903, fig. 311 A) but here the tails are not curled. Loops around the necks are also found on the Gloucester shaft and at Ilkley, as noted above, as well as on GLENCAIRN I, face C [Plate 18b].

Face B

The chain of paired animals on Face B [Plates 2a, 6a-b] is almost unparalleled in sculpture (with the partial exception of Colerne, Wiltshire (Kendrick 1938, Pl. LXXXIII) where the animals are crossed and not in a chain), but so closely resembles the manuscript examples cited below as to suggest that a model of this type was being followed
The animals in the upper imposts of the 3rd and 4th canon tables of the Lindisfarne Gospels, fols. 13v, 14 (Millar 1923, 33, Pls. XI, XII) have straight interlaced legs but different hindquarters. But in the Barberini Gospel Book (Rome, Vatican, Bibl. Apostolica, Barberini Lat. 570), dated to the late 8th century (Alexander 1978, 61-2, cat. 36), examples of this type of animal chain occur on four separate pages: fol. 1, canon table (idem, ill. 173); fol. 11v, St Matthew (idem, ill. 178); fol. 12, St Matthew opening page (idem, ill. 169); and fol. 18, St Matthew initial page (idem, ill. 170). The outer columns of the canon table, fol. 1, also include interlace in a changing pattern as on Face D of this cross [Plate 2b], with Pattern F loops with outside strand and also Pattern C.

The animals are linked by Simple Pattern B knots (Adcock 1974, 203, Pl. 788), a type which occurs locally in a broad band form on KIRCONNEL 2, face A [Plate 25a], and is found in a dated context at Hackness, Yorkshire (Collingwood 1927, fig. 75) together with a Latin text of the 8-9th centuries (Okasha 1971, 73-4, no. 42).

Conclusions

The ornament of this cross repays detailed examination, partly because it has never previously been undertaken, but also because of the extraordinarily close parallels in ivory carving and manuscripts, media not usually linked with stone sculpture, as well as in the sculptural repertoire of late 8th; early 9th-century Mercia, a region with no direct connection to or historical link with this area of south west Scotland. The dominance of period fashions and the extensive contacts available in the pre Viking period present the most acceptable context for this cross (see Bailey 1980, 83). The dating of both the Gandersheim casket and the Barberini Gospels to the late
8th century suggest that this cross is unlikely to be later than the mid 9th century. This dating is about a century earlier than that proposed in previous discussions by Collingwood (1924-25, 58), Cramp (1959-60, 17) and Adcock (1974, 207), but it seems difficult to accept that the layout and stylistic repertoire of this cross would have been conceivable following the fragmentation of monastic culture in the mid 9th century (Cramp 1978a, 8-10).

CLOSEBURN 1

The BOATFORD 1 and CLOSEBURN 1 crosses are usually discussed and dated together (e.g. Collingwood 1924-25, 57-8; Kendrick 1938, 203-4; Cramp 1959-60, 17-19), partly because of their proximity (the two sites are 3 miles (4.75 km) apart, and partly because of their stylistic isolation from other sculpture in the area. This practice will be followed here because it is important to discuss the stylistic differences between the two crosses, and the different repertoire of ornament used on each.

It has been noted above that there is no figural ornament or plant scroll on BOATFORD 1, and that the predominant motifs are symmetrically arranged animal ornament and varied patterns of interlace. In contrast, CLOSEBURN 1 has both human figures and an inhabited plant scroll. Only the long panel of interlace on Face B [Plate 12b] of CLOSEBURN 1 has any direct resemblance to the BOATFORD ornament [Plate 2b], and Half Pattern F appears on both crosses and on KIRKCONNEL 2 (see the Catalogue). The birds in panel C iii [Plate 15c], although paired, are not arranged symmetrically either side of a central axis, as are all the panels on the BOATFORD cross. None of the animals on CLOSEBURN 1 have bodies with lower limbs terminating in interlace, instead the body of each animal is splayed, humped or
otherwise contorted, but with naturalistic lower limbs [Plate 11b].

As with BOATFORD 1, most of the features of this cross are unparalleled elsewhere in Dumfries and Galloway, except for the proportions of the shaft, the triple leaf type on Face D which is found at WAMPHRAY [Plates 14a-c and 39a], and the bird in tangled plantscroll at DURRISDEER [Plate 17a]. As with most of the sculpture in Dumfriesshire the style of this cross is related to motifs found in Anglo-Saxon England and Mediterranean Christian culture. But in contrast to BOATFORD, the predominant contact appears to be with Yorkshire.

Face A

Face A is badly worn and damaged, and the details are difficult to see, but the predominant motif in the two upper panels is of a figure framed by tangled foliage [Plate 11a]. In contrast to the animal ornament on the opposite face the figures are symmetrical and front facing. As Cramp noted (1959-60, 16, 18-19), this motif is paralleled at Tynemouth 2 and Ovingham 1 in Northumberland (Cramp 1984a, Pls. 220.1250, 210.1197). Tynemouth has both twist moulding and a centaur on the reverse face. The figure in panel A i [Plate 13a] is badly damaged, but appears to be bare legged with upper limbs raised, as at Stonegrave, Yorkshire (Kendrick 1949, Pl. XLIV.1). Alternatively the figure may be an enmeshed animal seen from above, as in the Codex Aureus (Stockholm, Royal Lib. A.135), fol. 11, incarnation initial, letter M (Nordenfalk 1977, Pl. 38). The iconographic implications of this are discussed below.

The figure beneath in panel A ii [Plate 13 b], though worn, appears to be haloed and robed with arms outstretched. The arms are elongated, as on Monkwearmouth 3 (Cramp 1984b, Pl. 107.595), but the
closest parallel is at Kippax, Yorkshire (Collingwood 1927, fig. 220), where the figure also has arms outstretched. Bailey (1980, 157-9, figs. 38a-d) saw the Kippax figure, together with the similar figure from Burton in Kendal, as Christ trampling the beasts. But both Kippax and CLOSEBURN 1 appear to derive from a Mediterranean model of an orans figure framed by foliage, as on Coptic stele (Beckwith 1963, Pl. 127; Salin 1959, fig. 106), and two gold glasses in the Vatican (van der Meer & Mohrmann 1956, Pls. 569, 571) which show the soul in the garden of Paradise. These Christian parallels, together with the apparent halo and the clearly vegetable nature of the foliage, make it unlikely that the figure represents Gunnar in the snake pit as has been suggested.

The third panel is worn, and the lower part is missing [Plate 13b]. But since the shaft appears to have been laid out with figural panels on one face and animal ornament on the other, Cramp's suggestion that it showed a stag with a roundel behind its horns (1959-60, 19) is less likely. It is seen here as a haloed figure with raised sword, and either flames or a bush to the left. There is a haloed figure with a sword at Leeds church, Yorkshire (Collingwood 1927, fig. 193), but the object to the left suggests that this panel may have shown the Sacrifice of Isaac. Examples of this scene which include figures with a sword, pointed flames and a bush include the Carmen Paschale (Antwerp, Museum Plantin-Moretus, M.17.4), fol. 8 (Alexander 1978, 83, cat 65, ill. 286) and Aelfric's Paraphrase of Pentateuch and Joshua, fol. 38 (London B.L., Cotton Claudius B.IV), fol. 38 (Temple 1976, 102-4, cat. 86, ill. 270). A haloed Abraham is seen in a miniature from the Etchmiadzin Gospels (Matenadaran 2374) (Smith 1922, 167, fig. 8).

It is therefore possible that the entire iconography of the panels
on this side of the shaft derives from the Sacrifice of Isaac (cf. Bailey 1977, 64-8). In this interpretation the damaged figure in panel A i could be the ram caught in the thicket; the bound figure in A ii the sacrificial figure of Isaac as a type of Christ; and the haloed figure with the sword, Abraham, flanked by flames and thorn bush as in the Etchmiadzin Gospels. However, there appear to be no other examples where the iconography is split between different panels.

Face C

The division of the panels on the opposite face [Plate 11b] by an ornamental border of twist ornament is also found at North Otterington and Nunnington, Yorkshire (Collingwood 1907, 376, fig. f; idem 1927, fig. 139g), as well as on the Franks casket (Webster 1982, Pls. 22-25). Kendrick referred to the Irton and Sandbach crosses (1938, 206), but both these have interlace, not twist, between the panels (Bailey & Cramp 1988, ills. 357, 366; Bu’lock 1972, Pl. 7). In contrast to the possible iconography on Face A and on the BOATFORD cross, there appears to be no recognisable scheme to the animal ornament on this side. As noted above, all the creatures are shown in contorted form, and this appears to be a period motif found on a number of crosses as well as metalwork and manuscripts (Kendrick 1938, 194; Wilson 1964, 11-12; Cramp 1965b, 230).

In the upper panel, Ci [Plate 15a], is a splayed beast seen from above, holding its feet. As Kendrick pointed out, this type of creature is found at Cundall and Ilkley in Yorkshire (1938, 204; Collingwood 1927, figs. 32, 61). The Cundall beast has the same head and ears, and sprawled legs, but does not touch its toes (Collingwood 1907, 310, fig. N). A similar creature occurs in the Codex Aureus (Stockholm, Royal Lib. A.135), fol. 11, letter V (Nordenfalk 1977, Pl. 38). The tall beast in the panel below, Cii [Plate 15b], with
its folded body and crossed legs can be seen at Newent, Gloucester, as Kendrick demonstrated (1938, 182, 204; Conder 1906-07, fig. D), and also Whitby, Ilkley and Melsonby in Yorkshire (Peers & Radford 1943, Pl. XXIIb; Collingwood 1927, fig. 61; Cramp & Lang 1977, no. 8). There is a similar creature though with leg raised on the Aldborough shaft (Collingwood 1915, 134, fig. d), which as Collingwood showed (1916-18a, 39, fig. 10; 1927, fig. 32), is part of the same cross as the Cundall fragment cited above. Both the Melsonby and Newent creatures have knots behind their heads, as does the similar animal at Jedburgh, Roxburgh (Cramp 1983a, fig. 117d).

As argued elsewhere (II, 33), there are two confronted mirror-image birds in C iii, the lower panel [Plate 15c]. This type of paired creature is found at several sites, though the animal type differs. At Croft, Yorkshire, there are both birds and canines (Brøndsted 1924, fig. 21; Cramp & Lang 1977, no. 3); at Woodwray, Angus, two canines (ECMS iii 1903, fig. 258a); and at Gloucester, two lizards (Baldwin Brown 1937, Pl. CXI). Down-reaching birds, though not paired, occur at Easby (Longhurst 1931, Pl. XXVI.3), Otley (Cramp 1971, taf. 41 B), and on the Cundall-Aldborough shaft (Collingwood 1927, fig. 32), all in Yorkshire. It is noticeable that Cundall-Aldborough provides parallels for all three panels of animal ornament on CLOSEBURN 1.

Face D

The iconographical significance of birds in a plant scroll has been pointed out by G. Henderson with reference to Bede's Commentary on St Luke's Gospel (Henderson 1980, 17). The inhabited scroll on Face D [Plate 12a] includes alternating birds of two different types, back tilted and stiff legged, with their heads emerging from the scroll and swallowing a bud at the junction of the stem. The closest parallels to
this scheme are again found in Yorkshire, at Croft (Cramp & Lang 1977, no. 3; Brøndsted 1924, fig. 21), St Peter's (St Leonard's Place 2), York (Cramp & Lang 1977, no. 9; Lang 1991, ill. 369), and Cundall-Aldborough (Collingwood 1907, 310, fig. E). The Croft birds have the same wing type, but the heads are within the scroll. The York creatures have extended legs with heads outside the scroll, but are canine in type and not winged. The Cundall bird has the same wing type and its head outside the scroll, but no leg. The Hilton of Cadboll slab in Ross-shire, often compared with CLOSEBURN 1 (Cramp 1959-60, 18; Henderson 1983, 250, fig. 104), has birds with the same wing type and heads outside the scroll in its top three volutes, but the legs are thrust forward and the bird types are not repeating. The loops around the birds here are also of a different type, but there are Pattern F loops in the same manner as CLOSEBURN surrounding the animals in the upper part of Sueno's Stone, Moray (Henderson 1983, fig. 107b).

Alternating Half Pattern F loops are used both in the plant scroll on Face D [Plate 12a] and in the panel of interlace on Face B [Plate 12b]. As noted above this pattern recurs both in the changing pattern on BOATFORD 1, face D [Plate 2b] and on KIRKCONNEL 2, face C [Plate 25c]. Collingwood (1924-25, 58) compared the pattern with Croft (idem 1907, 306, fig. a) and Otley 2 (idem 1915, 227, fig. p), both in Yorkshire, but in both cases there is one unit only amongst a changing pattern (Adcock 1974, 202). He also compared it with Thornhill, Yorkshire (Collingwood 1915, 247, fig. o) and was followed in this by Cramp (1959-60, 18), but in fact this is not alternating Pattern F but a related twist with outside strand. In addition to Croft and Otley, Adcock compared the CLOSEBURN interlace with Norham 14, Northumberland (Cramp 1984b, Pl. 206.1186) and saw the pattern type pointing to this area or Deira (Adcock 1974, 201-2).
Conclusion

As has been demonstrated above, the CLOSEBURN 1 cross has its closest links with sculpture in Yorkshire, in particular several pieces usually dated to the late 9th century (Cramp 1978a, 8-10). In particular, there are several distinct parallels between this cross and both Croft and Cundall-Aldborough. Croft has one unit of alternating Half Pattern F interlace, as found on Faces B and D; mirror-image birds, as found on panel C iii; and a knot behind the head of an animal, as on panel C ii (Brondsted 1924, fig. 21). But it has no figural ornament and most of the creatures are paired within a tree scroll. Cundall-Aldborough, as pointed out above, has contorted animals similar to all three creatures on Face C, and the panels on one face of the cross are small compartments bordered by geometrical ornament (Collingwood 1927, fig. 32), but the decorative scheme does not use long panels of vinescroll or interlace. It therefore appears that this cross uses motifs from Yorkshire, but fits them into a layout derived from Hoddom and Ruthwell. The use of long panels of interlace in this region at BOATFORD and CLOSEBURN, crosses with otherwise dissimilar ornament, is therefore perhaps not so much an indication of late date, as Adcock suggested (1974, 202, 206), but an adaptation from the local tradition of plant-scroll ornament.
1. This monument is usually known as the Thornhill or Nith Bridge cross. The reasons for changing the name here are given in the Catalogue (II, 18).

2. For example, the WAMPHRAY dragon [Plate 39b], discussed below, or the symbol stones of Scotland north of the Forth, including the local outlier, TRUSTY'S HILL [Plate 99].

3. For the development of this animal type in sculpture, see Cramp 1978a, 13-14, figs. 1.1, 1.2. But this sequence does not take account of either the animals with looped tails in the inhabited scroll at Ruthwell (Bailey & Cramp 1988, ills. 686, 687), or in particular the paired animals with wings and looped tails in the tree-scroll at Jedburgh (Cramp 1983a, fig. 120 a), which appear to provide a model for the winged bipeds on this cross (see below).

4. For the implications of this regional tradition, see below under CLOSEBURN, p. 155.

5. Not Simple Pattern E as claimed by Cramp (1984b, 17), and compared with Monkwearmouth 21A (idem, Pl. 124.677) and Jedburgh (Cramp 1983a, fig. 120a).

6. See below, p. 158.

"The humility of the Saviour in his Incarnation, says Bede, is like the mustard seed which a man plants in his garden, because St Joseph of Arimathea buried the body of the Lord, which grew and became a tree, because Christ rose and ascended into heaven, and the branches which the tree spreads where the birds rest are the preachers dispersed throughout the world preaching words of consolation" (Henderson 1980, 17).
CHAPTER 13

Wamphray, Glencairn, Durrisdeer, Mossknow

WAMPHRAY

The base of the CLOSEBURN shaft has the same width to depth ratio as BOATFORD 1 (1.82); the top has the same ratio as the WAMPHRAY slab (1.68). WAMPHRAY also shares with this piece the triple leaf type found on CLOSEBURN, Face D [Plate 14a-c]. But otherwise, as with CLOSEBURN and BOATFORD, there are very few links between WAMPHRAY and other sculpture in the region.

The plant scroll spiral in panel A i [Plate 39a] is nearly unique in early medieval sculpture. The only exception is in the west roundel of an architectural fragment at Edenham church, Lincolnshire (Taylor & Taylor 1963, 6-10, fig. 2, Pl. III). Triple leaf spirals x 4 are also found on a shaft in Ilkley museum, Yorkshire (Collingwood 1915, 195, fig. p), but in a different form to WAMPHRAY. This piece was seen by Collingwood as forming part of the same shaft as another fragment (op. cit., fig. j), which has panels bordered by cable moulding and two enlaced dragons.

There is some resemblance to the floral spiral on HODDOMCROSS [Plate 28a], but this is the centre of a cross-head, and the construction of the spiral is entirely different. The WAMPHRAY slab, on the other hand, appears to be part of a composite cross-shaft. It is decorated on the three visible faces and appears to be undamaged at either end. The south end with its wide plain mouldings is clearly the base. Composite cross shafts in early medieval sculpture have been listed by Bailey (1980, 240-2) and Tweddle (Wenham et al. 1987, 119), and there are also three examples from Iona (RCAHMS 1982, nos. 6.80, 6.81, and 6.82). It is less likely therefore that this is an unusual
type of cross-slab, as has been suggested previously (Williams 1968d, 15).

All other parallels to the floral medallion in panel A i are to be found in Insular metalwork, though quadruple spirals with no floral element are found in manuscripts (Cramp 1959-60, 20), and some examples are known in sculpture, for instance Kirk Onchan no. 92 (62) in the Isle of Man (Kermode 1907, Pl. XXIII) and Downpatrick Cathedral, Co. Down (Jope 1966, Pl. 74-408.3). But there appears to be no connection between these and the WAMPHRAY panel. The closest parallels, as Evison (Dunning & Evison 1961, 155) and Bakka (1963, 36, 41) have pointed out, are with the Lilleby and Komnes mounts, Norway (Lilleby - Petersen 1940, 22, fig. 11; Bakka 1963, figs. 42, 43a, c; Tweddle 1983, fig 4c, d. Komnes - Petersen 1940, 22-3, no. 12, fig. 12; Bakka 1963, figs. 44, 45; Tweddle 1983, 21, fig. 4e, f). To these may be added the Dolven sword pommel, also found in Norway (Petersen 1940, 116, no. 9, fig. 121; Bruce Mitford 1956a, 181, fn. 42, Pl. XXIII A). 2

Though found in Norwegian graves, all these pieces are of Insular, probably Anglo-Saxon origin, and have been dated by Bakka (1963) to the late 8th century. The panels on the Lilleby and Komnes mounts contain tree scrolls with the same leaf form as WAMPHRAY; the handle of the Dolven sword has a medallion with four foliate knots. There is also a floral swastika on the Trewhiddle silver pin head (Wilson 1964, 182, no. 92, fig. 38, Pl. XXXVI), but of much simpler form. Triple leaf bush scrolls are also found in two late 8th century manuscripts, the Leningrad Bede (Leningrad, State Publ. Lib. Cod. Q.v.I.18), fol. 3v (Alexander 1978, 47, cat. 19. ill. 83; Schapiro 1980a, fig. 4), where the offshoots have a similar structure to WAMPHRAY, and the Leningrad Gospels (Leningrad, State Publ. Lib. Cod. F.v.I.8), fol.
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12v. canon table, base of second column (Alexander 1978, 64, cat. 39, ill. 188; Bakka 1963, fig. 37). The dating of these metalwork and manuscript parallels is of significance when it comes to considering the antecedents of the dragon in panel A ii.

The pelta ornament in the corners of the panel outside the medallion have their closest parallel in the zoomorphic animal heads and forelimbs in the same position around the trumpet spiral in the centre of the rear face of the Gandersheim casket, Brunswick (Beckwith 1972, 19, cat. 2, ill. 13), though the WAMPHRAY slab is too weathered for any details of the ornament to be recognisable [Plate 39a]. On other sculpture, such as Irton, Cumbria (Bailey & Cramp 1988, ill. 362) or Gallen Priory, Co. Offaly, (Henry 1965, Pl. 64), such infill takes a different form.

The back-turned dragon in panel A ii [Plate 39b] has been the subject of some controversy about its date and stylistic background. Collingwood (1919-20, 109-10; 1927, 55) described the creature as "distinctly Norse", and dated it to the 10th century, but subsequently Aberg (1943, 68) suggested that the elongated jaw sling and the fronded feet indicated an Anglo-Saxon origin, and compared the animal with those in fol. 192v of the Book of Durrow (Nordenfalk 1977, Pl. 8; Alexander 1978, ill. 22). Cramp (1959-60, 19) also pointed to the creatures in Hiberno-Saxon manuscripts, though without specifying an example, but elsewhere (op. cit., 11) described this animal as showing Celto-Norse influence. Evison (in Dunning & Evison 1961, 155) again made the comparison with the Book of Durrow, apparently independently, and was followed in this by Bakka (1963, 41). Both these authors also commented on the relationship between the WAMPHRAY plant-scroll spiral and the Lilleby and Komness mounts (see above).
the Book of Durrow (Luce et al. 1960, 135), followed Collingwood and described the slab as "Anglo-Norse, X cent.". But Bruce-Mitford (1960, 111, fig. 7), in his commentary on the Lindisfarne Gospels, linked the Book of Durrow animals with examples from Style II Anglo-Saxon metalwork; and although he did not mention WAMPHRAY, the characteristics he defined linking the two types of animal apply equally well to this slab. The differences between the WAMPHRAY animal and Viking-Age developments of the form are summarised below.

This type of S-dragon has its origins in continental Germanic metalwork, for example a mount in Copenhagen museum (Henry 1965, 170, fig. 21b). The same composition as WAMPHRAY of a back-turned beast adjacent to plant ornament (in this case a marigold) is found on a Merovingian buckle in the Musée de Nîmes, France (James 1977, 124, 363, cat. 64, Pl. 52). In Anglo-Saxon Style II metalwork, examples of this type of animal can be found on a brooch from Sarre, Kent (Aberg 1926, 130, fig. 235-6), and in the chain of animals on the silver back plate of a brooch from Faversham, Kent (Speake 1980, fig. 8c), and the Allington Hill, Cambridge, gilt bronze disc (Speake 1980, fig. 8a, Pl. 15b). Fronded feet similar to WAMPHRAY occur on the Dover, gr. 20, bracteate (Speake 1980, fig. 13j) and the Sutton Hoo shield-mount (Speake 1980, fig. 10, Pl. 5a).

The use of this type of animal ornament in manuscripts has been demonstrated above. But perhaps closer to WAMPHRAY than the 7th-century Book of Durrow fol. 192v, with its panels of interlinked animal ornament, is the left hand S-dragon in the lower right panel of the Paris gospels (Paris, Bibl. Nat., nouv. acq. lat. 1587), fol. 85v, opening page to St John (Alexander 1978, 78-9, cat. 56, ill. 272), dated to the 8th or 9th century. The animal is flanked by triangular knots but has an angled hip.
This animal type is very long lasting and widespread, with examples occurring in 11th-century Irish manuscripts. But these animals have characteristic late features, such as curled jaws (Lang 1978a). A number of elements of the WAMPHRAY animal appear on a fragment of a sculptured panel from Monkwearmouth, Durham, dated to the late 7th or early 8th century (Cramp 1984b, 126, Pl. 121.656). These include jaw sling, looped back leg and spread foot, and similar thighs, but the legs are not knotted. In later sculpture, the closest parallel is on Aspatria 1, Cumbria (Bailey & Cramp 1988, 50-1, ill. 31), dated to the 10th century, but as Bailey notes, this is a pre-Viking form preserved (1980, 73-4). Animals like Aycliffe 1 (Cramp 1984b, Pl. 8.28) and Durham 1 (op. cit., Pl. 37.189) have knotted extensions, but their jaws are twisted. The animal on Ellerburn, Yorkshire (Collingwood 1927, fig. 138) has a reversed S-shaped body placed vertically on the cross-shaft, but with a double outline and looped jaws, as on the similar Middleton cross (Collingwood 1911, 298, fig.). Other animals of this devolved type have short jaws, or their bodies are slit and penetrated by the knotted extensions: see Breedon, Leicester (Cramp 1977, fig. 63 f), or Dupplin, Perth (ECMS iii 1903, fig. 334 B), which Curle (1939-40, 107) compared with WAMPHRAY.

It is clear however that the WAMPHRAY dragon shares none of these late and devolved features, and therefore that Collingwood’s ascription of this creature to a Norse context is mistaken. It also has no Jellinge characteristics as defined by Wilson & Klindt-Jensen (1966, 95-118) and Bailey (1980, 55-7), and the differences are strikingly apparent when compared with 10th to 11th-century Viking age carving such as the motif pieces from Dublin, Dungarvan and Lagore (O’Meadhra 1979, nos. 27, 64, 119), or a wooden spatula from the Dublin excavations (Lang 1988, 22, 60, DW31, fig. 32).
It is therefore apparent that the dragon in panel A ii (and on Face C) must be considered in conjunction with the plant spiral in panel A i. As shown above, this has a close resemblance to examples in metalwork and manuscripts dated to the 8th century, when plant ornament first started to be used in Insular decoration alongside animal ornament (Wilson 1984, 63-4). The WAMPHRAY dragon should therefore be seen as a developed form of this long lived motif, at a period subsequent to the Book of Durrow, which is dated to the late 7th century (Alexander 1978, 30), but prior to the later evolutions of the animal type.

This dating is supported by the interlace with long glides on Face D [Plate 38b]. Long glides occur in a dated context on the Jarrow octagon, face E, upper (Cramp 1984b, 115-17, Pl. 100.530), which was found in the floor of an 8th-century building and also carries plant motifs, and also on Hexham 30 and 37 (op. cit., Pls. 184.1000 and 185.1017; see Cramp 1974, 120-1, fn. 20). The type possibly derives from manuscript illumination, such as the Lindisfarne Gospels (London, B.L., Cotton Nero D.IV), fols. 13v, 14, canon tables (Millar 1923, Pls. XI, XII), and also occurs in the Lenigrad Bede (Leningrad, State Public Lib., cod. Q.v.I.18), fol. 26v, intial H (Alexander 1978, 47, cat. 19, ill. 84), dated to the mid 8th century.

GLENCAIRN

The remaining decorated crosses in Dumfriesshire are less extraordinary, but again show contact with areas outside the region. The GLENCAIRN 1 head is directly comparable with one at Lancaster (Garstang 1906, 266, plate; Collingwood 1927, fig. 137). Both cross-heads are the same shape, with stepped shoulders and a narrow shaft, and are carved in relief on one face and incised on the other;
both have a snake head in the lower arm. The same shape of cross-head, with parabolic armpits, is also found at Gargrave, Yorkshire (Collingwood 1927, fig. 156) and Kirkby Stephen 6, Cumbria (Bailey & Cramp 1988, ill. 410-12), and appears to be a period feature, dating to the 10th century. The use of incised and relief carving on opposite faces will be noted again in Wigtownshire.

The symmetrical plant scrolls in the cross-arms on Face A [Plate 19a] are of similar type to the foliate ornament in the corners of the silver covering to St Cuthbert’s portable altar (Radford 1956, fig. 3, Pl. XIX), and on the gilded copper-alloy cross at Bischofshofen, Austria (Wilson 1984, ill. 158; Campbell 1982, Pl. 101). But the tangled plant ornament in the lower arm and the shape of the head suggest that the sculptor is adapting an earlier style of ornament, possibly from a metalwork original. The damaged oval boss is unusual, though see Dewsbury, Yorkshire (Collingwood 1927, fig. 106), but as stated in the catalogue (II, 52), there is no clear evidence of a face as Bailey thought (1963, 188).

The linked triquetra knots in the cross-arms of Face C [Plate 19b] are also found at Lesmahagow, Lanark (ECMS iii 1903, fig. 502), and Northallerton, Yorkshire (Cramp 1983a, fig. 116). Cramp has noted a metalwork background to that cross-head (1974, 135), and the same knot type can be seen on a silver gilt pin from Hitchin (Wilson 1964, Pl. IIa). In her discussion of GLENCAIRN, Cramp (1959-60, 19) compared the snake or dragon on the shaft with Crathorne, Yorkshire (Collingwood 1907, 304, fig. e), and this type is also found in manuscripts. 5 The same type of jaw is seen on Cross Canonby 1, Cumbria (Bailey & Cramp 1988, ill. 218), and dragons with loops round their necks are found at Ilkley, Yorkshire, on the opposite face to a panel of incised interlace (Collingwood 1927, fig. 49). The only local characteristic
that this cross shares is the neck loop, also found on BOATFORD, panel C iv [Plate 5d].

**DURRISDEER**

The cross-head from DURRISDEER [Plate 17] has stronger links with local sculpture. Both CLOSEBURN 1 and HODDOM 6 have birds in plantscroll, though the former is symmetrical rather than straggling [Plate 14a-c], and the latter creature may be a biped [Plate 54a]. But there are straggling tendrils with triple buds on HODDOM 16 [Plate 56d] and LUCE [Plate 28b-c], of a type also found at Norham, Northumberland (Cramp 1984b, Pl. 203.1159).

The bird in foliage is a standard Mediterranean type, found on Coptic stele (Badawy 1979, fig. 3.135), and Maximian's chair, Ravenna (Volbach 1961, Pl. 224). In sculpture parallels can be seen in Yorkshire, at Otley (Cramp 1971, taf. 41B, 43.4), Ilkley (Collingwood 1915, 193, fig. 5), and Cundall-Aldborough (Collingwood 1915, 134, fig. b). Ilkley (loc. cit.), and Dewsbury, also in west Yorkshire (Collingwood 1915, 168, figs. m, p), also have straggling tendrils and a concentric circular boss in the cross-head. This cross therefore appears to share some of the same Deiran links as CLOSEBURN 1, though it is not possible to be more precise on the evidence of such a damaged piece.

**MOSSKNOW**

The MOSSKNOW 'hogback' [Plate 29a-c] is of similar shape to examples from Cross Canonby, Cumbria (Lang 1984a, 128-9; Bailey & Cramp 1988, ills. 232-4) and Castledermot, Co. Kildare (Roe 1967, Pl. 24; Lang 1971, 156-8) as Lang has shown (1971, 158; 1972-74, 219), but MOSSKNOW
is very small and short. In its dimensions and shape it closely resembles the Cammin bone casket, from Pommerania, Germany, destroyed during the war (Wilson & Klindt-Jensen 1966, 126, Pl. LV). The casket measured 63 cm long, 26 cm high and 33 cm wide; MOSSKNOW, whose ends are damaged, measures 61 cm long, 24.5 cm high and 33 cm wide.

Like Cross Canonby and Castledermot, as well as Ingleby Arncliffe 3, Yorkshire (Lang 1984a, 142) and St Helen's on the Lea, Berwick (Lang 1972-74, 218-9), the ornament on either side is dissimilar. The twist ornament on the ridge resembles that on two hogbacks from Crathorne, Yorkshire (Lang 1984a, 126-7, figs. 10e, 10k). The clinker bands on Face B are only paralleled on the Welsh hogback from Llanddewi-aber-art, Cardigan (Nash-Williams 1950, fig. 92, Pl. LIX; see Lang 1972-74, 219). The medallion scroll on Face C is unparalleled on any other hogback, though there is plant scroll on Dewsbury, Yorkshire (Lang 1984a, 130) and the lozenges on Castledermot resemble medallion scroll as much as tegulae (contra Lang 1971, 155).

Side-linked scroll is found on recumbent monuments at Ramsbury, Wiltshire (Kendrick 1938, Pl. XCIX; Baldwin Brown 1937, Pl. CXIV.1), but as Lang notes, the hang of the berries implies that MOSSKNOW was copied from an upright piece (1972-74, 219).

Medallion scroll with inturned shoots is found locally at KILTERLITIE and RASCARREL [Plates 85a, 93b], as well as at Ilkley, Yorkshire, in the upper part of the shaft (Collingwood 1915, 187, fig. d), but it is possible that the use of medallion scroll on MOSSKNOW derives from the Falstead and Dalston stones in Cumbria (Bailey & Cramp 1988, ills. 277, 247). As Cramp points out (Bailey & Cramp 1988, 98), hooked tendrils are rare in sculpture, and MOSSKNOW is only 14 km north of Falstead, which is the nearest sculpture site to the south apart from Rockcliffe.
As Lang has shown, MOSSKNOW shares several of its characteristics with the other outlying hogbacks from Ireland and Wales, and like them it exists in isolation from other sculpture of this type (1972-74, 207-9). It is the only hogback monument in Dumfries and Galloway, and while this may partly be to do with reasons of geology, as has been suggested for the Isle of Man (Bailey 1980, 96), MOSSKNOW is distinctive in using an entirely Anglian form of ornament on a type of monument usually ascribed to the Viking age. Since it has been suggested that hogbacks may derive their form from Anglian house shrines (Bailey 1980, 92-7), it is possible that this monument likewise derived its form directly from a metal or bone object like the Cammin casket, and is not part of the evolution of this type of monument from the series of hogbacks with zoomorphic ends found at Brompton, Yorkshire (Lang 1972-74, 206-7; Bailey 1980, 85-6). It may therefore be closer to the inscribed, house-shaped stone from Falstone, Northumberland, of 8th to 9th-century date (Cramp 1984b, 172-3, Pl. 166; Bailey 1980, 95).
1. Book of Kells (Dublin, Trinity College Lib., A.I.6(58)), fol. 34 (Nordenfalk 1977, 117, Pl. 44); Canterbury Codex Aureus (Stockholm, Royal Lib., A.135), fol. 6v (Nordenfalk 1977, 101, Pl. 35); Barberini gospel book (Rome, Vatican, Bibl. Apostolica, Barberini Lat. 570), fol. 18, initial XPI (Alexander 1978, ill. 170).

2. Bruce-Mitford referred to this piece as the Grønneberg sword (1956a, loc. cit.; 1974, 329-30, Pl. 102 c), but in Shetelig 1933, 181, fig. 64, and Petersen 1940, loc. cit., it is named as Dolven. For the Grønneberg sword see Petersen 1940, 116-17, no. 13).

3. These include: elongation of the jaws; thin lines of jaws interweaved with thicker body; elongated front leg; body crossed by elongated leg; foot with straight open toes; laid back ear (Bruce-Mitford 1960, 111).

4. For instance, the Southampton psalter (Cambridge, St John’s College, C.9(59)), fol. 4v (Henry 1967, Pl. M), and the Liber Hymnorum (Dublin, Trinity College Lib., A.4.2) (Henry 1970, Pl. 3).

5. See the Durham Cassiodorus (Nordenfalk 1977, 85, Pl. 27); St Chad gospels, fols. 5, 142 (Alexander 1978, cat. 21, ills. 76, 80); and the Psalter of King Louis, fol. 3r (Mütherich & Gaehdhe 1977, 66-7, Pl. 17).
CHAPTER 14
The Later Sculpture in Nithsdale

KIRKCONNEL 1-8. CLOSEBURN 2. PENPONT 1-2

The later sculpture in Nithsdale is more clearly recognisable as a regional group, since there are links in the layout and ornament between pieces from several different sites, with evidence for clearly focussed external contacts. There appears to be limited awareness of earlier carving in the region, though the symmetrical layout of some of the slabs could be based on BOATFORD 1.

Most of the sculpture consists of slabs decorated on both faces with twists or simple interlace ornament in small closed-circuit units. Almost all these slabs were found at later parish church sites, and probably acted as grave markers. Four fragments from KIRKCONNEL, though found at the same site as slabs of this type, were parts of free-standing crosses, and a cross would have stood in the decorated base KIRKCONNEL 8 [Plate 27a-c].

Only the cross-shaft KIRKCONNEL 2 shares interlace types with earlier sculpture in the area. The simple Pattern B on Face A [Plate 25a] is found on BOATFORD, face B, between the animals [Plate 6]. Half Pattern F on Face C [Plate 25c] occurs both on CLOSEBURN 1, face B [Plate 12b] and in the changing pattern on BOATFORD face D [Plate 2b]. But in both cases the interlace on KIRKCONNEL 2 is in broad-band form and likely to be later. KIRKCONNEL 4 [Plate 25d] is also probably from a cross-shaft, and fat spirals of the same type are found at Kirkdale and Dewsbury in Yorkshire (Collingwood 1911, 286, fig. m; Collingwood 1915, 166, fig. i). It appears to have lost the vegetable elements of HODDOM 7, 9 and 11 [Plates 54-6].

The cross-arm KIRKCONNEL 3 [Plate 26d-f] has a knot on face A of
the same type as on an arm of similar shape found at Cairn, Ayrshire (ECMS iii 1903, fig. 505), just north of the border with Dumfriesshire (Hewat 1899-1900) and 6 km W.S.W. of Kirkconnel old church, the main source of sculpture in this area (see Fig. 15). The flat-ended plait on the other fragment from Cairn (ECMS iii 1903, fig. 504 B, C) is also found on KIRKCONNEL 5, face D [Plate 24d] and at Lythe in Yorkshire (Collingwood 1927, fig. 173). The four-cord plait on face C of KIRKCONNEL 5 [Plate 24c] is seen on South Tyne 1, Northumberland (Cramp 1984b, Pl. 220.1246-9), which closely resembles this shaft. As suggested in the catalogue, KIRKCONNEL 3 and KIRKCONNEL 5 may be part of the same cross.

The other slabs from this area appear to have been upright grave markers, though PENPONT 1 and CLOSEBURN 2 are decorated on one face only. The piece with the strongest links outside the the area is KIRKCONNEL 1 [Plate 22a-d]. As described in the catalogue (II, 62) this slab is decorated on both broad faces with an interlace formed from short broken segments, medially incised. The same technique is also used on face A of KIRKCONNEL 7 [Plate 23a]. The closest parallels are found in the Whithorn area of Galloway to the west [e.g. Plates 175, 183] and in Cumbria, as Collingwood showed (Charleson 1928-29, 126; 1929-30, 169). He termed the motif 'stopped-plait' (Collingwood 1922-23, 217-18). Bailey has listed its occurrence in Cumbria and Galloway (1974, I, 48, 53, 394, appendix 2), but a revised list for this region is given in Table 4. The main difference between KIRKCONNEL 1 and the Whithorn slabs is the width to depth ratio. This piece has a ratio of 2 : 1 as opposed to 6.5 : 1, which is standard for almost all the measurable slabs in the Whithorn area. The only exception is the tall MONREITH cross [Plates 154-5] which is the same ratio as KIRKCONNEL 1. Also, as shown in the catalogue,
there is no entasis on the shaft, unlike all the Whithorn area slabs with stopped plait, including MONREITH.

As Cramp (1959-60, 20) first noted, the other decorated slabs KIRKCONNEL 6 and 7 [Plate 26a-f] are closely related to CLOSEBURN 2 [Plate 15d] and PENPONT 1 and 2 [Plates 32a, 33a-d], and form a group with links up into Clydesdale (Fig. 15). Opposed Simple Pattern E knots are found on CLOSEBURN 2 [Plate 15d], KIRKCONNEL 6 [Plate 26a], Cairn 2 in Ayrshire (loc. cit.), and Kirkmuirhill, Lanarkshire (Macdonald & Laing 1969-70, Pl. 12), as well as South Tyne (see above) and Bedale in Yorkshire (Collingwood 1907, 296, fig. a). Plain twists are found on PENPONT 1 and 2, KIRKCONNEL 7, Kirkmuirhill (loc. cit.) and Lesmahagow, also in Lanarkshire (ECMS iii 1903, fig. 502). Paired closed-circuit pattern B loops, known as twin-link pattern (Lang 1984a, 130), or the duplex (Collingwood 1924-25, 60), are a ubiquitous late form of closed-circuit interlace found on PENPONT 1 and 2, KIRKCONNEL 7, and the cross-base KIRKCONNEL 8, as well as Sockburn 7 and Dinsdale 8 in Durham (Cramp 1984b, Pls. 134.728, 36.184) and on the slab from South Tyne already noted, as well as Govan and Inchinnan near Glasgow (ECMS iii 1903, figs. 476, 478, 486), and sites in Wales and Ireland. There is also an example in Galloway on the side of ST NINIAN'S CAVE 1 [Plate 161b], a slab with stopped-plait on the adjacent face [Plate 161a].

The CLOSEBURN 2 slab [Plate 15d], with interlace borders and a plain central panel, has some resemblance in its layout to HODDOM 20 [Plate 57c], and a similar slab was found at Mansfield, near Cairn in Ayrshire (Stuart 1867, Pl. CXXI.2), which has foliate scrolls of the type found on PENPONT 1 [Plate 32a]. This round-headed slab carries similar ornament to PENPONT 2 [Plate 33a-d] and KIRKCONNEL 7 [Plate 23a-d], but its shape is unique in this region, and similar to several
late slabs in Northumberland and Durham, including Elwick Hall 2 and Warkworth 2 (Cramp 1984b, 7, Pls. 51.244, 229.188-91), though all these carry crosses.

The general use of twists or simple interlace ornament in small closed-circuit units suggest that all the slabs in upper Nithsdale date to the 10th or 11th century, and were probably all made within a limited period, possibly by the same carvers. The free-standing crosses from KIRKCONNEL share several of the same motifs as the slabs and are unlikely to be much earlier, with the possible exception of KIRKCONNEL 2. The links with sculpture in Clydesdale to the north show that contacts initiated by the expansion of Strathclyde in the 10th century (Kirby 1962; Wilson 1966a) are reflected in sculpture, as Cramp suggested (1959-60, 20). The other main link appears to be westward, with the part of Northumbria outside the main area of Viking settlement in Yorkshire to the south (see Cramp 1984b, 3-4).
1. As demonstrated in the Catalogue (II, 64), Collingwood's drawing of this face is wrong (Charleson 1928-29, Pl. IIa; idem 1929-30, fig. 4).

2. See also Fig. 22, where the sites are mapped.
CHAPTER 15
Cross-bases. Architectural and Incised Sculpture in Dumfries

KIRKCONNEL 8, BOATFORD 2, ORCHARD

The decorated cross-base KIRKCONNEL 8 [Plate 27a-d] is clearly linked stylistically to the other sculpture from the church site, though it was found in a field dyke half a mile to the S.W. and there is no evidence for its original position. The cross-base HODDOM 29 [Plate 64] is similarly displaced, but lies outside the S.E. corner of the graveyard, close to the area where further sculpture was discovered by ploughing in 1991 (Lowe 1991, 12; Craig forthcoming). Its tapering octagonal form, though not its size, invites comparison with the base of the Bewcastle cross, Cumbria (Ferguson 1893, 54-5). The BOATFORD 2 socket stone appears to be in situ [Plate 7a], but manuscript evidence shows that the cross was lifted in the 19th century (see II, 23). The siting of the BOATFORD cross is discussed in more detail elsewhere (p. 110).

The socket stone at ORCHARD [Plate 30] is more problematic. It is marked as a font on early maps, but this interpretation seems mistaken (II, 86). Its date is uncertain, though the two weathered crosses on the W. face appear to resemble that on the Mansfield slab, Ayr (Stuart 1867, Pl. CXXI.2) found just north of the border with Dumfriesshire, and with stylistic resemblances to CLOSEBURN 2 and PENPONT 1, as demonstrated above. A base with a similar cross in false relief was found at Whitehill, Ayrshire (Galloway 1882, Pl. I; Curle 1961-62, Pl. XV.6). The site at ORCHARD lies adjacent to the road between Sanquhar and the N.E., so the base could mark the site of a wayside cross associated with the late medieval pilgrimage route from Edinburgh to Whithorn (see p. 65), but 17th-century records refer to a religious house or convent at Orchard, and human bones may
have been found here (II, 88).

RUTHWELL 3 and 4

The architectural fragment RUTHWELL 3 [Plate 36] has one moulded edge and may be part of a jamb or string-course (Collingwood 1916-18a, 44; Adcock 1974, 201; Williams 1975a, 29). Complete Pattern C interlace is used on friezes at Ripon, Yorkshire (Cramp 1974, 120, 134, Pl. XIId), and in a slightly different form at Breedon, Leicestershire (Clapham 1927, Pl. XXXI, fig. 2). This pattern is also found on recumbent monuments such as Chester-le-Street 1, Durham (Cramp 1984b, Pl. 24.107) and Hurworth 2, Durham (following Morris 1973, fig. 1 rather than Cramp 1984b, fig. 11), but it seems more suitable for long panels of repetitive ornament.

This appears to be the only early medieval architectural fragment found in Dumfries and Galloway, with the possible exceptions of HODDOM 32 [Plate 65b], discussed above, and ARDWALL 12 [Plate 74a], which Thomas saw as a roof finial (1967a 158), and it is of considerable interest that it should come from the same site as the RUTHWELL 1 cross. Cramp (1965a) and Cambridge (1984) have shown the link between sculpture, stone churches and monastic sites elsewhere in Northumbria, but both the fabric and the documentary evidence is lacking in this region.

Crowe's excavations at Ruthwell in the early 1980s appeared to show that there was no link between the cross and an enclosure near the church visible on air photographs (Jones 1979, 4), as this yielded a single carbon date of 370bc±90, though the metalworking evidence discovered was considered to be later (Livingstone 1982, 3; Crowe 1987, 43, 46, fig. 2). Other than the RUTHWELL 3 architectural...
fragment there is no evidence of a pre-Conquest decorated stone church on the site. RUTHWELL 4 [Plate 35b] appears to be part of a later column or font, comparable in its arcaded form with the Norman font from Beverly minster (Bond 1908, 147), despite earlier ascriptions of a 9th- or 10th-century date (Truckell 1962-63, 62; Williams 1968e, 15).

WAUCHOPE

The WAUCHOPE stone [Plate 32b] might also be architectural rather than funerary, but a cross in outline on a squared block is also found at Cross Canonby 3, Cumbria (Bailey & Cramp 1988, 88, ill. 224-6), described as a grave marker. The type of cross with a spiked foot has not been found elsewhere in this region, but examples are known in Wales, in particular four crosses from Llangaffo, Anglesey (Nash-Williams 1950, 57-9, nos. 17, 19, 20, 24), dated between the 7th and 11th centuries. Other examples have been found elsewhere in Scotland, at Alyth, Perth (ECMS iii 1903, fig. 304a), and Cladh a Bhile 7, Argyll (Galloway 1876-78, Pl. IV.7), and in Ireland, for instance at Clonmacnois, Co. Offaly (Lionard 1961, fig. 6.1). The type has been seen by Radford (1954-55, 180) and Edwards (1985, 399-400) as deriving from a wooden prototype, as with the STAPLEGORDON cross [Plate 37] discussed below.

CLEUCH, FOREGIRTH, RUTHWELL 2, STAPLEGORDON

Incised sculpture has been found at only four sites in the area, RUTHWELL 2, FOREGIRTH, STAPLEGORDON, and CLEUCH. The first three sites (CLEUCH was only found in 1978) were linked by Thomas on his map of early Christian activity in the area, and dated to the 6th or 7th centuries (Thomas 1968, 98, 100). However, despite their superficial similarity, the incised linear crosses on RUTHWELL 2 and FOREGIRTH are
carved in a completely different technique.

The cross on the FOREGIRTH stone [Plate 18a], which is placed at the top of the slab, is of equal width along its arms, which are carved with a wide shallow channel; and on either side of the cross the edges of the stone are chamfered, as on the incised cross from Wigtownshire, LAGGANGARN FARM [Plate 143]. The stone itself is smooth and apparently otherwise unworked, apart from the cup marks on one side and the knife cuts at the top (II, 47). In contrast the cross on RUTHWELL 2 is deeply but roughly cut, its arms tapering in width at each end [Plate 35a]. It is placed at the centre of the slab rather than at the top, but the slab itself appears to have been dressed on two adjacent narrow faces before this was done, so that the terminals of the horizontal arm are equidistant from both dressed and undressed edges (see II, 104). The stone therefore seems to be a block which was originally dressed for some other purpose, possibly architectural, before being used as a cross slab.

Like FOREGIRTH, the cross on the STAPLEGORDON slab is placed at the top of the stone (contra Radford et al. see II, 112), and is carved with smooth shallow lines [Plate 37]. But in contrast each arm of the the cross is formed by three parallel channels, with the effect noted by Thomas (1971, 118) that it appears to be a skeuomorph of a wooden cross. The kite shaped slab is unusual, and best paralleled outside the area at Peebles and Iona (Steer 1968-69, Pl. 9a; RCAHMS 1982, 180, nos. 6.5, 6.9). It is therefore possible that despite the location of this cross in a churchyard adjacent to a motte (RCAHMS 1981, 21, no. 123) and at a site recorded in the 12th century in a royal charter which provides evidence of a road in the immediate area (Lawrie 1905, 162), that this cross is the earliest in Dumfriesshire.

The type of the FOREGIRTH cross is less diagnostic, but the chamfer
on either side suggests that it is not as crude as RUTHWELL 2, which may be secondary and is unlikely to be early. The CLEUCH cross [Plate 10a], which is carved in outline with swollen terminals on an undressed slab, has some resemblance to STAPLEGORDON in that one arm appears to overlie the other, possibly following a wooden model as proposed by Thomas (see above). STAPLEGORDON and RUTHWELL 2 were found in churchyards, but CLEUCH was turned up by the plough and FOREGIRTH was recorded in the early 19th century lying in a farmyard. Neither site appears to have any ecclesiastical association, though a rectangular enclosure can be seen on air photographs of the field in which the CLEUCH cross was found [Plate 10c].
PART II

Kirkcudbright
CHAPTER 16
Sculptural Groups in Kirkcudbright

**Plant-scroll in the south-east**

Plant-scroll ornament has been found at two sites only west of the river Nith, at RASCARREL and KILTERLILTIE in the coastal zone east of Kirkcudbright. With the exception of KILMORIE, which will be discussed later (p. 253), there is no ornament of this type on any of the sculpture from Whithorn or the rest of Wigtownshire, nor in the area of the Stewartry west of Kirkcudbright. It is therefore evident that a form of ornament found on a number of major monuments in Dumfriesshire is absent in the rest of the region.

Both shafts are almost exactly 1 ft wide and carry similar plant scroll ornament. On the broad surviving face of RASCARREL [Plate 93b] and on the exposed face of KILTERLILTIE [Plate 85a] this occurs in medallion form, with two symmetrical plant stems crossing each other. In the angles between each medallion there are hooked offshoots, and two further offshoots within the medallion itself. Because KILTERLILTIE is painted and RASCARREL is extremely worn, it is not possible to say if the two pieces came from the same shaft, though the offshoots on RASCARREL do not appear to cross internally.

As noted above this form of plant scroll is not found at Hoddom, and only occurs in Dumfriesshire on the miniature hogback MOSSKNOW [Plate 29]. The closest analogies are with the group of sculpture that Collingwood (1927, 36-7) and Cramp (in Edwards 1966, 148-9) saw as derived from Hexham in Northumberland, in particular Hexham 2 (Cramp 1984b, Pl. 173.916), Kendal 1, Cumbria (Bailey & Cramp 1988, ill. 380), and Lancaster B (Collingwood 1927, fig. 46). The location of both KILTERLILTIE and RASCARREL near the S.E. coast of the...
Stewartry emphasises the link between the sites provided by the Irish Sea basin, as it appears that this particular connection bypassed Hoddom near the head of the Solway. The spiral scroll on the narrow faces of RASCARREL [Plate 94a] also points to Hexham, including again Hexham 2 (Cramp 1984b, Pl. 173.917) and Lancaster B (loc. cit.), but also Simonburn 1, Northumberland (Cramp 1984b, Pl. 218.1240) and Lowther 1, Cumbria (Bailey & Cramp 1988, ill. 438). The same form occurs again on two shafts at Ilkley, Yorkshire (Collingwood 1915, 189, fig. h; 194, fig. d). The paired offshoots on the broad face of RASCARREL [Plate 93b] are found on Otley 1, also in Yorkshire (Cramp 1971, taf. 41 D, 42.4) and Carlisle 2, Cumbria (Bailey and Cramp 1988, ill. 204). It is therefore clear that while the cross-shafts share similar external contacts to Hoddom, they are part of a distinct group with no direct connection to that site. It is also apparent that these two pieces follow a purer version of the Hexham tradition of plant scroll as opposed to the Hexham/Ruthwell mixture of plant scroll and figural sculpture recognised above on the Hoddom sculpture.

These two pieces near Kirkcudbright however, have no relation to the sculpture found in the western part of the Stewartry or in Wigtownshire. As will be shown below, no example of Anglian plant scroll ornament has been found on any of the sculpture in the Whithorn area, despite the recorded existence of an Anglian bishopric there in the 8th century (p. 208) and the evidence for trading contacts demonstrated by the current excavations at Whithorn (Hill 1988-90, 21).

Similarly the free-armed cross-head in the Stewartry Museum [Plate 96a-c] is again the most westerly example of the type, apart from the plain miniature grave-marker ARDWALL 9/16 and examples incised in outline or carved in low relief on cross-slabs at several sites discussed below. As shown in the Catalogue, the meandering border
on Face C of STEWARTRY MUSEUM [Plate 96b] makes it difficult to reconstruct the cross-head decoration, but the four-leaf rosette is best paralleled at York, on St Mary Bishophill Junior 5, which has an 8th- to early 9th-century Latin inscription on the reverse face (Lang 1991, 85-6, ill. 235). The nest of bosses on Face A [Plate 96a] is a type found at Brigham 5, Cumbria (Bailey & Cramp 1988, ill. 147) and Heysham, Lancashire (Collingwood 1927, fig. 128), though the raised stepped form [Plate 96c] is reminiscent of the rosette on a head fragment at Abercorn, W. Lothian (Calder 1937-38, figs. 1-3).

None of these three slabs is closely provenanced, as KILTERLILTIE is built into a cottage wall, RASCARREL was discovered built into the parapet of a bridge, and the findspot of the STEWARTRY MUSEUM head is unknown, but it is shown in the Catalogue (II, 319-20) that the KILTERLILTIE shaft and the other fragments built into the cottage may have come from a lost church site on Barncrosh farm 550 m to the N. The place-name means 'steading of the cross', as Thomas noted (1959-60b, 81).

It is noticeable that these three pieces were all found in the coastal zone east of Kirkcudbright. There are only two other pieces known from this area, the incised pebble from the MOTE OF MARK [Plate 93a], which was unfortunately found unstratified during the 1973 excavation of this hilltop metalworking site (Laing 1973a, 124), and the cross-head from RERRICK churchyard [Plate 95]. Despite being found at the same site as a possible shrine plaque dated to the 8th century (Webster & Backhouse 1991, 137, no. 102), this appears to be later than the other pieces so far discussed, with spiral-scroll ornament reminiscent of several Viking age pieces in Cumbria, such as Beckermet St John 2, Distington 4, and St Bees 2 (Bailey & Cramp 1988, ills. 56, 269, 551, 554), though the tapering arms are closer to a
These five pieces, and the undatable plain cross-base also in Rerrick churchyard [Plate 95c-e], which might be compared with examples from Lindisfarne, Northumberland (Cramp 1984b 201, Pls. 196, 197.1103-7, 198.1108-9), are the only pieces of sculpture found in the whole of the fertile low lying region to the east of Kirkcudbright (see Fig. 16), despite the growth of modern settlement between Dumfries, New Galloway and Castle Douglas.

The South-West Coast

The only site to the west of Kirkcudbright with any relation to these pieces is Ardwall Isle, which has the miniature free-standing cross ARDWALL 9/16 [Plate 73a] and an inscription [Plate 72a-b] which has been recognised as an Anglian personal name (Thomas 1967a. 153-5; Okasha 1971, 48, no. 3), as well as a linear incised cross [Plate 75a] reminiscent of MOTE OF MARK [Plate 93a]. But the closest connections of this site are with sculpture found on the mainland of Kirkcudbright to the west.

The most distinctive features of this western group of crosses are a swollen stem, and expanded terminals and rounded arm-pits. This form can be most clearly seen on the miniature free-standing cross ARDWALL 9/16 [Plate 73a], but the same form is also found in outline on ARDWALL 13 [Plate 71c] and 3 [Plate 70c], though without the swollen stem. But both expanded terminals and swollen stem occur on the incised outline cross on the ANWOTH slab [Plate 77a], as both Collingwood (Collingwood & Reed 1925-26, 129) and Thomas (1967a, 152) have pointed out, which though found 6.75 km to the W., is the closest sculpture site to Ardwall Isle. The swollen stem recurs on one face of the KIRKCLAUGH slab [Plate 87b], found 6.25 km to the west of ANWOTH.
The incised pattern on the other face of this slab [Plate 87a] is similar to that on MINNIGAFF 2 [Plate 92], found 19 km to the N.W. on the border with Wigtownshire, where this interlocking series of form and ornament dies out, and the shape of both the cross-slabs themselves and their decoration changes totally to a disk-headed type with interlace ornament (see p. 209).

That this complete cultural break is not a matter of chance is suggested by the name of the River Cree, which divided the pre-1975 counties of Wigtownshire and Kirkcudbright. Nicolaisen has shown that this derives from the Gaelic element ‘crioch’, meaning boundary. The name is found in documents of 1301 and 1326, even before the Stewartry of Kirkcudbright was created in 1369 (Nicolaisen 1966, 329, 332-3; see Hare 1942b, 407; MacQueen 1973, 28).

The only exception to this break is the relationship between the Ardwall type with expanded terminals and rounded armpits and two of the slabs and a number of the incised crosses on the wall of ST NINIAN’S CAVE in Wigtownshire [Plates 158-9, 162]. This relationship is most clearly seen on ARDWALL 13 [Plate 71c], which is the same shape and cut in the same broad-pocked manner as the rock-cut crosses ST NINIAN’S CAVE R.4-R.7, and also has the same central depression [Plate 159a-d]. The connection is reinforced by the cross within a circle with rounded armpits on ARDWALL 6 [Plate 72a], a type that is found elsewhere in Galloway only on ST NINIAN’S CAVE 3, upper cross [Plate 162a] and WHITHORN 4 [Plate 173c]. The lower cross on this slab is again the standard Ardwall type as found on the walls of the cave. It is noticeable that both Ardwall Isle and St Ninian’s Cave are immediately adjacent to the sea, and only 12 miles (20 km) apart (see Fig. 20).

The type of head with expanded terminals and rounded armpits found
at Ardwall and the other sites may relate to examples at Hexham (Cramp 1984b, Pl. 181.971) and Bewcastle (Bailey & Cramp 1988, ill. 127), but the most distinctive local feature is the use of a nick between head and shaft, on both the free-standing cross ARDWALL 9/16 [Plate 73a] and the slab ARDWALL 3 [Plate 70c]. This feature is also found on a rock-cut cross at ST NINIAN'S CAVE, R.6 [Plate 163a] and on a slab, BRAIDENOCH HILL 1 [Plate 78b], found near Carsphairn in the uplands of the Stewartry. Both these have expanded terminals and rounded armpits of the same form as on the two ARDWALL pieces.

The Northern Uplands

The BRAIDENOCH HILL slab belongs to the third major grouping of sculpture in the Stewartry, apart from the Northumbrian influenced material east of Kirkcudbright and the coastal strip between Ardwall Isle and Newton Stewart to the west. This northern group of slabs were found in the depopulated moorland area around Carsphairn, 42 km N. of Kirkcudbright, but close to the intersection of two major routes running north-south and east-west. Because of the topography described in Chapter 2, apart from the coastal zone there are a limited number of routes available in either direction. All the carved stones found in this area are cross-slabs, with the exception of STROANFREGGAN 1, which will be discussed separately below.

All these slabs, which include AUCHENSHINNOCH [Plate 77b], BRAIDENOCH HILL 1 and 2 [Plate 78a, b], CUMNOCK KNOWES [Plate 81a], and DALTALLOCHAN 1 [Plate 82a], appear to have been found in association with mounds or cairns (see Catalogue), with the possible exception of BRAIDENOCH HILL. All are cross-slabs of similar type, though CUMNOCK KNOWES is carved in relief. The arms of CUMNOCK KNOWES, DALTALLOCHAN and AUCHENSHINNOCH are all wedge-shaped, whereas both the
BRAIDENOCH HILL slabs have curved armpits. Despite this, it is
difficult not to see these slabs as a group, possibly performing some
common function. The evidence for mounds or cairns suggests that this
could either be funerary, though one would expect churchyard burial
by the date that these slabs are likely to have been carved (Morris
1983, 49), or else they acted as route markers or praying stations
for pilgrims using the north-south or west-east routes for pilgrimage
to Whithorn. There are no distinctively medieval traits to any of
these slabs but they are too plain to be closely dated. Individual
details may be compared with other crosses in the region, such as the
open foot on the AUCHENSHINNOCH slab [Plate 77b], which is also found
on LAGGANGARN 2 in Wigtownshire [Plate 140c-d], a site that may also
have been on a pilgrimage route (p. 246). The cross in relief on
CUMNOCK KNOWES [Plate 81a] is reminiscent of CRAIGLEMIN 3, also in
Wigtownshire [Plate 111a], which also has the indented shaft and
uplifted arms of DALTALLOCHAN 1 [Plate 82a], though it is a much more
carefully shaped slab. But the relationship with the ARDWALL group
demonstrated for BRAIDENOCH HILL 1 suggests that all the slabs may be
early rather than later medieval.

This may not be true of the STROANFREGGAN 1 stone [Plate 97a]. This
appears to be the shaft and part of the head of a free standing cross,
but the details are so worn, presumably by running water (II, 350),
that it is difficult to make out the scene on the figure panel [Plate
98] or the form of the cross-head. The figures appear to be embracing
or perhaps wrestling, but are not crossed, so the closest English
parallels seem to be with Lythe, Yorkshire (Collingwood 1927, fig.
173), or Crowle, Lincolnshire (Stephens 1884, 126, fig.). There are
also a number of Irish examples of this scene (Hamlin 1971, 80-1),
which may show the kiss of Judas, or Jacob and the angel, Adam & Eve,
the return of the prodigal, Paul and Antony, or Cain and Abel; but the
form of the cross itself, with broad shaft, tapering shoulders, and
possible ring head, seems closest to the Romanesque cross at St
Helen's, Kelloe, Durham (Lang 1977, 114-15, Pl. VI a, b). Again this
cross may have have been a praying station on the medieval pilgrimage
route, as it was found in deserted moorland.

Incised Ornament

There is no interlace on any of the crosses or slabs in the
Stewartry of Kirkcudbright, despite the metalworking evidence from the
Mote of Mark excavations (Curle 1913-14; Laing 1975a). The
cross-hatched ornament on KIRKCLAUGH and MINNIGAFF 2 may be imitating
this form of decoration, as Collingwood suggested (1922-23, 228), but
the pattern on KIRKCLAUGH, face A [Plate 87a] is more carefully
planned than the rough lines on MINNIGAFF 2 [Plate 92], forming, as
is shown in the Catalogue, an interlocking T and Y pattern (II, 323).
This appears to be unique, but the closest parallels are with two
crosses in the Isle of Man: Greeba Hill, German (Kermode 1968, II.
fig. 9) and the Hedin cross at Maughold (Kermode 1968, IV, fig. 34),
which appear to be 11th century or later. Both KIRKCLAUGH and
MINNIGAFF 2 were found on or adjacent to motte sites, and may
therefore mark a change to Romanesque forms of decoration.

However, MINNIGAFF 2 has a cross-head which stands out from the
slab in semi-relief. In the centre of the head are five dots. This
pattern is also found in the cross on Face A of the MINNIGAFF 1 pillar
stone [Plate 89a]. It is likely that the carver of the MINNIGAFF 2
slab was imitating a feature of an earlier cross, though it is
possible that the irregular scratched lines on the face are a
subsequent addition, in imitation of KIRKCLAUGH. But the technique on
both KIRKCLAUGH and MINNIGAFF 2 of cutting back the area around the
cross head, leaving this part only in relief, suggests that they are
more likely to be contemporary.

The two pillar stones from HIGH AUCHENLARIE [Plate 83a, b] are more
problematic. They relate to no other sculpture found in the area of
the Stewartry, though the incised outline crosses on each, with long
shafts the same width as the cross-arms, show that they are certainly
a pair, quite apart from the evidence for their original findspot
standing together in a cairn (Stuart 1856, 38). Paired standing stones
incised with crosses also occur at LAGGANGARN in Wigtownshire [Plate
140a-d]. The square-armed cross type of HIGH AUCHENLARIE 2 [Plate 83b]
and the hammer-headed cross on HIGH AUCHENLARIE 1 [Plate 83a] are
again found in Wigtownshire, on KIRKMADRINE 7 [Plate 136d-e] and
GLENLUCE ABBEY [Plate 121c] respectively. The saltire cross on HIGH
AUCHENLARIE 1 which Collingwood (1922-23, 228) compared with
CASSENDEOCH [Plate 106b] appears to be secondary, though a similar
scratched cross is found on KIRKMADRINE 4 [Plate 137a].

The location of these crosses, in a field at the foot of Barholm
hill and Cairnharrow, makes it difficult to believe that they marked a
route, as Truckell suggested (1961-62b, 89-90). It is pointed out in
the Catalogue that they stood adjacent to the same stream that ran by
the slab at KIRKCLAUGH, 1.3 km to the south, and it is therefore
possible that they marked a boundary. But their apparent position in
a cairn may link them functionally with the group around Carsphairn,
40 km to the north.

Ardwall

Ardwall Isle is the only site prior to the current excavations at
Whithorn and Barhobble where sculpture has been found in relation to
burials and where the position of each piece was recorded. Consequently the layout of the cemetery has been re-examined in the Catalogue (II, 277), and Thomas' phase plans redrawn so as to clarify the distribution of the sculpture (see Fig. 41). This exercise has shown that the Phase II and Phase III finds were concentrated to the S. of the Phase III chapel, with the exception of five of the largest stones which were found within the chapel itself. Only the two architectural pieces were found west of the chapel, and the graves in this area appear to have been unmarked. It is therefore argued here that the position of the cross fragments is not simply the result of later disturbance, but reflects the original layout of the cemetery. The discovery of most of the larger cross-slabs within the chapel itself suggests that they were being used to mark higher status burials, and this function seems more important than their difference in type. The Phase I to III levels at Ardwall were dated 6th to 11th century, but five centuries of occupation seems an improbably long timespan for the sequence of graves revealed. Thomas's use of the carving techniques of the sculpture to construct a chronology is partly dependent on the need to fill this time span (1967a, 152-3).

The remaining slabs from ARDWALL do not follow the regional types discussed above. The linear cross in a circle with an elongated stem is a type found widely in Ireland, Scotland, Wales and the Isle of Man (Lionard 1961, 118, fig. 13.1, 13.2), though only the example from Lonan on Man (Kermode 1907, Pl. VII, no. 9) has the same clover-shaped form as ARDWALL 4 [Plate 71a-b].

The cross with intersecting grooved arms on ARDWALL 8 [Plate 75b] was compared by Thomas with the STAPLEGORDON slab in Dumfriesshire [Plate 37], and with examples in Shetland and Skye (Thomas 1967a, 160-1; idem 1971, 118), but on STAPLEGORDON the vertical lines do not
cross the horizontal. Thomas saw this slab as a skeuomorph of a wooden cross (loc. cit.), but the edges of the shaft beneath the head have been deepened, so it is probable that the other incisions are laying-out lines.

He interpreted the animal on ARDWALL 17 [Plate 76b] as the Agnus Dei (Thomas 1967a, 165), by analogy with HODDOM 2 [Plate 51a], and this is probably correct, given its proximity to the two incised crosses. As noted under MINNIGAFF 1, figure carving is very rare in Galloway, and the tiny incised profile figures carrying croziers on ARDWALL 11 [Plate 76a] are closer to such incised figures as Ballyvourney in Co. Cork, Ireland (Henry 1965, Pl. 50). Their processional stance recalls the clerics on the Papil altar slab, Shetland (Wainwright 1962, Pl. XV.2).
1. The place-name Rerrick has been shown to be Scandinavian. It is derived from O.N. hreyrr-eyk, meaning 'cairn oak' (Brooke forthcoming a).

2. For crosses in cairns, see Lewis 1976b, 15, and Hamlin 1985a, 294. Hamlin has pointed to the late 7th-century Patrician text by Tírecháin which refers to stones being gathered for a burial: "congregavit lapidis erga sepulcrum" (Bieler 1979, 152-3).

3. But the Scandinavian silver arm-ring fragment from Blackerne, Kirkcudbright (Grieg 1940, 109; Graham-Campbell 1975-76, 131), 36 km to the S. of Carsphairn, was found in a cist within a cairn (Wilson 1851, 443; Yates 1984, 2, 140. SK 46).

4. Apart from the panel of four triquetra on MINNIGAFF 1 [Plate 91a-b] which is considered separately.

5. See for example: Kermode 1907, Pl. VII, no. 10; Simpson 1935, fig. 15; Nash-Williams 1950, fig. 56, Pl. I; Newall 1956a, 12; Newall 1956b, 22; Knight et al 1977, fig. 3; Hamlin 1982, Pl. 17.1.B.
CHAPTER 17
Minnigaff 1

This pillar stone is oblong in section and tapers towards the summit, which is uneven. It is about 1 metre high and 25 cm wide at the base. On two of the surviving faces are figure carvings, on the third is a cross surmounted by a bird. There are two ornamental panels on the shaft of the cross, the upper with four opposed spiral volutes, the lower with four triquetra [Plate 89a]. Only the heads of the figure carvings are defined, above featureless robed bodies. One head is that of a man, the other that of a bird [Plates 89b, 90a].

I have summarised the detailed description given in the catalogue because it is essential to understand that this stone is quite unlike any other carving in the region, or, to the best of my knowledge, anywhere else in Britain. It has only been discussed by Collingwood, who dated it to the 11th century (1922-23, 227-8, fig. 39). His drawing is very poor and misleading, and gives the impression for instance that the carefully carved triquetra panel is scrambled. In fact it is precisely symmetrical [Plate 91a, b]. Both he and Romilly Allen (ECMS iii 1903, 477) describe the creature on Face C as a "monster". Because it abuts the alcove wall it has not previously been properly illustrated. The photograph [Plate 90a] shows the head of an eagle with a hooked beak. Collingwood's sketch of the human face on Face B [Plate 89b] misrepresents it as incompetently drawn, with boot-button eyes. In fact there are no pupils, and the eyes and nose are drawn as a pendant, S-curved line. Above this, though not shown on Collingwood's drawing, are lightly incised eyebrows and rings forming the hair.

In sculpture, this type of figure is found on several crosses in Ireland, in particular the Moone cross, Co. Kildare (Henry 1965, Pl.
71), and the cross at Carndonagh, Co. Donegal, on the E. face and on
the narrow S. side (Harbison 1986, Pl. 4.3a, 4.4a), and also on the E.
side of the South pillar there (op. cit., Pl. 4.7a). The same type is
also found in metalwork, on the Athlone crucifixion plaque and the
Miklebostad, Norway, hanging bowl (Henry 1965, Pl. 46; Pl. B). In
manuscripts, the closest parallel is the St Matthew figure in the Book
of Durrow (Dublin, Trinity College Lib., A.4.5.(57)), fol. 21v
(Alexander 1978, 30-2, cat. 6, ill. 14). The significance of this will
be discussed below, but it is a reminder that the plain body panel may
have been painted (see Lang 1990).

In sculpture, the raised bird head on Face C [Plate 90a] is almost
unique, but closely resembles an unpublished fragment from Heysham,
Lancashire, found during recent excavations by Dr T. Potter of the
British Museum. 1 This may be part of a chair or furnishing
(R.J. Cramp, personal comment). The type is more commonly found on
metalwork, for instance the Oseberg mount (Bruce Mitford 1964, Pl. XL
b), but also occurs on the Franks casket (Webster 1982, fig. 3), and
in manuscripts in the canon tables of the Lindisfarne gospels, fol.
14v (Bruce-Mitford 1960, 179, fig. 25d; 198, fig. 38e). But the
closest parallel for a bird head placed above a robed body is the
evangelist symbol of St John on the gold plaque from Brandon, Suffolk
(Webster 1980, 12, fig. 1; Wilson 1984, ill. 123).

It is therefore suggested in the Catalogue that both the man and
the bird are evangelist symbols. The occurrence of such symbols on the
shaft of crosses has been noted by Cramp (1978b, 126). Matthew and
John figures without Luke and Mark occur on sculpture at Elgin, Moray
(ECMS iii 1903, 135-6, fig. 137) and Clonmacnois, Co. Offaly (Henry
1967, 167, 173, Pls. 91, 95). Henderson suggested that the two upper
figures at Elgin are also evangelist symbols (1978, 54), but Henry has
shown that the figures on the Cross of the Scriptures, Clonmacnois, are part of an apocalypse scheme based on Matthew 24 and John 5 (op. cit., 168).

Collingwood saw this shaft as a grave-marker, but the symbolism discussed above suggests that it may have functioned as a piece of church furniture, in particular a lectern. The summit of the shaft is sloped but uneven, and it is not certain whether it is damaged. The two oblong pillars at Clonmacnois, mentioned above, are of similar headless form (Harbison 1986, Pls. 4.6, 4.7), and one of the plain pillars from Sandwich, Kent (Tweddle 1983, 30, Pl. IXa) is of the same tapering shape.

The bird on the upper arm of the cross on Face A [Plate 89a] can be paralleled on a few stones in Ireland, for instance Caherlehillan, Co. Kerry (Crawford 1980, 8, Pl. XII.B), where it appears to be a symbol of the resurrection (see Fanning 1981, 145-7). The five depressions in the centre of the cross are reminiscent of nail-heads, and may show that it was derived from a metalwork original, but they may also represent the five wounds of Christ, as Bailey has argued for other sculpture (1980, 148-9).

The panel of four triquetra [Plate 91a, b] is a widespread form, with examples from Britford, Wiltshire (Cramp 1972, taf. 66.1b), and Penmon, Anglesey (Nash-Williams 1950, fig. 37, Pl. XXXI), as well as a number of sites in Scotland, for instance Ulbster, Caithness (ECMS iii 1903, fig. 30, 31), Holm, Orkney (op. cit., fig. 18), and St Andrews 31, Fife (Hay-Fleming 1931, fig. 52, 54). The quadruple spirals in the upper panel are less common, but there are examples from Latheron, Caithness (Curle 1939-40, Pl. 22) and Iniskea North 2, Co. Mayo (Henry 1945, Pl. XXVIII.2).
The Irish connections of this stone seem overwhelming, and most of the parallels cited above are dated to the 8th or 9th centuries (see also Youngs 1989). There is no evidence to support Collingwood’s 11th century date. This piece therefore appears to be related to Irish missionary activity in Galloway, of the type predicted by Thomas (1967a, 177-83), though without any influence on later sculpture in the area, apart from the use of five depressions in the centre of the cross on MINNIGAFF 2 [Plate 92].

It is noticeable that figure sculpture is very rare in Galloway, in contrast to the emphasis on classically carved figures at Hoddom and Ruthwell in Dumfriesshire to the east (see Table 10 and Fig. 30). The only examples in the Stewartry are this stone, the tiny incised figures on ARDWALL 11 [Plate 76a], and the panel on STROANFREGGAN 1 [Plate 98], which may be medieval. But the two pieces of figure carving in Wigtownshire have a closer relationship with MINNIGAFF. In particular the paired figures on the WHITHORN 2 shaft [Plate 172e] appear to follow the Irish type of frontal figures with round heads and plain featureless bodies without modelling. This is in complete contrast to the classical type of figure found at Hoddom and Ruthwell, with defined drapery and separate limbs. The KILMORIE slab [Plate 124] will be discussed in detail later, as its figure carving also shows relationships with Viking age carving in Yorkshire, but it again appears to follow the Irish type, as found on crosses at Castledermot and Moone Abbey in Co. Kildare (p. 258).
1. I am grateful to Professor Cramp for letting me see a photograph of this stone.
CHAPTER 18
Trusty's Hill

Despite the published interpretation of rock carvings of deer and horses recently found at Eggerness farm in Wigtownshire as Pictish symbols (Morris & van Hoek 1987, 35-8, figs. 4, 5), the TRUSTY'S HILL carvings [Plate 99] remain the only clear cut example of this series on any non-portable object found south of the Forth (see Henderson 1979; RCAHMS 1985b). In particular, the double-disc and Z-rod are not found on any other class of sculpture (Stevenson 1958, 99; Henderson 1967, 104). However, it is demonstrated in the catalogue that the horned face mask which lies below the other three carvings is probably an 18th or 19th century pastiche, the facial features of which are derived from the volutes of the dagger handle.

Given the position of this rock carving in Galloway, so far outside the Pictish heartland, and the first recorded mention of it in 1794, almost seventy years after the stones north of the Forth were first brought to public attention by A. Gordon (1726), it could be argued that the rest of the carving is also a piece of antiquarian drollery (see Cowan 1991, 74, fn. 53). That this is unlikely is suggested by two factors: the initial vague description of the symbols as "several waving and spiral lines, which exhibit however no regular figure" (H. Gordon 1794, 351); and the use of specific variants from the original symbol types as established by Stevenson (1955), Henderson (1957-58) and Murray (1986), which can be shown by detailed comparison to be devolved forms found on other symbol-bearing sculpture.

The form of double-disc with concentric circles is a type that occurs on at least five examples in northern Scotland (Murray 1986, 235-6) one of which is a Class II stone. Two have no Z-rod, but on Invereen, Inverness, the Z-rod has paired offshoots at both ends.
Z-rods identical at both ends appear to be a late feature as Henderson has shown in connection with TRUSTY'S HILL (1957-58, 50, fn. 2; 1967, 114; 1979, 24); examples with both ends pointed occur on St Vigeans 1, Angus (ECMS iii 1903, fig. 250B), and on the lost Monifieth metalwork plaque (op. cit., fig. 298). The Z-rod is interlaced with the cross-bar of the double-disc on Elgin, Moray (ECMS iii 1903, fig. 137A), and Meigle 7, Perth (op. cit., fig. 316B) in what again appears to be a developed form (Thomas 1959-60a, 69; Murray 1986, 236).

On other floriated rods the offshoots are usually placed alternately, and face outwards, with S-shaped stems (see Henderson 1979, 26). The TRUSTY'S HILL type is closer to the single paired offshoots found on the crescent and V-rod symbol, but there the volutes are curled inward (see Murray 1986, 241). However, Huntly 2, Aberdeen (ECMS iii 1903, fig. 177) and Aberlemno 3, Angus (ECMS iii 1903, fig. 228B), have similar paired offshoots facing backwards. Invereen, Inverness, as shown above, has both paired offshoots and concentric circles on the double-disc.

An S-dragon with a sword below, resembling the TRUSTY'S HILL composition, is depicted at Fowlis Wester, Perth (Curle 1939-40, Pl. XXVIIb; Henderson 1967, Pl. 44), on an elaborate Class II stone which seems to be the only other example of this pairing. S-dragons with spiralled tails appear to be a late feature (see Thomas 1961, 55-6), as the type is only found on Class II stones, often in pairs, as at Skinnet (ECMS iii 1903, fig. 29) and Ulbster (op. cit., figs. 30A, 31A) in Caithness, and Brodie, Moray (op. cit., fig. 136A), and Meigle 1, Perth (op. cit., fig. 310A).

The scrolled symmetrical jaws of the TRUSTY'S HILL creature may
possibly be based on the tail form of the V-rod symbol, as on Clynemilton 1 (op. cit., fig. 36) and Little Ferry Links 4 (op. cit., fig. 47) in Sutherland. The outlining of the jaw is comparable to the joint spirals characteristic of animals found on the symbol stones (see Thomas 1961, 43; Henderson 1967, 122-5, Pls. 33-39).

The form of pelta with volutes found on the dagger pommel also occurs at Abernethy, Perth (ECMS iii 1903, fig. 299), Dunrobin, Sutherland (op. cit., fig. 39), Monymusk, Aberdeen (op. cit., fig. 209) and North Redhill, Banff (op. cit., fig. 161), though not within a weapon handle. But it is possible that this pattern is based on a metalwork original such as the 'Ingelri' sword pommel from the Thames at Battersea, dated to the 9th century by Wilson (1964, 40, 107, Pl. VII), which is inlaid with a volute pattern closely resembling TRUSTY’S HILL.

This analysis therefore shows that the TRUSTY’S HILL symbols are following types found north of the Forth, which in general appear to be later developments of the original form, as the unusual composition of the S-dragon and the dagger might indicate. In particular a number of examples come from Class II stones. Consequently these symbols do not appear to be related to the occupational date of the fort at Trusty’s Hill as established by Thomas’ limited excavation in 1960, though this 1st or 2nd century date (Thomas 1959-60a, 66-7) was based on quern types which could have been salvaged from the Roman fort of Flavian date at Gatehouse-of-Fleet, 1.5 km to the east of the site (St Joseph 1983). The symbols can only be related to a later occupation by inference from the form of the southern ramparts, which Thomas saw as those of a nuclear fort of Dark Age type (1959-60a, 67). But recent work at Dundurn has shown that the form of an unexcavated hillfort can no longer be taken as diagnostic, as this may be the
result of several different phases of activity (Alcock 1989, 204-14).

It is therefore difficult to see a single late symbol as evidence for Pictish settlement in Galloway. The animals carved at Eggerness do not have characteristic Pictish joint spirals or outlining, as found for instance even on the boar at Dunadd in Argyll (RCAHMS 1992, no. 281), and there seems no convincing reason otherwise to date them to the early medieval period. These symbols at TRUSTY’S HILL therefore remain without a context.
1. See for instance ECMS iii 1903, figs. 488, 101, 224, and 303.

2. Though see also Bailey 1980, 117, 120, fig. 19a, 20, and Pl. 30 for a Scandinavian version of this scene.

3. MacQueen (1960-61) has demonstrated that the Picts of Galloway recorded in post-conquest sources are a medieval myth.
PART III

Wigtown
It has been noted above (p. 114) that there are no Early Christian Latin inscriptions anywhere in the eastern part of the region, despite the memorial stones at Liddelwater, Yarrowkirk, Manor Water and Peebles in the Border uplands to the east of Dumfriesshire (Thomas 1968, 102, fig.). Of these the Peebles and Manor Water stones carry crosses, but none has the chi-rho symbol. Thomas and Hamlin have demonstrated that in Britain and Ireland this takes two forms, an earlier ‘Constantinian’ form with the upright Rho crossed by an X figure, found on the continent from the 4th century, and the later ‘monogramatic’ form with the Rho found in both closed and open forms (Frantz 1929) crossed by a horizontal bar. The distribution of these forms in Britain and Ireland has been mapped by Hamlin (1972, fig. 3), with new additions listed by Hamlin 1982, 294, and RCAHMS 1992, 69-70, no. 33, 2.

**WHITHORN 1**

Apart from the lost Roman carving from Maryport on the Cumbrian coast and an example found at Catterick in Yorkshire (Wall 1965, 213-4, fig. 3; Thomas 1981, 106-7, figs. 4.1; 5.11), there are no examples of Contantinian chi-rhos found north of Cornwall other than the example prefacing the Jarrow dedication inscription (Cramp 1984b, 113-14, Pl. 58.524). It is shown in the Catalogue however that there appears to be a worn and damaged chi-rho of this type in the centre of the slab above the inscription on WHITHORN 1 [Plate 171a-c]. This chi-rho was noted at the time of the stone’s discovery (III, 285-6), but a drawing of it by William Galloway was in a closed file at the Scottish Record Office until noted during the course of research for
Although damaged, this chi-rho can be recognised to take the form found at Phillack and Cape Cornwall in Cornwall (Langdon 1893, 101-5, Pl. I, no. 1, 1a, 2; Wall 1968, 175-6, nos. 14 and 15, figs. 1.14, 1.16). Detailed comparison of the letter forms of the inscription with examples in Wales shows that this clearly predates the 7th-century Jarrow inscription. The layout of the inscription closely parallels the Carnsew slab in Cornwall, as Thomas and Radford have noted (Thomas 1971, 99, fig. 43; Radford 1975, 4), and also the triangular Llantrisant stone in Anglesey (Nash-Williams 1950, no. 33, fig. 36, Pls. II, VI). Another stone in Wales, Llanerfyl in Montgomery, refers to a daughter aged 13 (op. cit., no. 294, fig. 190, Pl. XIV).

It is also shown in the Catalogue that this pillar slab was not found at the east end of the later priory church at Whithorn near Radford's early building (1955-56b), but under the path to the present parish church which crosses the nave. It is therefore unlikely that earlier churches on this site were focussed on this stone. But recent excavations at Whithorn have shown that the earliest burials in the 5th century were focussed on a platform that may have carried a pillar stone at the centre (Hill 1990-91, 8-9, fig. 5).

KIRKMADRINE 1-3

The three pillars at KIRKMADRINE in the Rhins peninsula were moved in the early 19th century to serve as gateposts [Plate 134a-b]. But it is shown in the Catalogue that before this they were recorded standing together in the churchyard, at approximately the same height. Since the two undamaged stones KIRKMADRINE 1 and 2 are both about two metres high, it is therefore suggested here that they may have stood partly embedded in a cairn or cairns, as can be demonstrated for other
memorials of the same period on the basis of inscriptions and excavated evidence (see III, 123-4).

That these stones acted as foci for subsequent burial at Kirkmadrine is demonstrated by the later series of carvings from this site, which despite a lack of excavation, has produced about ten cross-slabs (see below, p. 248).

These three stones have recently been seen as separated over a period of several hundred years, with KIRKMADRINE 1 being dated to the 5th century, and KIRKMADRINE 3 to the early 7th (Radford & Donaldson 1957, 46-7). But given that all three stones appear originally to have been of the same type, despite the damage to the base of KIRKMADRINE 3 resulting from its horizontal reuse in the gate pillar [Plate 134b], it is possible that despite the use of insular majuscule on KIRKMADRINE 1 and 2 [Plates 130, 131], and the introduction of half-uncial letters on KIRKMADRINE 3 [Plate 132], that Radford's chronology is excessively extended, and that all three stones were carved within a single generation, as R.G. Collingwood implied (1936-38, 285-9). It is noted in the Catalogue that all three inscriptions use the same form of ligature in the word ET, which occurs on all three stones (Collingwood 1936-38, 286-7), and is also found in the inscription on the MAINS stone [Plate 150a]. The omega on KIRKMADRINE 1 is of minuscule type, also found on Maughold 41 (21), in the Isle of Man, a stone which carries a chi-rho of cross-of-arcs type (Trench-Jellicoe 1980, 202, Pl. XIa).

Chi-rho crosses of any form are rare in Wales, with only two examples (Nash-Williams 1950, 16), yet in Ireland where the monogram form is found on at least seven examples (Hamlin 1971, fig. 3, with additions), horizontal Latin inscriptions are extremely rare.
It is therefore possible that these stones with open rhos are the result of direct Mediterranean influence and contacts, as Frantz (1929) would imply. Evidence for long range contacts with this area is provided by the discovery of Type A table ware and Type B amphorae in the current excavations at Whithorn (Hill 1988-90, 4).

**MAINS**

The MAINS stone, which has previously been thought to have been first noted standing by the roadside south of Whithorn, is shown in the Catalogue to have been moved to that position from an unknown site on the farm to the east. It is therefore suggested there that it need not have been removed from Whithorn, but may have stood in a roadside cemetery, as has been demonstrated for the Kilknasaggart pillar in Co. Armagh, Ireland (Hamlin 1982, 291, 294, Pl. 17.4 A,B). This stone also carries an inscription dedicating the place to Peter. The name is found in similar form on St Cuthbert's portable altar, and the long side of the Cuthbert coffin (Okasha 1971, nos. 34, 35).

One edge of the slab is damaged, but it is shown in the Catalogue that this is likely to have taken place before the cross-of-arcs was carved, as it is equidistant from both damaged and undamaged edges. It is therefore possible, as Macalister suggested (1945, 499), that an earlier inscription has been defaced.

The type of cross-of-arcs on MAINS is almost unknown in Wales, but common on the west coast of Ireland and at Maughold in the Isle of Man. This cross-of-arcs with a double ring is a form found at Maughold on four examples (Kermode 1907, nos. 21, 25, 26, 117). As noted above, one of these also carries a chi-rho. The P letter form on MAINS also occurs at Maughold, and it is likely that there was close
contact with Man at this date. It is notable that this connection is
not visible in the later sculpture (Bailey 1984, 21, 27).

A fragmentary cross of this type, though with circumference arcs as
on Maughold 46 (26) and Ronaldsway (Kermode 1907, no. 26; Megaw 1939,
Pl. 173.5) was found in the Whithorn excavations in 1986 reused in a
later building (Hill 1984-86, 4, fig.). Subsequently, slabs with
compass-drawn designs forming marigold and cross patterns were
recognised on paving slabs in the Northumbrian period ecclesiastical
buildings (Hill 1988-90, 9, fig. 8). On the reverse of WHITHORN 5
[Plate 174b], discussed below, there are three interlocking circles
with two crudely drawn crosses with expanded terminals in the outer
circles. It is therefore clear that the cross-of-arcs on the MAINS
stone is not as isolated in this area as it appeared a few years ago,
and it is suggested below that it may have been the basis for a
regional form of cross within a circle with expanded terminals, as on
WHITHORN 4 [Plate 173c] and the crosses above an indented stem on ST
NINIAN'S CAVE 3 [Plate 162a] which, the St Ninian's Cave evidence
suggests, may have been the basis for the Whithorn School disk-head
type.
CHAPTER 20
The Whithorn School

Anglian Whithorn

In Galloway the establishment of an Anglian bishopric at Whithorn, subject to the see of York, and its existence throughout the 8th century, is historically attested by Bede, H.E., III.4 and V.23, and by subsequent entries in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle D/E texts and elsewhere up to AD. 802 (see above, p. 54). The extent of Anglian political control over the region is less clear, as is the extent of Anglian immigration into the area (Laing 1973c, 37-52). At Whithorn, ironically, this documented period of the Anglian bishopric is hardly represented amongst the comparatively large quantity of sculpture found at various times in the area of the priory. Most of this sculpture, except for WHITHORN 3 and 4 [Plate 173a-d] and WHITHORN 6, one of the stones with Anglian runes [Plate 174a-c], appears to post-date the 8th century, despite the recent excavated evidence for a Northumbrian church at Whithorn (Hill 1990-91, 16-24) and the absence of further documentary evidence until AD. 1125.

There is also a notable lack of standard Northumbrian forms such as free-armed cross-heads (Table 8, Fig. 28). In the whole of Wigtownshire this type only occurs in the form of crosses incised in outline on a slab, and at Whithorn only on the stone no. 3 [Plate 173a-b]. There is a close similarity between crosses of this type from St NINIAN'S CAVE and ARDWALL ISLE (compare ARDWALL 13, Plate 71c, and ST NINIAN'S CAVE 2, 3 and R.6, Plates 162a, 162b, 159c), two sites which also have simple Anglian inscriptions on other stones (see ARDWALL 6, Plate 72a-b; ST NINIAN'S CAVE 1, Plate 161a-c). But classic Northumbrian plant-scroll sculpture has not been found west of KILTERLILTIE [Plate 85a-b] and RASCARREL [Plate 93-94] in
Kirkcudbright (see Fig. 29). A piece of worn plant-scroll from the current Whithorn excavations does not appear to date from before the 12th century. Such a small total may have been influenced by the lack of suitable sandstone in Wigtownshire (Fig. 9), but contrasts markedly with the evidence from Dumfriesshire to the east (Table 9).

The Whithorn School

The predominant quantity of sculpture from Whithorn appears to date from the undocumented period between the 9th and the 11th century (Collingwood 1922-23, 217-27), and unlike all other types of sculpture in the region, these cross-slabs, whether found whole or as fragments, have so many characteristics in common as to appear mass produced to a standard formula (op. cit., figs. 14-37).

When found complete the head is flat and circular, with a central boss and four circles near the edge, which form keyhole-shaped armpits and divide the head into four segments. The shafts are very broad in proportion to their thickness, and the two faces each contain a single panel of repetitive interlace usually carved in relief, somewhat different in design in each case but with broad flat strands forming loops or closed-circuit patterns. The strands are made up of separate segments, each divided by a groove down the middle stopping short of the crossing points [Plate 177b].

This is the decorative treatment known as 'stopped-plait' (Collingwood 1922-23, 217-18), which is also found on a number of sites in Cumbria and southern Scotland, including KIRKCONNEL 1 [Plate 22] in Dumfriesshire (Table 4, Fig. 22). Median-incised interlace with the groove running up to the crossing point is much less common in this area and is mainly confined to Whithorn itself (see Table 7).
In Cumbria stopped-plait is only one part of a decorative package (Bailey 1980, 196-206), the other elements of which are not found on the Whithorn area sculpture with stopped-plait. Like the disk-heads also found on these cross-slabs, but not found in Cumbria (Bailey 1984, 18), stopped-plait in this area is just one ingredient in a very distinctive local style, and it seems to be a feature indicative of the relative date of such sculpture (Bailey 1980, 205) and the type of slaty stone used.

A limited variety of interlace forms and twist patterns are used, but the predominant type has closed-circuit Pattern A rings (Cramp 1984a, fig. 24) binding the crossing points of diagonal strands, as on WHITHORN 9 [Plate 177b], WHITHORN 13 [Plate 179a], or WIGTOWN 1 [Plate 191a-b] (see Table 5). Most of the patterns used are symmetrical, but irregular branching strands are seen on MAINS OF PENNINGHAME [Plate 148c] and LONGCASTLE 1 [Plate 145b], and possibly KIRKINNER 2 [Plate 127a-b].

In a number of cases this type of interlace is found on one face of the shaft only. The reverse face is either carved with interlace in outline, as on CRAILEMINE 1 [Plate 110b] or WHITHORN 17 [Plate 181d], or else only the central groove has been carved [Plate 179b]. These examples suggest that a distinction can be made between the front and back of the stone, and a similar less elaborate treatment can also be seen on one side of a number of the disk-headed crosses, such as WHITHORN 9 [Plate 177a-b] and KIRKINNER 1 [Plate 126a, c]. Incised unfinished interlace is known from other areas, but here it is used consistently enough to suggest that these crosses served a function where only one side need be seen. It is possible that the type derives from WHITHORN 8 [Plate 176b-c], which as is shown below, may have preceded the rest of this group and is only carved on one face.
A few shafts have fret ornament along the lower border, for example MAINS OF PENNINGHAME [Plate 148b] and WHITHORN 13 [Plate 179a]. This may be decorative, but it may also represent the laying out points for the grid from which the interlace was constructed (cf. Lang 1984c). The incised unfinished interlace similarly shows that the stopped-plait form may have been developed by incising the central groove, in a manner found on 9th-century manuscripts, and cutting back around the strand at a later stage, as appears to be the case with WHITHORN 12 [Plate 178d].

The disk-headed crosses show slightly more variety. The key-hole type of armpit is used on most of these, but this may either be a circular hole cut through the head, as on KIRKINNER 1 [Plate 126a, c], or WHITHORN 27 and 28 [Plate 186a-d], or a domed boss filling the spandrel, as on WHITHORN 9 [Plate 177a-b] or WHITHORN 29 and 30 [Plate 187a-c]. Remains of holes cut through can also be seen on the upper parts of shafts like LONGCASTLE 1 [Plate 145a] or WHITHORN 11 [Plate 178a]. That the two types are related is indicated by KIRKINNER 1 and WHITHORN 29, which both have crosslets on the centre boss. Interlace filling the head is less common, but seen on WHITHORN 10 [Plate 177c-d] on the obverse face of a plain head.

The shafts of all these crosses, when complete, observe a width to depth ratio of 6.5 : 1. All the shafts also have convex sides, so that shaft entasis is another defining feature of this group of crosses. (see Table 5). In a number of examples a tenon at the base of the shaft survives, as on WHITHORN 9 and KIRKINNER 1, but in most cases this is now concealed and only known from early illustrations. A plain base with a central slot suitable for a tenon of this type is known from WHITHORN (36) [Plate 179c], and a missing example is recorded from KIRKINNER (3).
Territorial Implications

About 20 carved stones of this type have been found at Whithorn itself (though not from the current excavations), and about 15 more, following the same formula, from other sites in the area (see Table 5). All stones of this type, known as the 'Whithorn School' (Collingwood 1922-23, 218), are confined in their distribution to the triangular part of Wigtownshire sandwiched between the rivers Luce and Cree, known as the Machars (Fig. 23). Most of the land here is below 90 m (300 ft) and is nowadays, to the east of Port William, good farming country (Hare 1942b, 407-22). There is far more sculpture from this area than anywhere else in the region. Most of these stones have been found, usually singly, on or close to known church sites. In the other cases the original position is not known, usually because the stone has been built into a post-medieval wall (Fig. 27).

The find spots of each of these stones (see Table 5) is discussed in the Catalogue, but the scale of the maps makes it impossible to show these relationships and to draw conclusions without the dangers of oversimplification. The following qualifications should be noted. There are no stones from the former parishes of Eggerness or Cruggleton. One fragment has come from the recently discovered church site at BARHOBBLE [Plate 101a] in Mochrum parish. The stones from CRAIGLEMIN [Plates 110-111] appear to have come from a lost burial ground in Glasserton parish. The shaft from MAINS OF PENNINGHAME farm [Plate 148b-c] was found in use as a step 800 m from the church. The stone from WEST CROSERIE (Plate 169b) was built into a cottage 1 km from Kirkcowan church. These are the single stones in the two northern parishes on the map. The MONREITH cross (Plates 154-155) appears to have been related to a centre of lordship at Moure, in the
same parish as KIRKMAIDEN (see III, 210).

But it is notable that the church sites from which stones of this type come were the principal churches of most of the later medieval parishes in this area (Fig. 27), including such sites as Longcastle and Kirkmaiden-in-Farines where the parish was supressed at the Reformation (see Table 3 and Fig. 10). These parish church sites form a group that are shown in later documents as being incorporated within the medieval deanery of Farines, an administrative area first recorded in the 13th century (Dunlop 1939, 3-77). This is equivalent to the geographical area of the Machars and was bounded on the east by the river Cree and to the west by the Water of Luce (see Barrow 1975, 126-7, figs. 4 and 5).

Since we have a large quantity of these stones from a central place, Whithorn, recorded both earlier and later as an administrative centre (see Radford 1948-49a, 87-105; Donaldson 1948-49, 127-54), and also from the surrounding dependent parishes, all showing a limited and standardised vocabulary, there appears to be evidence of some centralised control in approximately the 10th or 11th centuries over an area equivalent to an administrative unit which comes on record at a later date. This therefore seems to suggest the continued survival of Whithorn as a regional centre in the undocumented period between 802-1125, which has been shown by recent excavation to mark a revival of the site on more commercial lines (Hill 1991).

As there is no other evidence for the development of parishes in this area before the Norman period, it also raises the question of why these particular sites with sculpture were later selected as parish churches. It should be noted that the distribution of the Whithorn school sculpture and the associated parish centres is confined to the
area of the eastern half of the Machars nowadays classed as good arable land (classes 2-4: see Bown & Heslop 1979, 287-305). This seems to reinforce the probability that the patronage of such stylised sculpture is a reflection of wealth and status (Higham 1985, 39), since these stones are imposing monuments, with a comparatively large carved area modelled in relief and with interlace constructed to a geometric formula (see Adcock 1974, 204-6). But as demonstrated above, they also appear to be the products of an organised professional school of carving, apparently working under the auspices of a central authority in this region.

It consequently seems probable that these sites were the churches of the estate centres attached to Whithorn, possibly with rights of baptism and burial, and thus richer than any neighbouring chapels (Collingwood 1922 23, 226-7; Blair 1985, 119, 139; Blair 1988a, 56-7). It is therefore likely that these cross-slabs are related to the establishment of burial rights on private estates, and may have been set up to mark the granting of such rights (see Baldwin Brown 1921, 75; Thomas 1978, 76), thus acting to some extent as a burial licence issued to dependencies by the centre of ecclesiastical administration in the area.

Scandinavian Settlement

These crosses have often been seen as evidence for Scandinavian overlordship of Galloway (Collingwood 1919-20, 97-118; Radford 1948-49a, 97-101), but the limited evidence for Scandinavian settlement in this area has recently been demonstrated by Brooke (1983, and forthcoming b), and in a number of papers in Oram and Stell 1991. Cowan showed that assertions of Viking control of the region are untenable on historical grounds (1991, 63-75). Fellows-Jensen
(1991, 92) accepted Brooke's argument that the 'kirkbride' name-forms can no longer be seen as pointing directly to Scandinavian settlement in the region, despite earlier use of this form of place-name evidence (Fellows-Jensen 1987a, 303-4). The Whithorn School crosses occur throughout the area of the Machars, and not simply in the coastal areas such as Glasserton where limited blocks of Scandinavian settlement have been recognised (Brooke forthcoming b). But it will be demonstrated below (p. 261) that there is a group of Scandinavian place-names around Wig Bay in the Rhins (MacQueen 1956a, 148), adjacent to the original site of the KILMORIE stone.

A number of features of these crosses can best be paralleled in Yorkshire, in particular the loose ring-knot interlace on WHITHORN 18 [Plate 182b] occurs at Othill and Wighill (Collingwood 1915, 228, fig. x; 248, fig.), and outline median incised interlace at Middleham (Collingwood 1907, 368, fig.). The loosely woven strands at Wighill are also comparable to CRAIGLEMINE 1 [Plate 110b]. But the diamond-shaped twist join on CRAIGLEMINE 1 is less like Millom, Cumbria, as Bailey claims (Bailey 1980, 223, fig. 66), than the twists interlaced with animal bodies on Aycliffe 1, Durham 1, and Tynemouth 4 in Durham and Northumberland (Cramp 1984b, Pls. 8.28, 37.189, 226.1266).

But these parallels on Viking age carvings in England are insufficient evidence for recognising Scandinavian influence on these crosses, despite the evidence for Norse trading contacts and house types demonstrated from the Whithorn excavations (Hill 1988-90, 13-21; idem 1991). Lang has shown that even sculpture found within areas of Viking settlement is usually decorated with variants and developments of pre Viking age motifs (Lang 1978a), and there is no use in this region of the decorative elements that have been convincingly linked.
to Scandinavian influence elsewhere in the British Isles. For instance there are no hogbacks (see Lang 1972-74, 207-9, fig. 2), although like the Isle of Man, 20 miles to the south, this may have to do with an unsuitable geology (Smyth 1979a, 272, 282; Bailey 1980, 96). But unlike Man, there are no Scandinavian runic inscriptions (Bailey 1980, 51-3), no use of the four Scandinavian art styles (op. cit., 53-8) or the form of 'ring-chain' ornament found in the Isle of Man and Cumbria (op. cit., 54-5, 217).

Western British links

Most of the sculpture of this type which has been taken as evidence for the domination of Galloway by the 'Gall Ghadhil' (Radford 1948-49a, 100; see Brooke 1991) should probably be seen as part of a Western British tradition, as it bears a general resemblance to material from Cumbria, the Isle of Man, Wales, and Cornwall, rather than Ireland or the Western Isles of Scotland. Despite the use of Anglian runes, the type of hammer-headed cross on indented shoulders seen on WHITHORN 6 [Plate 175a, c] is also found at Llanyinis, Brecknockshire (Nash-Williams 1950, no. 65, Pl. XL), which also has squared-off arm tips and interlace around small bosses as on ST NINIAN’S CAVE 1 [Plate 161a]. But the scrolled edge on WHITHORN 6 does not seem to be Cumbrian spiral-scroll, as Bailey has argued (1980, 226) (see III, 304).

The tall disk-headed cross at MONREITH [Plates 154] is comparable to Penally, Pembroke (Nash-Williams 1950, no. 364, Pl. XXXIX), and the Simple Pattern A ring-chain on its side [Plate 155] is found on Llantwit Major, Glamorgan (op. cit., no. 223, fig. 156). The ring-chain on the edge of WHITHORN 26 is found on Whitford, Flint (Nash-Williams 1950, no. 190, Pl. XXXIV). The step-pattern at the base
of WHITHORN 13 [Plate 179b] and MAINS OF PENNINGHAME [Plate 148b] is found at Muncaster in Cumbria (Bailey & Cramp 1988, ill. 474), as Bailey (1980, 226-7) noted, but it is also found in the Isle of Man, on Braddan 136 (109) (Baldwin Brown 1937, Pl. LXXXVI).

WHITHORN 8

But the development of the Whithorn School sculpture in this area may have derived from the presence of an earlier monument. WHITHORN 8 [Plate 176b-c], because of its comparatively complete condition, is often illustrated as the primary example of a Whithorn School cross (e.g. Collingwood 1922-23, fig. 16; Radford & Donaldson 1957, Pl. 8). However, despite the disk-head and the keyhole form of armpits, it lacks stopped-plait interlace, the sides of the shaft are straight, and it is carved on one side only. Stopped-plait is found on all carvings from Whithorn and its surroundings, with the exception of two sub-groups noted below, with median-incised interlace (Table 7) or plain narrow-band interlace (Table 6). Apart from WHITHORN 8, the most striking example from Whithorn itself is the straight-sided narrow shaft WHITHORN 15 [Plate 180c-d].

Collingwood drew WHITHORN 8 adjacent to KIRKINNER 1 and showed both with straight-sided shafts (1922-23, fig. 16, 17). However, KIRKINNER 1 and all other shafts with stopped-plait from Whithorn and its surrounding area have an entasis on the shaft, meaning that it is broadest at the centre and tapers above and below. Apart from being straight-sided, the WHITHORN 8 shaft is plain on the back and curved, expanding in depth towards the foot, and chamfered on either side. The back of the head is also plain and curved. On the reverse side the decorated face of the slab is slightly convex. This is the only cross-slab in the area to be treated this way, and it is possible that
it originally stood against a wall. All the other shafts are
decorated on both faces, which are approximately flat. It has been
noted above that a number of the Whithorn School shafts have incised
unfinished interlace on one face, and it is suggested here that this
cross-slab was a major monument at the site which was used at a later
date as a model for the Whithorn School slabs, when changes in fashion
dictated a different type of interlace.
1. See below, p. 230.

2. This type of circular cross-head will be referred to here as a 'disk-head', following the usage and spelling of the Corpus of Anglo-Saxon Sculpture (Cramp 1984a, xiv).

3. There also appears to be a stray example in Ireland, at Bangor Abbey, Co. Down (Jope 1966, 266, Pl. 76), on a fragment with Turned Pattern F interlace as on KIRKINNER 1 [Plate 126b].

4. See below p. 223.

5. See note 2.

6. See WHITHORN 2 [Plate 172b, d]; WHITHORN 13 [Plate 179b]; WHITHORN 17 [Plate 181d]; WHITHORN 18 [Plate 182b]; WHITHORN 29 [Plate 187b]; CRAIGLEMIN 1 [Plate 110b]. KIRKMAIDEN 2 [Plate 128a-b] has narrow band plain interlace on the relief-decorated face. KILMORIE [Plate 123-124] is carved in relief on one side and incised on the other, but uses a completely different type of ornament.

7. Compare Lindisfarne 10, Northumberland (Cramp 1984b, 198, fig. 19, Pl. 194.1088; Ilkley (Collingwood 1927, fig. 49.1); Lastingham (Collingwood 1907, 359), Stonegrave (op. cit., 400, fig. m), and Wharram Percy (Andrews 1979, 124, fig. 66) in Yorkshire; and Irton 1, Cumbria (Bailey & Cramp 1988, 116, ills. 356, 358). See also Adcock 1974, 29-30, 44 fn.19.

8. WHITHORN 13 has 5 units of step pattern, equivalent to every second diagonal. Each step unit is 2 ins apart, thus there are vertical lines every inch.

9. See Cologne, Dombibliothek, 137, fol. 2r (Micheli 1939, 153.
10. Tenons - see WHITHORN 9 [Plate 177a-b]; WHITHORN 13 [Plate 179a-b]; KIRKINNER 1 [Plate 125]; KIRKMAIDEN 2 [Plate 128a-b]; LONGCASTLE 1 [Plate 145a-b]; MAINS OF PENNINGHAME [Plate 148b-c]; WIGTOWN 1 [Plate 191a-b]. Comparable examples at Easington (Collingwood 1907, 317, fig. i, j), Lastingham (op. cit., 358, fig. l-o) and Tanfield (Collingwood 1911, 300, fig. c-e) in Yorkshire have been discussed by Bailey 1980, 242.

11. Dunlop's list appears to omit parishes whose revenues were appropriated to the Praemonstratensian priory at Whithorn by c. 1274 (Donaldson 1948-49, 148-52). I have therefore followed Cowan 1967 in deciding which parishes lay within the deanery (Table 3).

12. In this connection it should be noted that deer bones from the current excavations have been interpreted as food renders to Whithorn. 9th-century Northumbrian coins were found in the same context (Hill 1984-86, 5; id. 1984-87, 13).

13. "Edgar's second code (960x62) defends the principle of parochiae while conceding limited rights to private churches. All tithe is to be paid 'to the old minster to which the obedience pertains' (to tham ealden mynstre the seo hernes to hyrth), except that a thegn whose church has a graveyard may endow it with one third of his demesne tithes" (Blair 1985, 119).

14. MacOueen (1956a) argued that place-names in Galloway which included the Germanic element 'kirk-' followed in Celtic word order by the name of a saint, should be seen as demonstrating the existence of a bilingual society of Scandinavian speakers familiar with Gaelic grammar, probably in the 10th century; and
this was accepted by Nicolaisen (1960, 67). This argument was undermined by Brooke (1983), who showed that the earliest recorded place-name forms in a number of instances did not include either 'kirk-' or the Gaelic form 'kil-' which it supposedly translates, but followed the formula "church of...". She argued that these forms only emerged in the 12th century after the word 'kirk-' had been assimilated into Middle English (op. cit., 66), a possibility also recognised by Nicolaisen (1960, 64).

15. WHITHORN 8 has side arms the same width as the neck of the shaft. The distance between the opposite arm-holes is the same as the radius. The width of the upper part of the panel is also the same as the radius.
CHAPTER 21
Related Sculpture in the Whithorn Area

Figural

WHITHORN 2 [Plate 172a-e] is unusual amongst the sculpture from Whithorn in several respects: it appears to be part of the shaft of a freestanding cross, and the panel of paired saints on Face A is the only example of figure sculpture from Whithorn itself or the adjacent area. It also uses distinctive forms of interlace.

Apart from the tall MONREITH disk-headed cross [Plates 154-5], this is the only shaft in the region west of Kirkcudbright whose depth is approximately half its width. It has a width to depth ratio of 2:1, unlike the Whithorn School slabs, which when complete have a ratio of 6.5:1. Even the tall narrow shafts WHITHORN 14 and WHITHORN 15 have an approximate ratio of 3.5:1 [Plates 180a-b, 180c-d]. It is therefore unfortunate that it is not apparent what type of cross-head it carried, since free-armed cross-heads are unknown in the area west of ARDWALL ISLE, other than in the incised outline form found on WHITHORN 3 and at ST NINIAN'S CAVE (Table 7 and Fig. 28).

As pointed out under MINNIGAFF 1 [Plate 89b], it is noticeable that figure sculpture is also very rare in the western area, in contrast to the emphasis on classically carved figures at Hoddom and Ruthwell in Dumfriesshire to the east (see Table 10 and Fig. 30). The only other example in Wigtownshire is KILMORIE [Plate 124], which will be discussed in detail later. All three sites have frontal figures with round heads and plain featureless bodies without modelling, again in contrast to the classical type of figure with defined drapery and separate limbs found at Hoddom and Ruthwell.

This type of figure is found on Viking age sculpture in north
Yorkshire, at Forcett (Collingwood 1907, 320, fig. c) and Kirklevington (op. cit., 353, fig. w), and on Monifieth 4, Angus (ECMS iii 1903, fig. 275A); but the predominance of this type in Ireland, at Moone, Co. Kildare (Henry 1964, Pls. 13-17), the South cross, Castledermot, Co. Kildare (Henry 1967, Pl. 66), and Carndonagh, Co. Donegal (Harbison 1986, Pls. 4.3a; 4.4a; 4.7a), suggests that Collingwood was unwise to classify this shaft as Anglian, even if of Viking age date (1922-23, 215-6), though the double twist on Face B [Plate 172b] is comparable to Urswick 1, Cumbria (Bailey & Cramp 1988, 148-50, ill. 566) which carries a 9th-century runic inscription.

Examples of frontal robed figures with the same peculiar hair or halo can be found in the same areas, on the North cross, Castledermot, Co. Kildare (Henry 1967, Pls. 69, 70), though the curl of the hair is the reverse of WHITHORN 2, and Camuston, Angus (ECMS iii 1903, fig. 263B) where the figures have ears and carry books. There appears to be an incised hand on one of the WHITHORN 2 figures (see Plate 172e, and catalogue), but it is not clear if it is holding anything (see Bailey 1980, 232).

**Median-incised interlace**

The interlace in the panel above these figures and on the reverse face has flat-topped strands with a fine median groove running up to the crossing points [Plate 172a, c]. The type is found in this area only at Whithorn (Table 7), and is distinctively different to the ‘stopped-plait’ interlace with short, flat-topped stands, each with a deeply incised median groove contained within the rounded ends, which is found on a number of sites in the area of the Machars as well as Whithorn itself (Collingwood 1922-23, 217-8). The strands of the two types vary in their unit measurement. Those of the median-incised
type are comparatively narrow, varying between 1.5 and 2 cm in width. Stopped-plait interlace is usually broader, varying between 2 and 3.5 cm in width. The median grooves of stopped-plait are usually emphasised by enlarged depressions at either end (op. cit., 218); those of the median-incised strands are narrow and sharply cut, with no expansion at the terminals. Collingwood includes two of these pieces in his Later Whithorn School (op. cit., 223-5, figs. 30, 35), but he does not seem to have recognised that at this site and in this area they constitute a clearly defined type, probably because his attention was caught by the more unusual stopped-plait form and its links with Cumbria. He also drew the first piece as if it had stopped-plait.

Apart from its use on the figural shaft WHITHORN 2, this median-incised type is also found in the form of twist ornament on the other narrow shaft WHITHORN 15 [Plate 180d], which also has narrow-band plain interlace on the reverse face [Plate 180c], which will be discussed below. This shaft is unlike all others found at Whithorn as it has recessed edges and a rope moulding border, and like WHITHORN 2 there is no entasis or swelling of the shaft, as found almost without exception on the Whithorn school cross-slabs decorated with stopped-plait. Recessed edges of this type are only found in this area on the KNOCK 2 head [Plate 129c], which also has narrow-band plain interlace on one face, though this is clearly not part of the same cross as it is undecorated on the reverse.

The other examples are the shaft fragment WHITHORN 19 and the cross-head fragment WHITHORN 31. On one face [Plate 182c] WHITHORN 19 has closed circuit Pattern A rings of the type usually found on the Whithorn school sculpture, but on the reverse face [Plate 182d] is a border of rope moulding, as on WHITHORN 15, and a panel of bosses
surrounded by twist. This closely resembles the knotted bosses on WHITHORN 31 [Plate 188a], and it is likely that these two pieces were part of the same cross. WHITHORN 22 [Plate 184a] probably also used this form of interlace, but it is too worn to be certain. These are the only examples of this type, and given their more individualistic form and ornament in contrast to the mass-produced air of the Whithorn school slabs, it is likely that these pieces are earlier, rather than later as Collingwood suggested for WHITHORN 19 and 31 (loc. cit.).

Stopped-plait is more likely to have developed from this more usual form of median-incised interlace, found on the only two cross-shafts from Whithorn, but it is clear from the disk-headed form of WHITHORN 31 and the expanded shaft of WHITHORN 19, as well as the use of closed circuit Pattern A rings, that the two branches of sculpture are linked.

Narrow-band plain interlace

This median-incised type, which would not seem unusual elsewhere,\(^3\) is found on no other site in the region\(^4\) and appears to be an isolated development. But the use of plain twist ornament on the narrow faces of WHITHORN 2 [Plate 172b, d] and plain interlace on the reverse face of WHITHORN 15 [Plate 180c] shows that it is related to the other main group in the Whithorn area, narrow-band plain interlace carved in relief (Table 6 and Fig. 24). Like the median-incised strands, all the examples of this form observe a narrower unit measure than the stopped-plait type, and are of similar width to the median-incised strands, with a variation between 1.5 and 2.5 cm. Apart from WHITHORN 2 and WHITHORN 15, this type is only found at Whithorn on the large disk-headed cross WHITHORN 8 [Plate 176b] and the ring chain on the edge of WHITHORN 26 [Plate 185c]. It is however found in two outlying areas in the Whithorn peninsula.
The cross-head with recessed edges, KNOCK 2 [Plate 129c], has already been mentioned in connection with WHITHORN 15. It is shown in the catalogue that the previous ascription of this piece to Glasserton is mistaken, and that it was in fact found at Knock farm, adjacent to Kirkmaiden church, which stands on the seashore 8 km S.W. of Whithorn. KIRKMAIDEN 2, found at this site, is decorated on one face with narrow-band plain interlace [Plate 128a], though KIRKMAIDEN 1 has stopped-plait [Plate 128c]. KNOCK 1, a plain disk-head of unusual type [Plate 129b], has a central outline crosslet of a type also found at ELRIG [Plate 117a] (see below).

A larger group of sculpture of this type is found in the area of Mochrum, 15 km to the N.W. of Whithorn. Although one piece of stopped-plait has recently been found at BARHOBBLE [Plate 101b], the majority of sculpture in this area uses narrow-band plain interlace. These include AIRYLICK [Plate 100a], ELRIG [Plate 117a], MAY [Plate 153b] and MOCHRUM [Plate 157a], as well as two more pieces found during the current excavations at Barhobble (Cormack 1989a, 5, fig. 4.6). This site, which has been revealed as a church and chapel site in use from the 8th to the 12th centuries (Cormack 1990a), is likely to be the production centre for sculpture of this type, as all the examples from this area have been found within 5 km of the site, most built into modern walls (see Radford 1949-50b, 52).

Barhobble

Barhobble is the only church site in the Machars with sculpture not to have subsequently been used as a parish church in the medieval period, and it is possible that this was due to some degree of independence from Whithorn. I have suggested above that the Whithorn school sculpture found at outlying parish church sites may to some
extent be seen as a burial licence issued to dependencies by the centre of ecclesiastical administration in the area (see also Craig 1991, 53-5). This hypothesis is supported by the occurrence of this type of sculpture within a limited territory, which comes on record in the middle ages as the deanery of Farines (Dunlop 1939, 3-77), centred on Whithorn but extending out as far as MAINS OF PENNINGHAME, WEST CROSERIE, GLEINRON SEVERAL, and GLENLUCE 1 (see Barrow 1975, fig. 5). That a church site within this area which followed a somewhat different sculptural tradition should decline with the re-establishment of the bishopric at Whithorn in the 12th century (see p. 48) would lend some support to this interpretation of sculpture as a manifestation of territorial control.

This site has also produced the same type of hammer-headed cross with a central roundel as on BOGHOUSE 1 [Plate 103a], found in Kirk of Mochrum village 4.5 km to the S.E. (see Cormack 1989a, 5, fig. 4.5). The cross built into HOUSE OF ELRIG also appears to be of this hammer-headed form [Plate 122b]. MAY and ELRIG are plate-headed crosses [Plates 117a, 153b], with infill between the arms, but with the cross standing out separately from the background, and open armpits. Consequently these are distinct from the disk-headed crosses found at Whithorn [Plates 186, 187] and on KIRKINNER 1 [Plate 126], and even the KNOCK 2 cross-head, which has bosses between the arms [Plate 129c]. But a link between the plain narrow-band interlace at Whithorn and this area is suggested by the occurrence of Complete Pattern A on both MOCHRUM [Plate 157a] and WHITHORN 15 [Plate 180c].
1. But an unusual cresset lamp or stoup, found during the current excavations at Whithorn in 1988, has a figure with a staff on one face and a cross with expanded terminals on the other, as well as zig-zag ornament around the rim (Hill 1988-90, 17, fig. 15 (face not illustrated)).

2. The WHITHORN 2 figures have the plain robed body type of MINNIGAFF 1, and the circular eyes linked by a pendant nose of KILMORIE.

3. Compare the twist and pellets on WHITHORN 19 with Fingall and Lastingham in Yorkshire (Collingwood 1907, 321, fig. b; op. cit., 356, fig. f), and St Bees 3 and 4, and Unknown Provenance 1 in Cumbria (Bailey & Cramp 1988, ills. 546, 553; 606-8).

4. ARDWELL HOUSE and KIRKMADRINE 6 should probably be removed from Table 7 as they follow different irregular forms. BOGHOUSE 1 is too worn for the details to be clear.

5. WHITHORN 8 appears in its disk-headed form like a standard Whithorn school cross, but it lacks stopped-plait, the sides of the shaft are straight, and it is carved on one side only [Plate 176b-c].

6. The other sculpture from this site is mainly carved in outline with broad pocked grooves. See Plate 101, and Cormack 1989a, 5, fig. 6; Cormack 1990a, 9-10, figs. 7, 8, 9, nos. 7-11.

7. Links with the Rhins area to the north and west are suggested by the use of swastikas on BARHOBBLE 1 and CRAIGNARGET 1. It is demonstrated below that this area shows no affinity with the Whithorn sculpture.
Rather than an unusual type of prehistoric carving, as suggested by Morris (1979, 99, GAL 51).
CHAPTER 22
Whithorn sculpture without interlace

Two slabs from Whithorn, which Collingwood (1922-23, 215) saw as predating the sculpture with interlace, plus one other slab discovered during excavations in 1967 (III, 301), are carved in a mixture of incised grooves and pocked relief. These are the slab with three crosses, WHITHORN 3 [Plate 173a-b], the cross in a circle with expanded terminals, WHITHORN 4 [Plate 173c-d], and the slab with a worn inscription in Anglian runes on one face, WHITHORN 5 [Plate 174a-c]. These last two slabs, and possibly the first, are clearly linked.

On the reverse face of WHITHORN 5 is an arrangement of three interlocking circles [Plate 174b]. On the equivalent face of WHITHORN 4 there is a circle abutted by another beneath [Plate 173d]. The outer two circles on WHITHORN 5 contain irregular incised crosses with expanded terminals. This appears to echo the motif of triple crosses on WHITHORN 3 [Plate 173a-b]. The crosses on WHITHORN 4, Face A [Plate 173c], and WHITHORN 5, Face A [Plate 174a], both have expanded arms with incised borders and a depression at the centre of the head. The curved armpits of both crosses are pocked back, leaving a smooth surface to the cross itself but a rough finish to the background. The WHITHORN 4 cross is enclosed within a circle, but WHITHORN 5 expands to the edges of the slab. However, in the panel beneath are two crosslets of the same equal-armed form as WHITHORN 4, each enclosed within a circle [Plate 174a]. The triple cross motif of WHITHORN 3 is therefore repeated on both faces. The runic inscription is placed in the outline shaft between these crosslets [Plate 174c]. Although described as illegible in the only publication (Radford & Donaldson 1984, 30), it appears to read ‘[..] f l a d h’.
In its cross-form with expanded arms and an Anglian inscription on the shaft, Face A of WHITHORN 5 is reminiscent of two inscribed slabs from Wensley, Yorkshire (Collingwood 1907, 409, figs. a, b; Okasha 1971, nos. 120, 121), of 8th-to 9th-century date.

Although quite roughly carved, the interlocking circles on Face C of WHITHORN 5 [Plate 174b] may be related to the compass drawings on two newly discovered slabs from the Whithorn excavations, which were found in association with the Northumbrian church dated to the late 8th or early 9th centuries by coin evidence (Hill 1988-90, 9, fig. 8). The persistent interest in geometric art in this area is evidenced in the cross-of-arcs on the MAINS pillar [Plate 150a] and the miniature cross-of-arcs on this slab. The motif of three crosses within circles is also found on ST NINIAN'S CAVE 4 [Plate 163a], though these are not interlocking.

The equal-armed cross within a circle [Plate 173c] on WHITHORN 4 is a type also found at this site 5 km to the S. of Whithorn, on ST NINIAN'S CAVE 3 [Plate 162a]. This type of cross with recessed armpits is found outside the area on Hexham 13, Northumberland (Cramp 1984b, Pl. 178.952). The spiral within a circle on the reverse face [Plate 173d] can be seen in manuscript art, in the Lindisfarne Gospels (London, B.L., Cotton Nero D.IV), fols. 139, 208, and 211 (Millar 1923, Pls. XXXII a, d, e, XXXV; Backhouse 1981, Pls. 9, 35, 49), and is therefore possibly a link between this cross and other media.

This link is seen more clearly on WHITHORN 3 [Plate 173a-b]. Radford has shown that the taller cross flanked by two others is a crucifixion motif (Radford & Donaldson 1957, 40). Coatsworth compared this example with Byzantine crux gemmata (Beckwith 1970, Pl. 83), and the central cross in particular appears to be copying a model with the
crossing emphasised by an inset jewel (Coatsworth 1979, 29-30). She showed that the symbolic grouping of three crosses has a continental origin, and is found on Merovingian Gaulish monuments such as Mandourel in Aude (Salin 1952, fig. 44), though the type is also found in Ireland, particularly at Inismurray (Lionard 1961, fig. 10). This is a persistent regional motif in this area, and its influence will be discussed below in connection with the sculpture found to the north and west in the Rhins area. But there appear to be two versions, this particular crucifixion motif, and the three crosses within circles, which may represent the Trinity.

The central cross, with its jewelled panels, convex side arms, and angled armpits, appears to have been derived from a model quite closely resembling the pectoral cross of St Cuthbert, which has, as Bruce-Mitford pointed out, a "slight angularity between the arms" (1956b, 323-4, Pl. XV). This seems a closer parallel than the outline cross at Kildreenagh, Loher, Co. Kerry (Henry 1965, Pl. 16), which Coatsworth cites (loc. cit.). Jewelled panels of the outlined type seen on the side arms are also found in this area on the arms of the cross-slab from KNOCK OF LUCE [Plate 138a], and to the south in Cumbria on Workington 6 (Bailey & Cramp 1988, ill. 598), though both these examples are likely to be later.

The double cross on WHITHORN 35 [Plate 189c-e] may relate it to ST NINIAN'S CAVE 2 [Plate 162b], but the irregular incised decoration appears to be a type found in Wales, on Llanddetty, Glamorgan (Nash-Williams 1950, no. 46, Pl. XXVIII), and a slab of uncertain provenance (op. cit., no. 412, Pl. XXI). The only equivalent to this type of decoration found at Whithorn surrounds a crosslet on one face of WHITHORN 34 [Plate 189a-b], which on the reverse face appears to have had an outline hammer-headed cross with a convex upper arm.
of the type seen on KIRKMADRINE 5 [Plate 136b]. The decoration surrounding the crosslet may, however, be a degenerate form of spiral-scroll, of the type found in Cumbria (Bailey & Cramp 1988, 35).
1. This face of the slab is placed against the wall of the museum, and has not been previously noted.

2. That on the left may be a cross-of-arcs (see III, 300).
ST NINIAN'S CAVE

Out of the 16 pieces of sculpture from ST NINIAN'S CAVE, only one is carved in relief with interlace ornament [Plate 161]. This is modelled in stopped-plait technique, as found on the bulk of the sculpture from Whithorn, 5 km to the N., and like WHITHORN 5, 6 and 7, carries the remains of an inscription in Anglian runes. It is shown in the catalogue that its association with a burial is uncertain, but the use of an inscription strongly suggests its purpose was funerary. At least three other burials of unknown date have also been found here. However the bulk of the sculpture was found reused in the drystone wall across the cave mouth and its surroundings, and the stratigraphy showed that it was completely divorced from its original context, since no sculpture was found beneath the first pavement within the cave (see III, 220-6).

The contrast between the discovery of 16 pieces of sculpture and 7 or so rock-cut crosses at this isolated seashore site and the lack of any excavated evidence for early medieval occupation is striking. But it is clear that a considerable quantity of sculpture was available here for later reuse. The reasons for this may be pilgrimage or the use of the cave as a retreat, as have been suggested (Radford & Donaldson 1957, 8, 37-8), but it is also possible that the seashore was being used as a source of stone and that this was a workshop site attached to Whithorn. One basis for this hypothesis is the occurrence of the same type of cross with cusped arms, central depression and waisted stem carved in a broad pocked technique on six examples from the cave wall, ST NINIAN'S CAVE R.1, R.2, R.4, R.5, R.6, R.7 [Plates 158a-c, 159a-d], and on two of the carved slabs, ST NINIAN'S CAVE 2 and 3 [Plate 162a-b]. The same type is also found at ARDWALL ISLE.
[Plate 71c], and it has been suggested above that the two sites may have been linked in some way. The main basis for the pilgrimage hypothesis is the series of rock-cut crosses on the W. wall of the cave, but out of the seven certain examples, six are of this distinctive type. The consistent use of this form seems unlikely in any intermittent use such as pilgrimage, and it is therefore suggested here that retreat and manual work were combined as an appropriate meditative discipline in the production of these crosses. It is probably unwise in the early medieval period to draw too fine a distinction between work of this sort and prayer, if both the activity itself and the end result could be seen as dedicated to the glory of God.

This particular form of free-armed cross with a central depression is not found at Whithorn itself, though it may derive from a model like WHITHORN 3 [Plate 173a], which though carved in outline appears to be a skeuomorph of a jewelled cross (Coatsworth 1979, 28-30). Equal-armed ring crosses with a central depression are found at both sites, on WHITHORN 4 [Plate 173c] and ST NINIAN'S CAVE 7 [Plate 164b]. On ST NINIAN'S CAVE 3 the two forms of cross are linked on the one slab [Plate 162a]. All of these appear to have been pillar slabs, like ST NINIAN'S CAVE 4 [Plate 163a], which also has the distinctive regional motif of triple crosses as on WHITHORN 5 [Plate 174b], which as suggested above, may evoke either the crucifixion or the Trinity. The equal-armed crosses within circles on this pillar are of a form with expanded terminals also found on the fragmentary relief-carved slab ST NINIAN'S CAVE 5 [Plate 163c]. Crosslets within the head are also seen on ARDWALL 3 [Plate 70c] and WIGTOWN 2 [Plate 191c].

Equal-armed crosses of this type with round or oval armpits are the main motif of sculpture from the cave, and examples are also found on
ST NINIAN'S CAVE 6, 8, and 9 [Plates 164a, c, 165a]. It has been suggested that these are simplified versions of the Whithorn disk-head (Radford & Donaldson 1957, 45), but they may derive from the layout of the four small crosslets within circles on ST NINIAN'S CAVE 11 [Plate 165b-c]. It is unlikely that this slab was funerary, and it may have been carved for an altar (see Lionard 1961, 136-7, fig. 27). But once again it is clear that a distinctive motif is being used consistently on the ST NINIAN'S CAVE sculpture.

ST NINIAN'S CAVE 16 [Plate 168a] on the other hand seems unrelated to all the rest of the sculpture from the cave, and appears instead to be linked to LARG LIDDESDALE and DRUMMORE in the Rhins (see below), which are water-worn boulders carved in the same broad pocked technique [Plates 144a-c, 114a-b]. It also has two roundels adjacent to the cross, as on CRAIGNARGET 1 [Plate 113a-b].

The last group from the cave to be considered are the incised crosses with barred terminals and a long stem. These are found on two waterworn pebbles ST NINIAN'S CAVE 12 and 13 [Plate 166a-d], one miniature slab ST NINIAN'S CAVE 14 [Plate 167a-b], and the linear cross R.8 on the cave wall [Plate 160a] is of the same form. These stones may have been intended for placement with a burial, but they may also have been carved as suggested above, as a form of prayer. Linear crosses on their own are very rare in this area, and the only examples known at present apart from the ST NINIAN'S CAVE group are ARDWALL 7 [Plate 75a], the unstratified pebble from the MOTE OF MARK [Plate 93a], and LAGGANGARN FARM, to the north of the region, which is elaborated with a D-shaped foot [Plate 143]. The few examples from Dumfriesshire, which include FOREGIRTH and RUTHWELL 2, are much larger in size and are carved in a different technique. FOREGIRTH has broad shallow channels [Plate 18], RUTHWELL 2 is deeply and sharply cut with
tapering ends [Plate 35a]. Apart from LAGGANGARN FARM, all these have plain terminals. The ST NINIAN'S CAVE group therefore appear different in both scale and type to all the other examples. This type with barred terminals is found in Ireland, on Inishmore, Co. Galway (Higgins 1987, fig. 24), and in Scotland, at Cladh Beag, Tiree (RCAHMS 1980b, no. 276 (3)), and St Ninian's Isle, Shetland (Thomas 1973, no. 10, Pl. VIII), and so may relate, as Thomas has suggested, to the spread of Irish Christianity (1967a, 173-4, fig. 37).

The rock basin ST NINIAN'S CAVE 17 [Plate 168b] could be a bullaun stone of the type found on Irish ecclesiastical sites (Price 1959; Lacy 1983, 307; Cuppage 1986, 358), which were probably used for grinding or mixing, or for holding liquid (Hughes & Hamlin 1977, 99-100). A comparable stone with three small hollows is known from KIRKMADRINE 11 [Plate 137c], but the type appears very rare on sites in Britain, possibly because they have not been searched for or recognised.

The layout of a cross in a circle above a Latin cross on ST NINIAN'S CAVE 3 [Plate 162a] is paralleled in Ireland at Kilmalkedar, Co. Kerry (Lionard 1961, fig. 8.7), and in particular, Altoir-Beg, Inismurray, Co. Sligo (Wakeman 1893, 71-2, fig. 34, Pl. IV), where a cross-slab of the same tapering form was used on top of a 'leacht' surrounded by cross-incised round stones like ST NINIAN'S CAVE 15 [Plate 167c]. Five more round altar stones of this type were found on Clocha-breaca on the same island (op. cit., 62-8, figs. 27-31). It is therefore possible that a similar altar-like structure existed at this site.

Cave chapels are known at a number of sites in Argyll, including Eilean Mor (RCAHMS 1992, no. 33), St Columba's Cave, Cove (op. cit., no. 94), St Ciaran's Cave, Kintyre (RCAHMS 1971, no. 298), Nun's Cave
and Scoor Cave, Mull (RCAHMS 1980, nos. 318, 326). Incised crosses were found on the walls of all these caves. St Ciaran’s Cave and St Columba’s Cave produced a trough and a rock basin respectively, possibly serving a similar purpose to ST NINIAN’S CAVE 17. St Columba’s Cave had several inhumation burials. A Chi-rho has recently been recognised on the wall of the cave at Eilean Mor (RCAHMS 1992, no. 33, 2). The Commission has suggested that these caves functioned as retreats for meditation or penance, probably dating to the 7th or 8th century (op. cit., 5). It is evident that St Ninian's Cave was formerly more enclosed than it is today, but the original shape has been lost as a result of rock falls from the cliff above (see III, 220).

St Medan’s Cave in the Rhins peninsula (NX 1437 3159) was formerly seen as a retreat of this sort (RCAHMS 1912, no. 135), but this was dismissed for lack of evidence by the Royal Commission in their recent re-survey of the area (RCAHMS 1985, 38, no. 243). A cross, not mentioned by the Commission, was recorded at the cave subsequent to the 19th-century excavation (M’Kerlie 1906a, 273).
1. But compare Hexham 17, Northumberland (Cramp 1984b, Pl. 181.971) and Bewcastle 4, Cumbria (Bailey & Cramp 1988, ill. 127).

2. The central depression seems a consistent motif on both types of cross from St Ninian's Cave.

3. The waisted stem at the base of this slab may derive from the stem of the cross-of-arcs on MAINS [Plate 150a]. It is therefore possible that the equal-armed type of cross within a circle is derived from the same source.

4. Compare for instance BRIGHOUSE [Plate 104a].

5. This category does not include the Chi-rho crosses on the KIRKMAADRINE stones, or crosslets used in multiples of three and four as part of an overall scheme, or the linear cross with a leaf-shaped stem beneath the interlace panel on ARDWELL HOUSE [Plate 100c].

6. See also the drawing of the lost slab from PULTADIE [Plate 157b].

7. See Thomas 1971, 169, fig. 79.
CHAPTER 24
The Rhins and Moors Area

Incised

The sculptured stones in the Rhins and moors territory to the west and north of Glenluce (Fig. 21) are mainly unshaped, the crosses simply incised in outline on the surface of the stones, usually with splayed, fan-shaped arms and occasional subordinate crosslets. The designs are often quite abstract, in comparison with the groups in Kirkcudbright and the few incised crosses from the Whithorn area, mainly from St Ninian’s Cave, which follow standard forms (Fig. 25).

These incised stones generally come from higher altitudes and poorer land than the Whithorn School and other interlace stones (Table 2 and Fig. 18), and only rarely from known church or chapel sites (Fig. 26). Examples of this type, with splayed arms and subordinate crosslets, include DRUMMORE, LARG LIDDESDALE, and LAGGANGARN 1 and 2 [Plates 114a-b, 144a-c, 140a-d]. DRUMMORE and LARG LIDDESDALE are incised in a similar pocked technique on waterworn boulders. LAGGANGARN 1 and 2 are carved on adjacent standing stones [Plate 141]. BARMORE and CRAIGNARGET 1 also have crosslets, though with crosses of different types [Plates 102a, 113a-b]. All these except LAGGANGARN 1 have bosses in the centre of the cross head.

On a number of slabs a splayed upper arm is separated from a continuous tranverse arm by a horizontal break, with a separate shaft beneath. Examples include CHAPEL DONNAN 2, DRUMMORE, INCH and LAGGANGARN 2 [Plates 107b, 114a-b, 118c, 140c-d]. The occurrence of both crosslets and a separate upper arm on DRUMMORE and LAGGANGARN 2 show that the two types are related. Both have a central boss and straight shafts much narrower than the splayed upper arm [Plates 114a,
LAGGANGARN 1 and LAGGANGARN 1, found at the same sites as crosses with a separate upper arm, have splayed crosses with no central boss, but prominently drilled arm-pits [Plates 107a, 140a-b]. LAGGANGARN 1 like INCH has an open foot [Plates 140a-b, 118c]. GLAIK has a central boss and a groove down the centre of the shaft like INCH [Plates 118a, 118c], but with plain fan-shaped arms and a swollen shaft like LARG LIDDESDALE [Plate 144b].

LAGGANGARN FARM is a linear cross with a D-shaped terminal to the foot [Plate 143]. There was a double linear cross with a central crossing on PULTADIE [Plate 157b]. There are also linear crosses on SINNINESS and CRAIGNARGET, but both have central bosses and expanded terminals, as well as triple dot decoration [Plates 113a-b, 113c]. Both slabs have been elaborated. SINNINESS with a triple incised border around the cross, reminiscent of DRUMMORE [Plate 114a]. CRAIGNARGET with what appears to be secondary recutting, including the swastika and the edge loops which appear to overlie an earlier border (see below). These loops may relate it to CASSENDEOCH, Face A [Plate 106a], found nearby. CASSENDEOCH appears to be a cross-shaft, but the ornament is similar to RASNACH, a possible trial piece found to the west of Whithorn [Plate 157c]. The only other slab within the Whithorn area related to these styles is ST NINIAN'S CAVE 16 [Plate 168a], which has a crosslet like LARG LIDDESDALE [Plate 144a-c], and is carved on a waterworn boulder in the same broad pocked technique as this and DRUMMORE [Plate 114a]. The outline cross has short lobed arms like LOW ELDRIG [Plate 148a]. The crosslet is flanked by a linear border like BARMORE [Plate 102a]. The slab from the chapel site at KNOCK OF LUCE appears unrelated to the other sculpture in this area, since it has a jewelled cross partly carved in relief and incised meander pattern on the shaft [Plate 138a], but there is a jewelled cross at the centre of WHITHORN 3 [Plate 173a].
The fan-shaped cross and swollen stem on the GLAIK slab [Plate 118a] are found at Blairston, Ayrshire (Childe & Graham 1942-43, 49, fig. 5), up the coast to the north. The vertical arm crossing the horizontal on CHAPEL DONNAN 2 [Plate 107b] takes a form also found on an altar frontal at Peel (31), Isle of Man (Kermode 1907, no. 15, Pl. VIII; Cubbon 1982, fig. 16.3). But the bulk of the sculpture from the Rhins and moors area, despite the close interrelationships demonstrated above, is so localised in style as to make a search for parallels outside the region of limited value. However, there is sufficient evidence to merit an examination of the use of crosslets in threes and fours on the DRUMMORE, LARG LIDDESDALE, and BARMORE slabs, and the standing stones LAGGANGARN 1 and 2, and also to discuss the CRAIGNARGET slab, which has been described as Norse, and used as evidence to date other sculpture such as SINNINESS and DRUMMORE by both Collingwood (1922-23, 229-30) and Stevenson (1958-59, 50, 52).

Craignarget and Sinniness

The CRAIGNARGET slab is covered with a confusing mixture of crosses, circles, triple dots, edge loops and a swastika [Plate 113a-b]. However, it is demonstrated in the catalogue that this stone is a palimpsest, since the edge loops can be shown to cut through an earlier edge moulding. There appear to be two periods of use visible on this slab, which can probably be broken down into: (a) the central cross with its lobed and barred terminals, and the patterns of triple dots; it is not clear if the crosslets also belong to this stage. The second phase (b) appears to involve the addition of the edge loops, the lower circles and the swastika, which is used to link six out of a group of eight depressions. If this hypothesis is valid, then the original form of this slab was closer to SINNINESS, which also has a
linear cross with a central boss, triple dots and an edge moulding [Plate 113c]. The second phase brought this slab closer to the Viking age slab at ASPATRIA in Cumbria (Bailey & Cramp 1988, 52, ill. 38), as Collingwood saw (1922-23, 229-30), but the link is only with features that can be ascribed to this second phase. Consequently, Stevenson's use of the secondary features on CRAIGNARGET to assign a Viking age date to SINNINESS (1958-59, 52) seems invalid. If the crosslets and the swastika are of different phases, as is suggested below, then his use of the swastika to assign a similar date to DRUMMORE is also unsustainable (op. cit., 50).

Apart from the link with Aspatria, the semi-circular loops along the edge are paralleled on a group of late slabs from the Dublin area, as Ó hEailidhe has shown (1957, 87-8). These include Rathmichael, Killegar, and Dalkey (op. cit., nos. 1, 12, 17). But the combination of roundels and crosslets may belong to the first phase, as this motif is found on an incised slab from Cladh a'Bhile, Argyll (RCAHMS 1992, no. 20, 22), a site seen as going out of use by the end of the 8th century (op. cit., 8). The form of equal-armed crosslets with lobed terminals also occurs in Argyll, at Eileach an Naoimh (RCAHMS 1984, no. 354, fig. 181 A(1)) and Killundine (RCAHMS 1980, no. 303, fig. 181 Aa). None of these slabs have any Norse features, and it is therefore concluded here that these motifs provide further evidence that CRAIGNARGET has been recarved, as has been demonstrated for other early medieval sculpture at Iona, Argyll (RCAHMS 1982, 182, nos. 6.18a, 6.19), and Nunburnholme, Yorkshire (Lang 1976a, 75-94).

The closest parallels to linear crosses with triple dots in the spandrels occur on two crosses from Taynish and Eilean Mor, Argyll (RCAHMS 1992, nos. 33, 3 and 44). It has recently been demonstrated that both these probably come from Eilean Mor (op. cit., 7). This form
of ornament is unusual, but is also found in Ireland at Lateevemanagh, Co. Kerry (Cuppage 1986, no. 865, fig. 156b). It is therefore possible that CRAIGNARGET (a) and SINNINESS may share a similar cultural background. Both slabs were found either side of the same bay. The multiple outlines on SINNINESS are probably original, as they are also paralleled in Ireland and the Western Isles, at Inismurray, Co. Sligo (Wakeman 1893, fig. 54), Kilcoo, Co. Fermanagh (Macalister 1949, no. 962, Pl. XLVII), and Bagh Ban, Pabbay (RCAHMS 1928, no. 438, fig. 175).

Multiple crosses

Triple crosses as on LARG LIDDESDALE [Plate 144a-c] are found on a number of different stones in both the Rhins and the Whithorn area, though the cross types themselves vary considerably. Examples include DRUMMORE, already mentioned, but also the crosses with fan-shaped arms on KIRKMAKDRINE 5 [Plate 136a], the three outline crosses on WHITHORN 3 [Plate 173a], and the crosses in circles on WHITHORN 5 [Plate 174b] and ST NINIAN’S CAVE 4 [Plate 163a]. This is clearly a regional tradition, not found in Kirkcudbright or Dumfriesshire to the east, but occurring on a number of Irish sites such as Glencolumbkille, Co. Donegal (Lacy 1983, fig. 156b), Gallen Priory, Co. Offaly (Kendrick 1939, Pl. V, fig. 1), Reask B, Co. Kerry (Fanning 1981, fig. 29), and Inismurray, Co. Sligo (Wakeman 1893, figs. 78, 79). As Lionard (1961, 105) and Coatsworth (1979, 29) have shown, this is a crucifixion motif, probably derived from continental examples such as Mandourel, France (Salin 1952, fig. 44), though the crosses in circles may be intended to represent the Trinity.

The four crosslets in the armpits of LAGGANGARN 1 and 2 [Plate 140a-d] and probably BARMORE [Plate 102a] seem to be from a different tradition, possibly derived from the layout of altar slabs. Crosses
of this type are found on sites in Wales (Nash-Williams 1950, nos. 158, 405, Pls. XXII, XXV) and Ireland (Lionard 1961, figs. 4.1, 6.6, 27.4), but particularly on Inismurray, Co. Sligo, which has at least five examples (Wakeman 1893, figs. 26, 48, 49, 72, 84). It is therefore of interest that Inismurray also has two beehive holy wells (Wakeman 1893, 124-6, figs. 61, 62) similar to the Wells of the Rees (RCAHMS 1912, 43, no. 114, fig. 32), which lie 1 km to the N.E. of the standing stones at LAGGANGARN, and near the chapel site at Kilgallioch (see III, 163-4, and Plate 142).

Standing stones carved with crosses are found elsewhere in this region at HIGH AUCHENLARIE 1 and 2 in Kirkcudbright [Plate 83a-b], which also originally stood as a pair close together (see II, 313-4). Torran, Argyll (RCAHMS 1992, 210, no. 107) and Fendermore, Co. Tyrone (Hamlin 1982, Pl. 17.4c) are single examples from Scotland and Ireland. Recent work has shown that there is no evidence for a stone circle at Laggangarn (Murray 1981, 21-3), but Hamlin has pointed to literary evidence for the practice of carving crosses on standing stones (1982, 293). These stones appear to have stood on the pilgrimage route from Ayrshire to Whithorn (see Fig. 12) which is recorded in late medieval documents (p. 65), but the 8th-century evidence of the Miracula Nynie Episcopi (MacQueen 1959-60, 30-2, 45-8) shows that pilgrimage to St Ninian's shrine at Whithorn had already begun by that date (Hill 1990-91, 2).

Out of these sixteen slabs, most of which appear to be unshaped, only one, INCH, was found at a known parish church site, in contrast to the slabs found in the Whithorn area (see Fig. 26). Apart from KNOCK OF LUCE, none of the slabs so far discussed are carved in relief or carry interlace decoration. It is possible that there was a difference in function to the interlace sculpture, with these simply
carved stones being used as route markers or for wayside burial (Radford 1948-49b, 193-6), or at early chapel sites, though this has not yet been proved. 10 There appears to be a difference in geology, with the harder greywackes being more difficult to sculpt in relief. But the principal impression is of a lower technical and economic input, and thus a difference in status to the interlace sculpture, particularly the Whithorn School, since the incised stones are generally smaller in scale, and a lesser proportion of the whole surface is carved. The difference may be between domestic and professional workmanship, but the implications of a technical break along a geographical and later administrative boundary (see Figs. 21 and 27) suggests that we are dealing with unintegrated cultural traditions rather than a difference in periods.

This hypothesis appears to be supported by the place-name evidence from the Rhins. The Gaelic place-name 'slew-' ('sliabh'), which in Galloway means a hill, is concentrated in this area, 22 miles from the Irish coast (Nicolaisen 1965, 91-106, fig. 1). 11 This was seen by Nicolaisen as "potential evidence of a pre-Norse Gaelic-speaking settlement in the Rhins of Galloway" (op. cit., 103). Similarly MacQueen's analysis of the contrasting distributions of 'kirk-' and 'kil-' ecclesiastical names, as well as the Irish saints' names, showed that the 'kil-' sites also cluster in the Rhins and moors area, as opposed to the generalised distribution of the 'kirk-' names across the region (MacQueen 1956a, 144-5). 12 It is therefore possible that this group of sculpture, which has been shown to have parallels in Ireland and little evidence of influence from Whithorn, is further evidence for this settlement, though the date of the slabs themselves remains uncertain. 13
Interlace

The rare examples of relief carving and interlace in the Rhins and moors area to the west of Whithorn include GLENLUCE 1 [Plate 119] and GLENIRON SEVERAL [Plate 117b], both of which carry stopped-plait interlace of Whithorn School type and are shown on the maps as outliers of this group (Figs. 22, 23). The only interlace carvings found to the west of these in the Rhins are the unique, possibly Norse, cross-slab from the chapel site at KILMORIE [Plates 123, 124] (see below), and several stones from Kirkmadrine church, KIRKMADRINE 5, 6, and 8 [Plates 100c, 136a-b, 136c]. But these show little evidence of standardised design or a local school, despite the earlier importance of the Kirkmadrine site as demonstrated by the three Early Christian stones with chi-rhos and Latin inscriptions [Plates 130-132].

Kirkmadrine

These later carvings from Kirkmadrine seem to represent an uneasy hybrid between the incised and interlaced types. The slab from ARDWELL HOUSE carries irregular interlace in its upper panel, but the lower part of the shaft contains a linear cross with barred terminals and roundels between the arms, as on CRAIGNARGET [Plate 113a-b]. The foot of this cross is leaf-shaped [Plate 100c]. KIRKMADRINE 6 has similar fragmented interlace in one panel of the cross arm [Plate 136c], but in the centre of the head are four small bosses reminiscent of DRUMMORE, Face A [Plate 114a]. Below this are two smaller crosses of the same fan-shaped type as KIRKMADRINE 5, which also has the remains of two smaller crosses beneath [Plate 136a]. This cross has a lozenge and boss at the centre of the head, which like the four bosses on KIRKMADRINE 6 appears to be a skeuomorph of some metalwork original. The cross at the foot of KIRKMADRINE 6 also has a lozenge
of this type but with lobed terminals [Plate 136c]. There is a hammer-headed cross with a curved summit on the reverse face of KIRKMADRINE 5 [Plate 136b], which has rounded bosses within the pocked armpits of the same type as on the upper cross of KIRKMADRINE 6 [Plate 136c].

KIRKMADRINE 7 differs from the rest of the Kirkmadrine stones in that it is entirely incised, with a square cross-head with a central boss and several arched lines below [Plate 136d-e], reminiscent of DRUMMORE [Plate 114a-b]. Only the lines of the tranverse arms are deeply incised, so it appears to be hammer-headed. The remaining slab, KIRKMADRINE 4 [Plate 137a] also has a hammer-headed cross, with four crosslets of the same type as DRUMMORE [Plate 114a] in quadrants on the shaft. KIRKMADRINE 10 [Plate 137b] may be an unfinished cross-head. KIRKMADRINE 11 [Plate 137c] could be a bullaun stone, of the type found on Irish sites (see catalogue), but the hollows appear to be too small for grinding or mixing or for holding liquid (Hughes & Hamlin 1977, 99-100). A similar stone with one larger hollow is known from ST NINIAN’S CAVE (17) [Plate 168b].

The fragmented interlace on ARDWELL HOUSE [Plate 100c], which was almost certainly taken from Kirkmadrine (see Catalogue), is a type found at several sites on the west coast, including Fardenreoch, Ayrshire (Anderson 1925-26, 268, fig. 3) and Millport 9, Great Cumbrae, Bute (Curle 1961-62, 224, Pl. XV.1) in Scotland, and Beckermet St Bridget 2 in Cumbria (Bailey & Cramp 1988, 38, ill. 49). The leaf stem is a type found in Ireland, at Clonmacnois, Co. Offaly (Lionard 1961, fig. 23.13) and Inishmore in the Arran islands (Higgins 1987, II, fig. 32, Pl. 11a-b), and on Iona (RCAHMS 1982, no. 6.19).

The lozenge with lobed terminals on the cross at the foot of KIRKMADRINE 6 [Plate 136c] is found on several stones in the Irish sea
area, including a pebble from Peel, Isle of Man (Cubbon 1976; idem 1982, Pl. 16.2b) and a motif piece from Nendrum, Co. Down (Jope 1966, Pl. 81.913). As suggested above, this form of decoration appears to be based on a metalwork applique nailed onto a wooden cross and held in position by a rove (see Collingwood 1927, 8, 94, fig. 118).

The hammer-headed cross on KIRKMADRINE 4 [Plate 137a] seems to be late (see Collingwood 1927, 90-2; Bailey 1980, 182-3), but the arrangement of four crosslets in quadrants on the shaft is also found at Cladh a Bhile, Argyll (RCAHMS 1992, 57, no. 20 (11), ill. 56M). It is probably a reflection of the regional tradition noted above.

Within the region, the closest parallel to KIRKMADRINE 7 [Plate 136d-e] is HIGH AUCHENLARIE 2 in Kirkudbright [Plate 83b], which also has deeply incised lines between the transverse arm and the shaft. But the curved lines on the narrow faces of the head which connect the grooved terminals of the transverse arm [Plate 136e], and the indented shaft, appear to link this cross to KILMORIE [Plate 123], which is discussed below. The inturned spirals at the base of the head are found in Ireland at Clonmacnois, Co. Offaly and Fuerty, Co. Roscommon (Lionard 1961, figs. 14.1, 14.2, 15.10); the curved lines on either side again occur in Ireland, on a linear cross at Cloontuskert, Co. Roscommon (Fanning & Ó hÉailidhe 1980, fig. 4, no. 15).
1. Though see HIGH AUCHENLARIE 1 and 2 [Plate 83a-b].

2. ST NINIAN'S CAVE 2-15, R.1-8 [Plates 158-160, 162-167].

3. This style is reminiscent of the unbroken tranverse arm on STAPLEGORDON in Dumfriesshire [Plate 37a], but all the examples from Wigtownshire have a splayed upper arm and a separate shaft, and most have a central boss.

4. And possibly LARG LIDDESDALE [Plate 144b], though its upper arm and side arms are joined by a single groove.

5. See Anderson 1936-37, 394, 397; Radford 1948-49b, 195.

6. The herringbone grooves on LONGCASTLE 2 [Plate 147] are also found on this group of Dublin slabs (see Ó hEailidhe 1957, nos. 4, 7, 8, 10, 15, 16).

7. The sites of LAGGANGARN and BARMORE in the Moors area are linked by the river Tarf (see Fig. 19).


10. See the evidence discussed in the Evidence for Discovery sections of the Catalogue, especially under CHAPEL DONNAN, DRUMMORE, LARG LIDDESDALE, KNOCK OF LUCE, CASSENDEOCH, and CRAIGNARGET.

11. See also MacQueen 1953-54, 91; Thomas 1971, 222-3; MacQueen 1973, 18.

12. See also Nicolaisen 1960, 61-7, fig. 4; Nicolaisen 1970, 23-6, map 3; Thomas 1967a, 179-81, fig. 38).
13. Opposed positions were taken by Curle (1939-40, 72) and Stevenson (1958-59, 50), but Stevenson's arguments for a Norse date and background have been undermined above.
The final piece of sculpture to be considered here is the remarkable slab from KILMORIE on the coast north of Stranraer, with on one face a hammer-headed cross carved in relief, filled with plant scrolls, above a panel of snake-headed interlace [Plate 123]. On the opposite face is a cross of the same type, but incised, with a crucifixion above a squat figure flanked by birds and pincers [Plate 124].

This is the only slab in Wigtownshire to carry animal ornament and plant scroll, and the only one apart from WHITHORN 2 to carry figure sculpture (see Figs. 29, 30, and 31). The type of hammer-headed cross is again different from all the sculpture in the Whithorn area, and is only paralleled on GLENLUCE ABBEY I [Plate 121c], which is of similar scale to this slab, and may be unfinished. This form of head, with the terminals of the upper arm the same width as the transverse arm, has been analysed by Collingwood (1927, 90-2) and Bailey (1980, 182-3, fig. 46), who have shown that it is mainly found on Viking age carvings in Cumbria and western Yorkshire.¹

The foliate ornament on KILMORIE, Face A, is unlike the symmetrical plant scroll found at Hoddom and other sites in the east of the region, but instead resembles the non-naturalistic 'spiral-scroll' form again found in Cumbria, with indistinct stems and linked shoots forming an overall pattern (Bailey & Cramp 1988, 35). As Collingwood has shown (1922-23, 216), the closest parallel to this slab is Addingham I, Cumbria (Bailey & Cramp 1988, 45, ills. 1-4), which also has debased plant ornament and a hammer-headed cross, but with holes cut through at the armpits. On KILMORIE though, despite the knotted forking of the strands at the centre of the head, the spiral-scroll
partly retains the Anglian form of two volutes separated by a bud.²

KILMORIE shares the technique of relief carving on one face and incised on the other with several slabs in the Whithorn area,³ as well as KIRKCLAUGH and GLENCAIRN 1 to the east, but differs from the Whithorn sculpture in its use of different forms of ornament on each face. This is a feature of Pictish slabs such as Aberlemno churchyard, Angus (Henderson 1967, Pls. 40, 41), which have a cross and abstract relief ornament on one face, and secular figures and symbols on the reverse. However, the layout of the ornament is unique to this slab. The two sides are cleverly contrasted and balanced, with on Face C at the top a cross with the crucified figure of Christ shown in a triumphal pose, without any of the later medieval concern with suffering.⁴ On Face A a cross of the same type is filled with a symbolic representation of the same message of salvation, without recourse to any human figure. The relief carving suggests that this should be considered the principal face.⁵

Face A

In the centre of the cross-head on Face A [Plate 123] is a deep circular depression edged by a roll moulding. Directly beneath this is a carving which appears to show a chalice resting on a rayed pyramid. This closely resembles an image found in several continental gospel illustrations from the court of Charlemagne, in particular fol. 3v of the Godescalc gospels (Paris, Bibl. Nat., nouv. acq. lat. 1203) (Mütherich & Gaedhe 1977, 34, Pl. 2). Underwood has shown that this is an image of the Fountain of Life (1950, 46, 62-7, figs. 25, 30, 61). The roof of the ‘tholos’ or baptistry is surmounted by a cross which rests on a circular object placed above the chalice. The principal difference between this and the image on KILMORIE is that on the slab
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the other motifs are enclosed by the cross, which thus takes on some of the characteristics of the baptistery itself.

The circular object above the chalice may be a patten or the host. This image is found on post-conquest slabs such as Durham St Oswald 29 (Ryder 1985, Pl. 25) and Jervaulx abbey, Yorkshire (Cutts 1849, Pl. LXVI). That an image of the host should be placed at the centre of the cross would be appropriate to a theology that saw the eucharist as the true image of Christ, as proclaimed at the Council of 754 during the period of Iconoclasm (Gero 1975, 6-7). But this image is also balanced by and contrasted with the crucified Christ on the opposite face.

The significance of this depression at the centre of the cross-head is reinforced by the possibility that it may have held a sacred object. Such holes are known on a number of early medieval crosses, where they are usually described as being intended to receive a boss, or possibly a jewel. However, a passage from the 6th-century Life of St Theodore of Sykeon suggests that the most likely purpose was to hold a relic.

"Domnitziolus sent to the saint a gold cross for processions and worship; in its central boss Thomas ... had the following relics inserted - a piece of the Holy Cross and a piece of the stone of Golgotha and a piece of the holy tomb of our Saviour God, and the hem of the Holy Virgin’s tippet" (Dawes & Baynes 1948, 174).

On a stone slab like this it seems less likely that it would have held a wooden boss of the type found during the Dublin excavations (Lang 1988, 4, 49, D1, fig. 1, Pl. 1).

That the object beneath this represents a chalice is reinforced by the plant scrolls, which spring from either side of its base. Flowering chalices are found on an apse mosaic from S. Clemente, Rome and on the Chercel mensa (van der Meer & Mohrmann 1958, figs. 354,
474), and on a closure slab from Saint-Pierre-Citadelle, Metz (Hubert et al 1970, ill. 24), and the image is usually taken to be the Tree of Life (James 1966, 75, 78, 261). Consequently this cross-slab would appear to show what Daniélou has described as "an assimilation of the Eucharist to the fruit of the Tree of Life" (1964, 49). But since the motifs on this face apparently combine both Tree of Life and Water of Life imagery, it may also be an expression of a passage from Revelation, 22.1-2.

"And he showed me a pure river of water of life, clear as crystal, proceeding out of the throne of God and of the Lamb. In the midst of the street of it and on either side of the river, was there the tree of life, which bare twelve manner of fruits, and yielded her fruit every month: and the leaves of the tree were for the healing of the nations."

The image of the Fountain of Life derives from John 4.14, and that of Christ as Tree from Exodus 15.23-25. The two are combined in a passage on baptism by Tertullian.

"Item aqua de amaritudinis vitio in suum commodum suavitatis Mosei ligno remediatur. Lignum illud erat Christus venenatae et amarae retro naturae venas in saluberrimam aquam. baptismi scilicet, ex sese remedians."

"Secondly, water is healed of the blemish of bitterness, (and restored) to its own sweet usefulness, by the tree Moses throws in: and that tree was Christ, who from within himself heals the springs of that nature which was previously poisoned and embittered, (converting them) into exceedingly healthful water, that of baptism" (Evans 1964, 20-1).

It is therefore possible that baptism as well as the eucharist is a dominant theme behind the imagery displayed on this part of the cross. This may be reinforced by the original findspot of the stone, which is first recorded as having been taken from a chapel at St Mary's Croft. The site of this is now marked by a holy well (see III, 101). In either case this appears to be an extremely accomplished way of depicting the message of salvation offered by the cross, which lies behind the direct physical reality of the crucifixion.
The lower part of the face, in contrast, contains four separate images of serpents, separated by the blank panel from the images of salvation above. These therefore appear to be the denizens of hell and embodiments of evil, cast down by the triumph of the cross (see Bailey 1980, 140). The blank panel may have carried a painted inscription, but it should be noted that the serpentine interlacings beneath are not panelled, a feature which Bailey sees as a Scandinavian tradition rather than English or Irish (op. cit., 78-9, 230).

The D-shaped creature between the horns (Fig. 43) appears to be exactly like that on a shaft from Tenbury, Worcestershire (Cottrill 1935, 146-7, Pl. XVI.4), with the arms derived from a misunderstood interlace strand, and the tail, arm, and crossing strands muddled. The resemblance appears so close that KILMORIE must be following a model of the Tenbury type, though earlier examples can be seen in manuscript illustration such as the Book of Kells (Dublin, Trinity Coll. MS A.I.6.(58)), fol. 130r (Henry 1974, Pls. 51, 105), which also includes creatures with the same head type as KILMORIE (Stalley 1981, fig. 13.15b).

Interlace with snake heads, though unknown in the rest of the region, is found on a number of Viking age shafts (see Collingwood 1915, 277-8; idem 1927, 91-2), such as Aycliffe 2 A, Durham (Cramp 1984b, Pl. 9.29) Crofton, Yorkshire (Baldwin Brown 1937, Pl. LXXXVII) Beckermet St John 5, Cumbria (Bailey & Cramp 1988, ills. 76, 79) and Lancaster, Lancashire (Collingwood 1927, fig. 171), but the snake head on the upper interlace strand here is, as is shown in the catalogue (Fig. 44) of a distinct 'leaf & bud' type. Examples of this can be seen at Brompton, Yorkshire (Bailey 1980, Pl. 53), though the closest parallels to the upper interlaced creature are found in Ireland, on the North Cross, Duleek, Co. Meath (Henry 1970, fig. 34a; Crawford
1980, Pl. XXXI, no. 82) and the Bealin cross, Co. Westmeath (Henry 1970, fig. 34c; Crawford 1980, Pl. XXXI, no. 79).

The lower backturned creature with opened jaws is nearer to the animal type found on Lindisfarne 2, Northumberland (Cramp 1984b, Pl. 189.1045) and Gainford 5, Durham (op. cit., Pl. 62.294), though the encircled Pattern C ring knot is not usually found with animal ornament. But the cross-shaft of Gillu Christ O’Toole at Tuam cathedral, Co. Galway (Stalley 1981, Pls. 13.5, 13.16b), has snake heads in its lower panel and the same knot in its upper.

**Face C**

The crucifixion type on the reverse face [Plate 124], with the figure contained within the cross-head, has been analysed by Coatsworth (1979, 133-4, 142-6), and shown by Bailey (1980, 153, fig. 34) to occur at a number of sites in north Yorkshire. But the position of the head in the upper arm of the cross means that the body has low outspread arms and sloping shoulders. This type is found at three of the Ryedale sites, at Ellerburn, Kirklevington, and Thornton Steward (Collingwood 1927, figs. 129, 130; Coatsworth 1979, 134), but most distinctively occurs in Ireland, on a group of crosses in the area of Co. Kildare (Coatsworth 1979, 142-6). These include Moone Abbey (Henry 1964, Pls. 12, 16) and the North and South crosses, Castledermot (Henry 1965, Pl. 70: Henry 1967, Pl. 66), as well as St Mullins, Co. Carlow (Porter 1931, fig. 182) and Ballyogan, Graiguenamanagh, Co. Kilkenny (Coatsworth 1979, Pl. 57).

Rounded arm joints of the KILMORIE type are used in the Southampton psalter (Cambridge, St John’s College, C.9(59)), fol. 38v, an Irish manuscript of the 10th-11th century (Alexander 1978, 88, cat. 74, ill. 351). But the facial type with V-shaped eyebrows is found on a slab.
from York Minster, nos. 24 (Lang 1991, ill. 99). Prominent thumbs on crucifixion figures again occur in Yorkshire, on St Mary Castlegate 2 (Lang 1991, ill. 297), Stanwick (Collingwood 1907, 395, fig. h) and Kirklevington (Collingwood 1927, fig. 130).

The humped shoulders of the lower figure are a type found on Viking age sculpture both in west Yorkshire and the Isle of Man (see Collingwood 1907, 281; Bailey 1980, 220; Cramp 1982, 13, 17). The figure at Ilkley has his hands in front like KILMORIE, those on Otley and Weston carry swords (Cramp 1982, Pl. 20a-c). The figure at Keeill Chiggyrt, Ballafayle, Maughold, I. of Man (Kermode 1907, no. 51, Pl. XVIII) has the same type of eyes, but also has ears.

Double figures one above the other are found on a number of Viking age shafts, for instance Gainford 5, Durham (Cramp 1984b, Pl. 63.297), which also has humped shoulders, and Folkton, east Yorkshire (Lang 1991, ill. 446). But the lower figure at KILMORIE is flanked by two profile birds and a pair of pincers. A crucifixion scene with a pair of adjacent birds is seen on another continental manuscript, the Epistles of St Paul (Würzburg, Universitätsbibliothek, Cod. M.p.th.f.69), fol. 7v (Alexander 1978, 78, cat. 55, ill. 265) and the crucified figure here has a belt, rounded arm joints and prominent thumbs. In sculpture the cloaked or winged attendant angel or spear bearer on the Iniskeel 3 crucifixion slab, Co. Donegal, is similar in design to the KILMORIE profile birds (Lacy 1983, no. 1573.3, fig. 146a; Harbison 1986, 65, Pl. 4.13c). On Michael 129 (Kermode 1907, no. 101, Pl. LI), one of only three slabs from the Isle of Man with explicit Christian figures (Margeson 1983, 105), there is a bird and a figure above a crucifixion, which, like Iniskeel and KILMORIE, is placed within the cross-head with low outspread arms. It is therefore possible that this is a Christian scene, such as Elijah and the ravens
(I Kings, 17), but this interpretation is complicated by the presence of the tongs or pincers.\(^9\)

An alternative interpretation is suggested by a passage in \textit{Ynglinga Saga}, ch. VII (in \textit{Heimskringla}).

"Odin had with him Mimir's head and it told him many tidings of other worlds; and sometimes he awoke dead men from the earth and sat himself down under men who had been hanged. So he was called Lord of the Ghosts or the Hanged Men. He owned two ravens, which he had taught to talk; they flew far over the land and told many tidings. Through all this he became very wise" (Monsen 1932, 5; my emphasis).

The position of the lower figure beneath the crucifixion, with the two adjacent birds, seems therefore to provide evidence for seeing this figure as Odin, counterpointed with the explicitly Christian scene above. Such a conjunction is found on the Kirk Andreas 128 (102) fragment, Isle of Man (Kermode 1907, 192-3, no. 102, Pl. LII a, c), as Margeson (1983, 96, 105, fig. 1) and Wilson (1983, 185) have shown. But the tongs adjacent to the lower figure again seem out of place in this interpretation.

However, Margeson in her discussion of the iconography of the Manx sculpture (1983, 100-1), referred to the 'Regin the Smith' episode in the Sigurd cycle, in which birds warn Sigurd of Regin's treachery, and pointed to the birds on Kirk Andreas 121 (95), and the smith's tools on Maughold 122 (96) (op. cit., figs. 5 and 6). The occurrence of this and other episodes from the Sigurd legend on Viking age sculpture in northern England has been established by Lang (1976b, 83-94) and Bailey (1980, 116-25). Collingwood doubted that there was enough evidence on the KILMORIE slab for this interpretation (1927, 92), but a similar juxtaposition of a Sigurd panel surmounted by a crucifixion occurs at Kirby Hill, Yorkshire (Lang 1976b, 84-6, fig. 2 (not 3); Bailey 1980, 120-1, fig. 22).
On both faces of the slab, therefore, an image of Christian salvation is placed above a scene that on one side may represent hell and on the other a figure from secular legend. It is therefore possible that this juxtaposition parallels the abstract symbolism on the reverse face, and that both scenes show the triumph of Christ over hell and pagan beliefs. But since in the Sigurd episode, knowledge is gained through a "mystic meal", this scene has been proposed as a secular representation of the eucharist (Bailey 1980, 125). It may therefore also be possible that there are images of the eucharist counterpointed on either face of the slab, though without the figure sucking his fingers this seems less likely.

This slab therefore appears to combine Irish and Anglo-Scandinavian elements with motifs found in Carolingian manuscripts on a cross-slab of Pictish type. Its use of crucifixion imagery, figural ornament, plant scroll, snake-headed interlace, and the form of hammer-headed cross is unique in Galloway, and it appears isolated from most of the other sculpture in the Rhins area in its use of interlace and relief carving. It is also the only carving in the region with potential Scandinavian features (see p. 215), in particular the lower figure on Face A.

It is therefore of interest that the site of Kilmorie chapel is adjacent to Wig bay in Loch Ryan. This place-name has been shown to derive from Old Norse 'vik', and a spur of rock to the N.E. is called the Scar (O.N. 'sker'). MacQueen, without referring to the cross-slab, remarked that "these names seem to suggest a Norse settlement around church and bay" (MacQueen 1956a, 148; see also Nicolaisen 1960, 66).

Consequently, although this slab was classified as "Scottish with
Anglian features" by Collingwood (1922-23, 216, 227), it instead appears to represent an innovative mixture of styles which would better be described as Hiberno-Norse with Pictish, Anglian and continental features! Historically, this mixture is likely to derive from Scandinavian settlement in the Western Isles (Graham-Campbell 1975-76), Carolingian influence on the theology of Irish sculpture (Harbison 1987), and the establishment of a link between the Scandinavian kingdoms of Dublin and York in the 10th century (Smyth 1975a), with settlements in Yorkshire and Cumbria showing Norse or Gaelicised place-names (Ekwall 1918; Bailey 1980, 34-6; Fellows-Jensen 1985a). The limited evidence for Scandinavian settlement in Galloway (Brooke forthcoming b) is discussed on p. 214.
1. Examples of hammer-headed crosses in this region include WHITHORN 6, WHITHORN 33, ST NINIAN'S CAVE 1, BOGHOUSE 1, KIRKMADRINE 4 KIRKMADRINE 5, HIGH AUCHENLARIE 1 in Kirkcudbright, and possibly HOUSE OF ELRIG. But none of these apart from GLENLUCE ABBEY take the same form as KILMORIE.

2. Edwards has shown that plant-scroll is rarely found on Irish sculpture, and mainly occurs on a group centred on Clonmacnois (Edwards 1986, 31-3, figs. 2.1, 2.2). But see also Harbison 1988, 59-61, Pl. 1, for a slab from Clonmore, Co. Carlow, with plant scroll springing from either side of the shaft.

3. See WHITHORN 2 [Plate 172b, d]; WHITHORN 13 [Plate 179b]; WHITHORN 17 [Plate 181d]; WHITHORN 18 [Plate 182b]; WHITHORN 29 [Plate 187b]; CRAIGLEMINE 1 [Plate 110b]; KIRKMAIDEN 2 [Plate 128a-b]; KIRKCLAUGH [Plate B7a-b]; GLENCAIRN 1 [Plate 19a-b].

4. This is also the only image of the crucifixion in Dumfries and Galloway, apart from the scene on the base of RUTHWELL 1 (Coatsworth 1979, 188-96, Pl. 77; see also Cook 1912, fig. 8; Saxl 1943, Pl. 4c).

5. The balance of symbolism between the two sides of the cross makes it unlikely that the crucifixion was a later addition, as Coatsworth suggested (1979, 133). Despite the difference in carving technique on either side, it is shown in the catalogue that the span of the upper arm and the tranverse arm is identical on both crosses.

6. See Collingwood 1907, 274; Collingwood 1915, 281; Collingwood 1922-23, 216; Bailey 1980, 254; and compare Simonburn 2, Northumberland (Cramp 1984b, 223, Pl. 218.1239); Kelloe, Durham
(Lang 1977, 107-8, 110, 118, Pl. VIa); Lastingham (Collingwood 1907, 376, fig. a & b), Middleton (op. cit., 370, fig. g), and Osmotherly (op. cit., 378, 380, fig. g) in north Yorkshire, as well as Crosthorne, Worcester (Baldwin Brown 1937, Pl. CVI.1), and Keeill Chiggyrt, Maughold, I. of Man (Kermode 1907, 127-8, no. 51, Pl. XVIII). The settings on Reculver, Kent (Peers 1927, 253, no. 7, fig. 9), Cossins, Angus (Henderson 1978, 52, Pl. 3.7), and Iona, St John's Cross, W. face, Argyll (RCAHMS 1982, 203, no. 6.82) are larger in scale.

7. This type of crucifixion appears to have its origins in Ireland. See for example the Clonmacnois plaque, Co. Offaly (Henry 1967, Pl. 8) and the Carndonagh stele, E. face, Co. Donegal (Harbison 1986, 75, Pl. 4.4a).

8. This slab also has a possible relic hole. See note 6.

9. Tongs are usually seen as a medieval emblem (Butler 1964, 133-5; Ryder 1985, 38; Butler 1987, 246-55), but they occur on several pieces of Viking age sculpture: at Halton, Lancashire (Bailey 1980, fig. 15), and Leeds, Yorkshire (Collingwood 1915, 213, fig. j2) which includes a figure with a bird on an adjacent face, as well as Iona, Argyll (RCAHMS 1982, 212, no. 6.95), and Dunfallandy, Perth (ECMS iii 1903, fig. 305B). This last scene also includes an anvil (Allen 1887, 154, fn. 4), which is perhaps the most likely explanation of the object by the lower figure’s elbow (see III, 99).

10. This suggestion is not accepted by Margeson 1983, 105.

11. The only other examples of relief carving or interlace in the area to the west of GLENLUCE are found on three stones from KIRKMADRINE church, nos. 5, 6, and 8 [Plates 100c, 136a-b, 136c].
12. Despite the proximity of Galloway to the Isle of Man, which lies only 30 km to the south, the only carvings in the region with links to Manx sculpture are this slab, and two other pieces also from the Rhins, KIRKMANDRINE 6 and CHAPEL DONNAN 2 (see above), despite the earlier link between MAINS and Maughold suggested by the use of the Chi-Rho and cross-of-arcs on sculpture from both sites (Trench-Jellicoe 1980, 202-3, Pl. XIa). See also Bailey 1984, 21, 27.
CHAPTER 26
Conclusions

The above analysis has shown that there is a sharp diversity across the region between groups of sculpture with purely local links which tend to cluster in limited areas, and single elaborately decorated monuments that appear to exist independently of any local tradition, but demonstrate affinities outside the region. There is also a sharp dichotomy between the east and west halves of the region. The motif tables (Tables 8-12, Figs. 28-32) isolate a number of stylistic features most commonly found in sculpture elsewhere, and their distribution is shown in the figures.

Dumfries

There is a lack of inscriptions in Dumfriesshire to the east, but a tendency to use the most elaborate decorative motifs including figures and animals, and a variety of plant scrolls. There is also a predominant use of free-armed cross-heads. No disk-headed crosses are known from this area. The shafts of these crosses vary in proportion between 1.68 and 1.83, but are squarish or rectangular rather than slab-like (Cramp 1984a, xiv). Monuments of this type are found at Hoddom and Ruthwell, including RUTHWELL 1 and HODDOM 1 and 3. Although RUTHWELL uses inhabited plant scrolls and HODDOM plant-scrolls with rosettes, both crosses are laid out in the same way, with figure panels on the broad face and long panels of plant-scroll on the side. These two sites lie close together in lower Annandale. The crosses at BOATFORD 1 and CLOSEBURN 1 in Nithsdale, despite the use of motifs that can be dated to a later period by analogy with monuments elsewhere, preserve the same layout as HODDOM and RUTHWELL and appear to be following a local tradition.
Analysis of the motifs has shown that very close links can be established with sculpture in Yorkshire and Mercia, but that it is rare for the same motifs to appear on more than one cross. Despite the use of a local form of layout, each cross exists as an individually conceived monument, and it is not possible to say that they show a developing local tradition. Each monument shows an awareness of decorative fashions found to the south and east within the Anglo-Saxon kingdoms of England. RUTHWELL 1 and the major cross at HODDOM were carvings of national, even international stature, and the BOATFORD cross shows such awareness of Mercian forms of ornament that it could have been carved in that area. It is therefore clearly anachronistic to see this area of south-west Scotland as peripheral to the decorative traditions found to the south. The lack of interest in establishing a local school and the awareness shown of widespread decorative motifs at different periods suggests that these monuments are the product of centres with a widespread network of contacts.

The analysis of the iconography of the crosses has demonstrated that they were laid out with didactic intention and an awareness of widespread models of Mediterranean origin. It is difficult not to see the Ruthwell and Hoddom crosses as demonstrations of monastic art. Ruthwell has no clear locational context apart from that offered by the architectural fragment RUTHWELL 3, which is the only piece of carving clearly derived from a stone church in this region. Hoddom, with its large series of monuments of different date, clearly remained a productive site for sculpture throughout much of this period. The recent excavations have shown extensive evidence of occupation at the site in the 7th and 8th centuries (Lowe 1991). But despite this, there is no evidence of a sculptural impact on its immediate region. The rosette on the BOATFORD cross and the layout of CLOSEBURN 1 may
derive from a Hoddom tradition but they have no direct resemblance to any sculpture from that site. It is tempting to see Hoddom as the major site in the eastern area, because of the quantity of sculpture and the obscure references to the site in 12th century documents, but only in the use of ornament types such as figural and plant-scroll, and in the layout of the crosses, can it be said to have exerted any form of direct influence in its area. The motif table and map which show the distribution of plant scroll confined to the eastern part of the region obscure the variety of forms used (Table 9, Fig. 29). It is therefore clear that this area was continually open to new ideas and fashions in decoration, but this is manifested on a limited number of known monuments. As a result each monument appears to exist in isolation both in space and in period, and has to be discussed separately.

Apart from Hoddom the context of most of these monuments remains unexplored. No pre-conquest churches are known in this area, but evidence is given in the Catalogue for reconsidering the location of a number of these crosses. Since their function is not properly understood, it remains a matter of speculation what sort of site should provide a context for a cross of this type. The monastic model is usually put forward, particularly with regard to the evidence from Hoddom and Ruthwell, and the iconography of these pieces and the use of inscriptions at Ruthwell might support such a view. But at Hoddom, despite the large quantity of sculpture found, the evidence for literacy is minimal, even allowing for the blank panels between the figures which may have carried painted inscriptions. The contrast between this site and Ruthwell is the more remarkable given the correspondence between the figure sculpture from both sites. At Ruthwell the figures are identified by quotations, and doubt only remains when these quotations are lost or damaged. So much of the
HODDOM 3 cross is lost that it is not possible to say that it did not carry inscriptions, but there is clearly a contrast between the evidence for iconography and the lack of evidence for literacy. Further excavation at both sites would be helpful, given the inconclusive nature of Crowe's work at Ruthwell, and the peripheral nature of the area at Hoddom examined by Lowe. The timber buildings visible on the air photographs [Plates 67, 68] remain a prime focus at Hoddom, particularly if plough damage at the site is allowed to continue.

The evidence for the BOATFORD and WAMPHRAY crosses is more ambiguous. BOATFORD stands on a major routeway at a river crossing. It is therefore possible that it had no other context than as a wayside monument. But the possible evidence for timber buildings here as well [Plate 9] suggests that a magnetometer survey at the site would be helpful. The antiquarian records associate WAMPHRAY with a possible chapel site [Plates 40, 41]. Neither the location nor the existence of this chapel site have yet been clearly established but further field work in this area seems necessary. CLOSEBURN, DURRISDEER, GLENCAIRN and PENPONT all came from church sites. As stated above, no pre-conquest church is known from this area but these sites, and also Ruthwell, should be seen as the most likely to provide evidence for earlier structures. Crosses such as BOATFORD which are found at isolated sites with no ecclesiastical context appear to be different in kind to the four examples noted above. While sculpture may have been moved to a church site from elsewhere, in the first instance it should be taken as a strong pointer to early medieval activity at the site. Given the evidence for the continuity of occupation of church sites elsewhere, sculpture with this relationship should be seen as providing the sort of evidence derived elsewhere
from scatters of pottery.

This is particularly true of the later sculpture from this area, including CLOSEBURN 2, the PENPONT slabs and the material from KIRKCONNEL. The evidence from Kirkconnel showed that a medieval church site if excavated, could produce seven pieces of pre-conquest sculpture. It is unfortunate that the excavation took place in the 1920s and was inadequate for understanding the development of the site, since all the other church sites named are still in use as parish churches and are therefore less available for exploration. Unfortunately the incised sculpture from this area, which has generally been seen as early, can no longer be seen as a group and cannot be used to pinpoint a particular type of site, as Thomas would imply (1968, 98, 100). RUTHWELL 2 and STAPLEGORDON came from church sites. FOREGIRTH, which is too large to move far, has no recognisable context. It is therefore not possible to see a chronological development from these pieces to the Anglo-Saxon influenced sculpture with plant scroll and figural ornament.

This Anglo-Saxon influence, discussed above, appears to have lasted for only a limited length of time, since these crosses all appear to be 10th century or earlier. They are succeeded by the slabs decorated with interlace found at CLOSEBURN 2, PENPONT and KIRKCONNEL, and the later slabs at HODDOM. Interlace is sparingly used on the Anglian sculpture, in subordinate panels. Consequently these pieces appear to be following a separate sculptural tradition or period fashion, unrelated to the earlier Anglian crosses, and with links up into Clydesdale and parts of Northumberland, Durham and Yorkshire. It may be necessary to link these pieces with the evidence for Scandinavian settlement in Dumfriesshire that has been recognised from place-names (Fellows-Jensen 1985a), but there are no clearly Scandinavian
characteristics on any of these pieces. KIRKCONNEL 1 has the same form of stopped-plait interlace found over to the west in the Whithorn area and in Cumbria, but it is used on a different form of slab, and the link appears indirect. These late slabs from Dumfriesshire are clearly linked in their ornamental forms, unlike the earlier Anglian influenced sculpture, and are found within a limited area of upper Nithsdale, but appear to belong to a single period and have no chronological development. There is some variation amongst the pieces from Kirkconnel itself, but the other slabs are likely to be the final flourish of pre-medieval sculpture in this area.

**Kirkcudbright**

The orientation towards Anglo-Saxon England so apparent on the bulk of the sculpture from Dumfriesshire extends to the west only so far as eastern Kirkcudbright. As Figs. 28 and 29 demonstrate, plant-scroll and free-armed crosses are not found west of the river Nith in any form related to the types so far discussed, except at KILTERLILITIE, RASCARREL and STEWARTRY MUSEUM. But it is clear that the KILTERLILITIE and RASCARREL shaft fragments, which carry medallion scroll on their broad faces, are following a different ornamental tradition to the way plant-scroll is used together with figure panels in Dumfriesshire. Although the KILTERLILITIE shaft is now built into a cottage wall, it is likely that it was found at the lost church site at Barncrosh, 550 m to the north. The place-name alone suggests the former existence of a monument here, and the discovery of this site must be a high priority for locating an unoccupied church site with evidence of Northumbrian sculpture.

There is no classical figure sculpture thoroughout the area west of Dumfriesshire (Fig. 30), and the few examples noted, at MINNIGAFF,
KILMORIE and WHITHORN 2, appear to be following an entirely different tradition. This may be a period type, but it appears to have its origins in Ireland. No Irish influence is recognisable on the Dumfriesshire sculpture, but west of Kirkcudbright Irish elements become more common and become dominant in the Rhins area of Wigtownshire. There is thus a change in orientation across the region, with the sculpture in Dumfriesshire following models found in Anglo-Saxon England and the sculpture in Wigtownshire looking outwards to other areas around the Irish Sea.

Kirkcudbright is partly a no-man's land between these two zones of influence, and aside from the Anglian influenced sculpture in the south-eastern part and the external influence noted at ARDWALL ISLE and MINNIGAFF, all the sculpture in this area, both in the coastal zone to the south-west and in the upland area to the north is limited in decorative motifs, carved in outline on unshaped slabs, and uses a limited range of cross forms with swollen stems. These motifs appear to be extremely localised, as although there is a connection between the sculpture found on the south-west coast and in the uplands, this form is not found in either Dumfriesshire or Wigtownshire to the east and west. This type of sculpture appears to have developed from a form found at ARDWALL ISLE, and at ST NINIAN'S CAVE in Wigtownshire, but shows no evidence of continuing outside stimulation or the type of fashionable motifs noted in Dumfriesshire. It is tempting to see an economic basis to this, or a lack of patronage, as sculpture of this type requires minimum input. Hardly any carving in relief is attempted and no forms of elaborate motifs such as interlace are used. The only exception to this is the unique pillar MINNIGAFF I, which appears to have strong Irish connections.

Literacy is again unknown in this region, other than at Ardwall.
and there is little evidence to date the slabs or to separate them into a chronological sequence. Sculpture is only found in limited areas of Kirkcudbright, and other than at Ardwall, appears to represent a limited period of activity. The association between the sculpture found in the upland area and cairns or mounds suggests that these pieces are not chronologically separate, but were used for a specific purpose. This was either to mark routes or for wayside burial. The discovery of a Viking armlet in a cairn at Blackerne (Grieg 1940, 109) suggests that burial in cairns at this period was still practised, but it would be helpful if more of these sites could be investigated. Unfortunately most were destroyed or can no longer be identified on the ground.

The context of the sculpture at ARDWALL has been clarified by redrawing Thomas’ map [Fig. 41], as it is clearly related to burial, and even burials of different status, but further excavation at the site between the chapel and the outer enclosure would help to show how the graveyard developed, if it was zoned, and how it related to any domestic buildings.

Wigtown

The excavations at Whithorn have transformed our understanding of the development of this site as a major centre for the area, with evidence for shrines, burial, churches and trading activities, starting in the 5th century and with successive phases of use that can be related to the limited historical evidence, particularly the period of the Anglian bishopric in the 8th century. Excavation has shown that the site became derelict in the 9th century and was redeveloped on different, more commercial lines as a trading centre (Hill 1988-90, 1990-91).
Some context has therefore been provided for both the Early Christian sculpture, the Anglian inscriptions, and the group of disk-headed sculpture known as the Whithorn School. But it should be emphasised that the earlier finds can only be related to this sequence by analogy, and that none of the sculpture discussed in this thesis came from the currently excavated areas. Finds of A and B ware from the site (Hill 1988-90, 7) have shown that the Mediterranean influence formerly deduced from the Early Christian stones from Whithorn and KIRKMADRINE has a direct archaeological context. Similarly the cross-of-arcs on the MAINS stone has been shown to occur on a fragment from the new excavations, and compass-drawn crosses and grafitti have been found reused in Northumbrian buildings (Hill 1984-86, 4; Hill 1988-90, fig. 8). The interest in geometric circle ornament demonstrated on these pieces, the WHITHORN incised crosses and the sculpture from ST NINIAN'S CAVE suggests that earlier views that saw the disk-headed crosses as originating in the cross-of-arcs were probably correct (Simpson 1940), and that this was a development of a long lived regional motif, possibly stimulated by the veneration of a single monument with this motif. The current excavations have shown that pillars acted as foci for burial at Whithorn in the early period (Hill 1990-91, 9), and it is likely that a mechanism of this sort was behind the continued use of this motif in this area.

Despite the historical evidence for an Anglian bishopric at Whithorn and the excavated evidence for Northumbrian settlement, the motifs defined in the east of the region such as free-armed cross-heads, plant-scroll ornament and figure sculpture are almost unknown in this area (Figs. 28-30). It is clear that a different tradition developed, possibly as a result of the lack of suitable sandstone, but the type of sculpture from WHITHORN and ST NINIAN'S
CAVE which is likely to date to this period uses cross forms and slab forms found on a limited range of sculpture within Anglo-Saxon England. The use of Anglian runes on WHITHORN 5 probably indicates the cultural background of this group of carvings.

The lack of relationship between these incised slabs and the later disk-headed Whithorn school of carving suggests that the latter belong to the period when the site was revived. Whether this revival retained the ecclesiastical tradition of Whithorn is not clear, but the use of this type of carving on 20 stones at Whithorn itself and at 9 outlying sites, all following standard forms and using the same treatment of interlace ornament, suggests that these cross-slabs mark a period of dominance by Whithorn over its outlying region. The relationship between this type of carving and church sites, not found elsewhere in either Wigtownshire or Kirkcudbright, suggests that the slabs are an aspect of the growth of licensed private chapel sites that through being granted burial rights, later became parish churches. The number of these cross-slabs found at Whithorn itself suggests that burial in the area of the earlier shrines remained important, but that it became expedient to license burial in the outlying areas. That this process relates to centralised control from Whithorn is suggested by the occurrence of all slabs of this type within an area that later became the deanery of Farines. Some of these slabs are more closely tied to church sites than others, and this mechanism cannot be tested until excavation has demonstrated early structural remains at sites of this type. But the most profitable excavation has taken place at BARGHOBBLE, a site partly identified through sculptural evidence, but also one that was deserted before becoming a parish church. Since the bulk of the sculpture from this site is unrelated to the types found at Whithorn, it may have had some degree of independence. The lost site which produced the three
pieces of sculpture from CRAIGLEMIN is the most likely to repay a
similar programme of excavation, if its location can be identified.
Records of this site refer to structures and a burial.

That crosses of this type may be related to a growth of secular
lordship at this period is suggested by the association between the
MONREITH cross and a site of apparent high status when recorded at a
later date. This does not seem incompatible with an expansion in the
number of private burial grounds that crosses of this type suggest
elsewhere, as it implies a growth in both secular and ecclesiastical
authority.

Despite the unimaginative decorative formula used for interlace on
these crosses, and the impression that they were mass-produced from a
pattern book, these were clearly objects of high status and display,
requiring considerable investment in labour and skill. In their use
of stopped-plait interlace a link is implied with sculpture in Cumbria
to the south. With the diminished historical evidence for
Scandinavian activity in Galloway (Oram & Stell 1991, passim) it is no
longer possible to see these as evidence for Scandinavian overlordship
of the area, as they occur throughout the area around Whithorn and not
solely in the limited areas where Scandinavian place-names are
concentrated (Fellows-Jensen 1991; Brooke forthcoming b). But as Lang
has demonstrated, Viking age sculpture is usually decorated with
variants and developments of pre Viking age motifs (Lang 1978a), and
it seems unwise to try and identify the foreign elements in a
population on this basis.

As noted above the abrupt growth of this type of sculpture is
confined to a limited area. The cross-slabs found in the Rhins area
to the west present a stark contrast with this elaborately carved
type. Almost all the sculpture in this area is carved in outline or incised, with no relationship to sculpture types found anywhere to the east. Most of the slabs have been found away from known church sites, others appear to have come from chapel sites that went out of use at an early date. Although following a very localised style, with fan-shaped arms, the use of crosslets on these pieces, and other aspects, suggest that they may represent a settlement of the Rhins area from Ireland, a possibility that is reinforced by place-name evidence. KIRKMADRINE is the only site in this area which may have been linked with Whithorn, since it uses interlace, and it is possible that the Early Christian stones acted as a focus for burial at this later period. Otherwise, once again all the sculpture in the Rhins is without chronological sequence, and may again represent only a limited period of activity, since the distinctive motifs used are found on most of the sculpture in this area. The slab from a chapel site at KILMORIE in the Rhins appears unrelated to the other sculpture, and uses figural ornament, plant scroll and a crucifixion. All these features appear quite outside the local tradition, and it is suggested that this slab demonstrates a Hiberno-Norse background.

Conclusion

The absolute contrast between these different groups of sculpture is striking, and each is found in a distinct geographical area, with little overlap in the distribution of the various types. This aspect is made clearer by the lack of chronological development in any of this sculpture in the western area. The limited evidence for external contacts suggests that the location of the Wigtown area in the Irish Sea basin was the most important influence, in absolute contrast to Dumfries and its orientation towards Anglo-Saxon England. It is noticeable that this aspect would hardly have been apparent if the
thesis had covered one region or the other. It is the extreme contrasts within a limited geographical area that becomes most apparent when the distribution of the sculpture and its ornament are considered together, and the relationship between the regional groups defined by their ornament and location only becomes visible when all the sculpture within an area has been identified and their original find spots located. This aspect is not apparent from most published work on sculpture, and it is not certain whether this is a feature of the region itself or the method of analysing it. The former aspect only became clear in reviewing the evidence for the discovery of each stone, since little of the sculpture had previously been plotted on a map.

Given the difficulties of dating sculpture, particularly when no clear chronological sequence is apparent, and historical evidence is absent or inadequate, this recognition of regional groups enables their relationship to regional centres to be assessed. The regional centre need not be documented. Both Whithorn and Hoddom have produced the largest quantities of sculpture in their particular areas, although Hoddom is without the same impact on the surrounding countryside. Whithorn is recorded as a bishopric and has been revealed archaeologically as a focal point in this area. Hoddom, for which the historical evidence is much more uncertain, was initially identified as a focal point through sculptural evidence alone, and this model appears to have been substantiated by the recent excavations.

But without the historical record Anglian influence would not have been predicted from the sculpture found at Whithorn, which appears to be part of the Irish Sea province rather than the "western annexe of an eastern centred kingdom" (Bailey 1984, 16). It is only late in the period, with the sculptural evidence of the same interlace being used
at both Whithorn and Kirkconnel in Dumfriesshire that there is any evidence of a ubiquitous sculptural style across the region.

1. With future work in the region in mind, a list is presented here, based on the Evidence for Discovery sections of the Catalogue, which identifies the sites most likely to repay excavation or further fieldwork (cf. Hamlin 1976, I, 411). See Table 1, p. 280.
### Sculpture sites that might repay further fieldwork or excavation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dumfries</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boatford farm - cross-base and crop marks</td>
<td>NX 8689 9546</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoddom Castle drive - lost sculpture</td>
<td>NY 157 728</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoddom old churchyard - crop marks</td>
<td>NY 1666 7268</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchard farm - cross-base</td>
<td>NS 7818 1274</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wamphray chapel site</td>
<td>NY 1392 9915</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>churchyards - Closeburn</td>
<td>NX 9037 9230</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durnisdeer</td>
<td>NS 8940 0376</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glencain</td>
<td>NX 8095 9043</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoddom</td>
<td>NY 1667 7267</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkconnel (unexcavated area)</td>
<td>NS 7245 1501</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luce</td>
<td>NY 1875 7237</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penpont</td>
<td>NX 8487 9448</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruthwell</td>
<td>NY 1005 6821</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staplegordon</td>
<td>NY 3521 8791</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wauchope</td>
<td>NY 3556 8415</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Kirkcudbright                           |                |          |
| Ardwall - between excavated area and outer enclosure | NX 5731 4957 |          |
| lost church site on Barncrosh farm, near Kilterliltie | NX 709 592 |          |
| Braidenoch Hill cross-slabs?            | NX 5707 9083   |          |
| High Auchenlarie - site of knoll or cairn | NX 5364 5340 |          |
| churchyards - Anwoth                    | NX 5827 5621   |          |
| Kirkcudbright?                          | NX 6903 5119   |          |
| Minnigaff                               | NX 4102 6655   |          |
| Rerrick                                  | NX 7603 4670   |          |

| Wigtown                                 |                |          |
| knolls on Brighouse farm                | NX 430 441     |          |
| site of Chapel Donnan                   | NX 9983 6919   |          |
| High Mains farm - burials?              | NX 44 39       |          |
| Kirkchrist chapel site, near Cassendeoch | NX 2124 5502 |          |
| Kildonan chapel site, Drummore?         | NX 125 362     |          |
| Kilmorie chapel site                    | NX 0339 6583   |          |
| Laggangarn - mound                      | NX 2223 7166   |          |
| Longcastle church site                  | NX 3763 4740   |          |
| lost site on Low Craiglemine farm       | NX 399 390     |          |
| site of St John’s chapel, Knock of Luce | NX 2621 5573   |          |
| St Ninian’s Cave (E. half unexcavated)  | NX 4230 3597   |          |
| churchyards - Glasserton                | NX 4212 3808   |          |
| Glenluce                                 | NX 1969 5742   |          |
| Inch                                    | NX 1025 6087   |          |
| Kirkinner (embanked)                    | NX 4231 5148   |          |
| Kirkmadrine                              | NX 0801 4839   |          |
| Kirkmaiden                              | NX 3655 3997   |          |
| Mochrum                                  | NX 3473 4639   |          |
| Penninghame?                            | NX 4117 6126   |          |
| Wigtown                                  | NX 4356 5562   |          |
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The Irish Sea basin and general location of the region
Fig. 3

Dumfries and Galloway Region - modern administrative boundaries
A. Pre-1975 counties
B. Post-1975 districts
Fig. 4

Dumfries and Galloway Region - topography
### Table 2

**Sculpture Sites and Altitude**

(average height above sea level, in metres)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dumfries</th>
<th>Wigtown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FOREGIRTH</td>
<td>ST NINIAN’S CAVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUTHWELL</td>
<td>KILMORIE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HODDOM</td>
<td>KIRKMAIDEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUCE</td>
<td>KNOCK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOSSKNOW</td>
<td>LOW CURGHIE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOATFORD</td>
<td>GLENLUCE ABBEY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEUCH</td>
<td>LARG LIDDESDALE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLOSEBURN</td>
<td>MAINS OF PENNINGHAME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PENPONT</td>
<td>INCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLENCAIRN</td>
<td>KIRKINNER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAUCHOPE</td>
<td>WIGTOWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAPLEGORDON</td>
<td>GLENLUCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAMPFRAY</td>
<td>BOGHOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORCHARD</td>
<td>MOCHRUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DURRISDEER</td>
<td>BRIGHTHOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIRKCONNEL</td>
<td>WEST CROSHERIE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CHAPEL CROSSERIE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GLASSERTON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KIRKMADRINE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MAINS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SINNINESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WHITHORN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CASSENDEOH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LONGCASTLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BARMORE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GLAIK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AIRYLICK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CRAIGLEMINE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M TE OF MARK</td>
<td>ELRIG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KILTERLILTIE</td>
<td>KNOCK OF LUCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRUSTY’S HILL</td>
<td>BARRHOBBLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGH AUCHENLARIE</td>
<td>MAY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DALTALLOCHAN</td>
<td>HOUSE OF ELRIG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUMNOCK KNONES</td>
<td>GLENIRON SEVERAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STROANFREGGAN</td>
<td>PULTADIE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUCHENSHINNOCH</td>
<td>LOW ELDRIG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRAIDENOCHE HILL</td>
<td>LAGGANGARN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Kirkcudbright**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ardwall</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RASCARREL</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANWOTH</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIRKCLAUGH</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINNIGAFF</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M TE OF MARK</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KILTERLILTIE</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRUSTY’S HILL</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGH AUCHENLARIE</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DALTALLOCHAN</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUMNOCK KNONES</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STROANFREGGAN</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUCHENSHINNOCH</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRAIDENOCHE HILL</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig. 6

Dumfries and Galloway Region - rivers
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## Table 3

The Medieval Parishes

(* parish no longer extant)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rhinns</th>
<th>Glenken</th>
<th>Annandale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Clayshant *</td>
<td>Balmacellian</td>
<td>82 Annan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Inch</td>
<td>Dalry</td>
<td>83 Brydekirk *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Kirkcolm</td>
<td>Kells</td>
<td>84 Carruthers *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Kirkmaiden</td>
<td>Parton</td>
<td>85 Castlemilk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Leswalt</td>
<td></td>
<td>86 Corrie *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Soulseat *</td>
<td></td>
<td>87 Cummertrees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Stoneykirk</td>
<td></td>
<td>88 Dalton Magna *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Toskerton *</td>
<td>GLASGOW</td>
<td>89 Dalton Parva *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90 Dornock</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Farines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Farines</th>
<th>Desnes</th>
<th>Dessenes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9 Cruggleton *</td>
<td>48 Colmonell *</td>
<td>92 Dungree *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Eggerness *</td>
<td>49 Colvend</td>
<td>93 Ecclefechan *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Glasserton</td>
<td>50 Edingham *</td>
<td>94 Gardyne *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Glenlucet *</td>
<td>51 Kirkbean</td>
<td>95 Gretna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Kirkcowan</td>
<td>52 Kirkbryde *</td>
<td>96 Hoddam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Kırkiner</td>
<td>53 Kirkgunzeon</td>
<td>97 Hutton Magna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Kirkmaiden *</td>
<td>54 Kirkpatrick Durham</td>
<td>98 Johnstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Longcastle *</td>
<td>55 Kirkpatrick Irongray</td>
<td>99 Kirkconnel *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Mochrum</td>
<td>56 Lochkinderloch</td>
<td>100 Kirkpatrick Fleming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Penningham</td>
<td>57 Lochrutton</td>
<td>101 Kirkpatrick Juxta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Sorbie</td>
<td>58 Southwick *</td>
<td>102 Lochmaben</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Whithorn</td>
<td>59 Terregles</td>
<td>103 Luce *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Wigtown</td>
<td>60 Troqueer</td>
<td>104 Middlebie</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Desnes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Desnes</th>
<th>Nithsdale</th>
<th>-----</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22 Anw th</td>
<td>61 Caerlaverock</td>
<td>105 Moffat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Balnacross *</td>
<td>62 Closeburn</td>
<td>106 Morton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Borgue</td>
<td>63 Dalgarro *</td>
<td>107 Mouswald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Buittle</td>
<td>64 Dumfries</td>
<td>108 Pennersaux *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Crossmichael</td>
<td>65 Dunscore</td>
<td>109 Redkirk *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Dunrod</td>
<td>66 Durisdeer</td>
<td>110 Ruthwell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Galtway *</td>
<td>67 Garvald *</td>
<td>111 Sibbaldie *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Gelston *</td>
<td>68 Glencain</td>
<td>112 Trailtrow *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Girthon</td>
<td>69 Holywood</td>
<td>113 Tundergarth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Kelton</td>
<td>70 Keir</td>
<td>114 Wamphray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Kirkandrews *</td>
<td>71 Kirkbryde *</td>
<td>115 Canonbie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Kirkchrist *</td>
<td>72 Kirkconnel</td>
<td>116 Ewes-Duris *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Kirkcormack *</td>
<td>73 Kirkmahoe</td>
<td>117 Kirkandrews *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Kirkcudbright</td>
<td>74 Kirkmichael</td>
<td>118 Overkirk *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 Kirkdale *</td>
<td>75 Morton</td>
<td>119 Staplegordon *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 Kirkmabrecht</td>
<td>76 Penpont</td>
<td>120 Wauchop *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 Minnigaff</td>
<td>77 Sandquhar</td>
<td>121 Westerker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 Rerrick</td>
<td>78 Tinwald</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 Sennick *</td>
<td>79 Torthorwald</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 Tongland</td>
<td>80 Trailflet *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 Twynholm</td>
<td>81 Tynron</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3: The Medieval Parishes

This list, and the map, Fig. 10, have been prepared by collating the information on the medieval parishes in Cowan 1967, with the changes recorded in Sinclair 1791-1799; Chalmers 1824 and 1890; and NSA 1845. Boundaries between parishes amalgamated at the Reformation are drawn as straight dotted lines.

The parishes were grouped into deaneries under the control of the bishops of Glasgow and Galloway, and these divide the region into separate blocks of territory, some of which can be recognised in the distribution of the sculpture, particularly in the western areas of Rhinns and Farines. See also Figs. 26, 27, and 38.
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Fig. 11

Sculpture and medieval parishes in Dumfries and Galloway
Medieval pilgrimage routes to Whithorn
Sculpture in Dumfries and Galloway - relative totals per site
Fig. 14

Index of sites with sculpture in Dumfries
Sculpture sites in northern Dumfriesshire and Kirkcudbright, and in Strathclyde to the N. of the region.
Index of sites with sculpture in Kirkcudbright
Index of sites with sculpture in Wigtown
Fig. 18

Topography and sculpture in Galloway

- Land over 400 ft
- Land over 800 ft
- Sites with sculpture
Rivers and sculpture in Galloway
Fig. 20

Sculpture in Galloway - relative totals per site
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Plate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wigtown</td>
<td>BARHOBBLE 1</td>
<td>101b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CRAIGLEMINE 1 a</td>
<td>110a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GLENIRON SEVERAL</td>
<td>117b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GLENLUCE 1</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KIRKINNER 1 a</td>
<td>126b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KIRKINNER 2</td>
<td>127b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KIRKMAIDEN 1</td>
<td>128c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LONGCASTLE 1 a</td>
<td>145a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MAINS OF PENNINGHAME a</td>
<td>148b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MONREITH a</td>
<td>154a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ST NINIAN'S CAVE 1 a</td>
<td>161a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WEST CROSHERIE</td>
<td>169b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WHITHORN 6 a</td>
<td>175a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WHITHORN 9 a</td>
<td>177a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WHITHORN 10 a</td>
<td>177c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WHITHORN 11 a</td>
<td>178a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WHITHORN 12 a</td>
<td>178c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WHITHORN 13 a</td>
<td>179a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WHITHORN 16 a</td>
<td>181a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WHITHORN 17 a</td>
<td>181c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WHITHORN 18 a</td>
<td>182a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WHITHORN 20 a</td>
<td>183a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WHITHORN 21</td>
<td>183c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WHITHORN 23</td>
<td>184b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WHITHORN 24</td>
<td>184c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WHITHORN 25</td>
<td>185a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WHITHORN 26 a</td>
<td>185b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WHITHORN 29 a</td>
<td>187a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WHITHORN 30</td>
<td>187c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WIGTOWN 1 a</td>
<td>191a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumfries</td>
<td>KIRKCONNEL 1 a</td>
<td>22a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KIRKCONNEL 7 a</td>
<td>23a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PENPONT 1</td>
<td>32a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PENPONT 2 a</td>
<td>33a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig. 22

Distribution of 'stopped-plait' interlace in Dumfries and Galloway
### Table 5

**'Whithorn School' sculpture**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>shaft</th>
<th>disk</th>
<th>stopped plait</th>
<th>interlace type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WHITHORN 6</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>D ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITHORN 8</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITHORN 9</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>A F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITHORN 10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>A F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITHORN 11</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITHORN 12</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITHORN 13</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITHORN 14</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITHORN 16</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITHORN 17</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITHORN 18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITHORN 20</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>A F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITHORN 21</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>^</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITHORN 22</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITHORN 23</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITHORN 24</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>^</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITHORN 25</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITHORN 26</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITHORN 27</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITHORN 28</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITHORN 29</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITHORN 30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>^</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITHORN 32</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARHOBBLE 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRIGHOUSE ?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>^</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRAIGLEMIN 1</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>A E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRAIGLEMIN 2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLAINESTON 1 ?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLEINIRON SEVERAL</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLEINUCE 1 ?</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLEINUCE 5 ?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIRKINNER 1</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIRKINNER 2</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>^</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIRKMAIDRE 10 ?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIRKMAIDEN 1 ?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LONGCASTLE 1</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAINS OF PENNINGHAME</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONREITH</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST NINNISN CAVE 1 ?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST NINNISN CAVE 6 ?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST NINNISN CAVE 7 ?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEST CROMHERIE</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIGTOWN 1</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ presence  
- absence  
~ no  
? doubtful  
^ other
Table 6

Narrow-band plain interlace in relief (Whithorn area)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Plate/Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AIRYLICK</td>
<td>Plate 100a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARHOBBLE 6</td>
<td>Cormack 1989, 5-6, fig. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELRIG</td>
<td>Plate 117a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLENLUCE 1 (lower panel)</td>
<td>Plate 119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KILMORIE a</td>
<td>Plate 123a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIRKMAIDEN 2 a</td>
<td>Plate 128a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNOCK 2</td>
<td>Plate 129c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAY</td>
<td>Plate 153b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOCHRUM</td>
<td>Plate 157a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITHORN 2 a ?</td>
<td>Plate 172b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITHORN 2 b Console</td>
<td>Plate 172d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITHORN 8</td>
<td>Plate 176b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITHORN 15 a</td>
<td>Plate 180c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITHORN 26 b</td>
<td>Plate 185c</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7

Median-incised interlace (not 'stopped-plait')

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Plate/Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARDWELL HOUSE ?</td>
<td>Plate 100c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOGHOUSE 1 b</td>
<td>Plate 103b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIRKMADRINE 6 ?</td>
<td>Plate 136c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITHORN 2 a</td>
<td>Plate 172a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITHORN 15 c</td>
<td>Plate 172c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITHORN 19 a c</td>
<td>Plate 182d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITHORN 22 a ?</td>
<td>Plate 184a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITHORN 31 a</td>
<td>Plate 188a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig. 25

Distribution of incised sculpture in Galloway
Fig. 27

Sculpture from church sites in the Whithorn area

--- reconstructed medieval parish boundaries
--- medieval deaneries
- Whithorn-school and related sculpture
○ other sculpture
○ chapel site with sculpture
○ parish church site with sculpture
MOTIF TABLES

A. Free-armed cross-heads
B. Plant-scroll ornament
C. Figural ornament
D. Animal ornament
E. Stones with inscriptions
Table 8

Motif Tables

A. free-armed cross-heads

**Dumfries**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Plates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BOATFORD 1</td>
<td>1a-b, 3a, 4c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLOSEBURN 1</td>
<td>11a-b, 13a, 15a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DURRISDEER</td>
<td>Plate 17a-d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLENCAIRN 1</td>
<td>19a, b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HODDOM 1a/1b</td>
<td>46a-b, 47a-b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HODDOM 1c/1d</td>
<td>48a-b, 49a-b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HODDOM 2</td>
<td>Plate 51a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HODDOM 9</td>
<td>Plate 55a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HODDOM 10</td>
<td>Plate 55b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HODDOM 11</td>
<td>Plate 56a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HODDOM 12</td>
<td>Plate 56b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HODDOM 13</td>
<td>Plate 56c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HODDOM 15</td>
<td>Plate 51b, 56c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HODDOM 22</td>
<td>Plate 58a-d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HODDOM 23</td>
<td>Plate 59a-e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HODDOM 24</td>
<td>Plate 60a-d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HODDOM 28</td>
<td>Plate 63a-d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HODDOMCROSS</td>
<td>Plate 28a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIRCONNEL 3</td>
<td>Plate 26d-f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUTHWELL 1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Kirkcudbright**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Plates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARDWALL 9/16</td>
<td>Plate 73a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARDWALL 10</td>
<td>Plate 73b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARDWALL 15</td>
<td>Plate 73c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARDWALL 18</td>
<td>Plate 73d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RERRICK 1</td>
<td>Plate 95a-b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEWARTRY MUSEUM</td>
<td>Plate 96a-c</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Wigtown**

(none)
A. Distribution of free-armed cross-heads in Dumfries and Galloway
Table 9

Motif Tables

B. plant-scroll

Dumfries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Plates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLOSEBURN 1, face A</td>
<td>Plate 11a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>face D</td>
<td>Plates 12a, 14a-c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DURRISDEER, face A</td>
<td>Plate 17a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLENCAIRN 1, face A</td>
<td>Plate 19a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HODDOM 1a/lb</td>
<td>Plates 46a-b, 47a-b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HODDOM 3a</td>
<td>Plate 50a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HODDOM 3b</td>
<td>Plates 50b, 52a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HODDOM 3d</td>
<td>Plates 50d, 53b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HODDOM 4</td>
<td>Plates 51c, 52b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HODDOM 5</td>
<td>Plates 51d, 53a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HODDOM 6</td>
<td>Plate 54a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HODDOM 7</td>
<td>Plate 54b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HODDOM 8</td>
<td>Plate 54c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HODDOM 9</td>
<td>Plate 55a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HODDOM 10</td>
<td>Plate 55b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HODDOM 11</td>
<td>Plate 56a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HODDOM 13</td>
<td>Plate 56c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HODDOM 16</td>
<td>Plate 56d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HODDOM CROSS</td>
<td>Plate 28a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUCE</td>
<td>Plate 28b, c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSSKNOW, face B</td>
<td>Plate 29a, b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUTHWELL 1, E. &amp; W. faces</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAMPHRAY, face A</td>
<td>Plates 38a, 39a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kirkcudbright

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Plates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KILTERLILITIE</td>
<td>Plate 85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RASCARREL, face A</td>
<td>Plate 93b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>face B</td>
<td>Plate 94a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>face D</td>
<td>Plate 94b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wigtown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Plates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KILMORIE, face A *</td>
<td>Plate 123</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(* N.B. otherwise absent W. of Kirkcudbright)
B. Distribution of plant-scroll ornament in Dumfries and Galloway
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Motif Tables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. figural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Dumfries**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Plates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLOSEBURN 1, face A</td>
<td></td>
<td>Plates 11a, 13a, 13b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HODDOM 1a/1b</td>
<td></td>
<td>Plates 46, 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HODDOM 1c/1d</td>
<td></td>
<td>Plates 48, 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HODDOM 3a</td>
<td></td>
<td>Plate 50a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HODDOM 3c</td>
<td></td>
<td>Plate 50c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HODDOM 22, face A</td>
<td></td>
<td>Plate 58a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>face B</td>
<td></td>
<td>Plate 58b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>face C ?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Plate 58c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>face D</td>
<td></td>
<td>Plate 58d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HODDOM 23, face A</td>
<td></td>
<td>Plate 59a, b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUTHWELL 1, N. &amp; S. faces</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Kirkcudbright**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Plates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARDWALL 11</td>
<td></td>
<td>Plate 76a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINNIGAFF 1, face B</td>
<td></td>
<td>Plate 89b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STROANFREGGAN 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Plates 97a, 98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Wigtown**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Plates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KILMORIE, face C</td>
<td></td>
<td>Plate 124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITHORN 2, face A</td>
<td></td>
<td>Plate 172a, e</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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C. Distribution of figural ornament in Dumfries and Galloway
## Motif Tables

### D. animal

**Dumfries**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site/Location</th>
<th>Plate(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BOATFORD 1, face A</td>
<td>Plates 1a, 3b-4b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>face B</td>
<td>Plates 2a, 6a-b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>face C</td>
<td>Plates 1b, 5a-d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLOSEBURN 1, face C</td>
<td>Plate 11b, 15a-c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>face D</td>
<td>Plate 12a, 14a-c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DURRISDEER, face A</td>
<td>Plate 17a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLENCAIRN 1, face C</td>
<td>Plate 19b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HODDOM 1a/1b</td>
<td>Plates 46a-b, 47a-b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HODDOM 1c/1d</td>
<td>Plates 48a-b, 49a-b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HODDOM 2</td>
<td>Plate 51a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HODDOM 6</td>
<td>Plate 54a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HODDOM 55</td>
<td>Plate 44b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUTHWELL 1, E. &amp; W. faces</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAMPHRAY, face A</td>
<td>Plates 38a, 39b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>face C</td>
<td>Fig. 35a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Kirkcudbright**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site/Location</th>
<th>Plate(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARDWALL 17</td>
<td>Plate 76b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINNIGAFF 1, face A</td>
<td>Plate 89a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>face C</td>
<td>Plate 90a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRUSTY’S HILL</td>
<td>Plate 99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Wigtown**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site/Location</th>
<th>Plate(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KILMORIE, face C</td>
<td>Plate 124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D. Distribution of animal ornament in Dumfries and Galloway
Table 12

Motif Tables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E. stones with inscriptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dumfries</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HODDOM 30 (lost) ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUTHWELL 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kirkcudbright</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARDWALL 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARDWALL 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wigtown</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIRKMADRINE 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIRKMADRINE 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIRKMADRINE 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCHNAW ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOW CURGHIE (lost)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAINS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST NINNIANS CAVE 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITHORN 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITHORN 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITHORN 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITHORN 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX

Sculpture from Dumfries and Galloway in public museums
Early medieval sculpture from Wigtownshire, now in Whithorn Priory Museum; with a concordance between the accession numbers used in the museum and in Radford & Donaldson 1957 and 1984, and the numbering of the sculpture in this thesis.
Table 14

Dumfries Museum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dumfries</th>
<th>Kirkculdbrigh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLEUCH</td>
<td>ARDWALL 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLOSEBURN 1</td>
<td>ARDWALL 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLOSEBURN 2</td>
<td>ARDWALL 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRUMCORK</td>
<td>ARDWALL 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DURRISDEER</td>
<td>ARDWALL 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLENCAIN 1</td>
<td>ARDWALL 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'GRIERSON MUSEUM'</td>
<td>ARDWALL 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HODDOM 24a</td>
<td>ARDWALL 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HODDOM 25</td>
<td>ARDWALL 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HODDOM 26</td>
<td>ARDWALL 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HODDOM 27</td>
<td>ARDWALL 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HODDOM 28a</td>
<td>ARDWALL 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HODDOM 28b</td>
<td>ARDWALL 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HODDOM 34-46, 48-50, 51-54, 60</td>
<td>ARDWALL 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIRKCONNEL 1</td>
<td>ARDWALL 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIRKCONNEL 2</td>
<td>ARDWALL 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIRKCONNEL 3</td>
<td>ARDWALL 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIRKCONNEL 4</td>
<td>ARDWALL 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIRKCONNEL 5</td>
<td>ARDWALL 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIRKCONNEL 6</td>
<td>RASCARREL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIRKCONNEL 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOSSKNOW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PENPONT 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PENPONT 2</td>
<td>Wigtown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUTHWELL 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUTHWELL 4</td>
<td>LOCHNAW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Early Medieval sculpture from Dumfries and Galloway, now in the Observatory Museum, Dumfries.
Early Medieval sculpture from Wigtown and Kirkcudbright, now in local museums.
Table 17

Royal Museum of Scotland (formerly, National Museum of Antiquities)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dumfries</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* IB 9</td>
<td>HODDOM 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB 51</td>
<td>HODDOM 23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wigtown

| IB 50             | CASSENDEOCH    |
| IB 116            | CHAPEL DONNAN 1|
| IB 117            | CHAPEL DONNAN 2|
| IB 121            | CRAIGLEMIN 1   |
| IB 122            | CRAIGLEMIN 2   |
| IB 43             | CRAIGNARGET 1  |
| IB 33             | DRUMMORE       |
| IB 45             | GLENLUCE 1     |
| IB 239            | GLENLUCE 5     |
| IB 90             | KIRKMADRINE 1 (cast) |
| IB 91             | KIRKMADRINE 2 (cast) |
| IB 125            | KNOCK 1        |
| IB 124            | KNOCK 2        |
| IB 123            | MAINS OF PENNINGHAME |
| IB 126            | MOCHRUM        |
| KG 80             | RASNACH        |
| IB 16             | SINNINESS      |
| IB 54             | ST NINNANS CAVE 2 |
| IB 300            | ST NINNANS CAVE 14 |
| IB 207            | ST NINNANS CAVE 15 |
| IB 34             | WHITHORN 28    |
| IB 35             | WHITHORN 29    |
| IB 253            | WHITHORN 30    |

(* museum catalogue number)

Early Medieval sculpture from Dumfries and Galloway, now in the Royal Museum of Scotland, Queen Street, Edinburgh.
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A. Manuscript Sources and Abbreviations

Name Book (county).
Object Name Books of the Ordnance Survey, (NMRS and SRO microfilms).

NMRS/OS Record Cards.
Card index of the Archaeology Branch, Ordnance Survey, Scotland, now in the National Monuments Record of Scotland.

NMRS/SAS MS.
Society of Antiquaries of Scotland manuscript, now in the National Monuments Record of Scotland.

RMS/SAS MS.
Society of Antiquaries of Scotland manuscript, now in the Royal Museum of Scotland, Queen Street.

SRO/MW.1/ - .

SRO/DD.27/ - .
Scottish Record Office. Records of the Scottish Development Department, Ancient Monuments Case Files (mainly closed to public inspection under the Official Secrets Act, thirty year rule).

A.O. Curle. RCAHMS Field Notebooks and Journals: 'Galloway 1-4', 'Dumfries 1-3', (NMRS MS 36/3-6).

Dr T.B. Grierson. 'Running Catalogue of the Contents of My Museum, Consisting of Natural History Specimens, Antiquities, and Objects of Virtu, etc.', (Dumfries Museum MS).

Thomas Johnstone. 'Antiquarian Researches, 1825-27', (NMRS/SAS MS 371).

Robert Riddell. 'A Collection of Scottish Antiquities, selected by Robert Riddell' (seven volumes); 'Scottish Heraldry'; 'Scottish Topography'. (RMS/SAS MSS 581-590).

William Todd. 'Statistical, Historical and Miscellaneous Memoranda of Matters Connected with the Parish of Kirkmaiden', (Stranraer public library MS).


HBM(SDD) typescript inventory of Whithorn Priory Museum, by courtesy of HBM(SDD).
B. Printed Sources

Note. Periodicals are cited by the year or years for which they were issued (the date on the cover) rather than the date of publication.


(---), 1851-54. 'I. Conversazione.- Nov. 28, 1851'. *PSAS,* I, 8-15.

(---), 1860-62. 'Monday, 10th June 1861: Donations to the Museum'. *PSAS,* IV, 293.


(---), 1872-74a. 'Monday, 12th May 1873: Donations to the Museum, (3.)'. *PSAS,* X, 242.

(---), 1872-74b. 'Monday, 9th March 1874: Donations to the Museum, (1.)'. *PSAS,* X, 524.

(---), 1872-74c. 'Monday, 8th June 1874: Exhibited, (1.)'. *PSAS,* X, 721.

(---), 1874-75. 'Monday, 10th May 1875: Donations to the Museum, (1.)'. *PSAS,* XI, 233-4.

(---), 1876-78. 'Field meetings of 1878'. *TDGNHAS,* 2nd ser., I, 32-42.

(---), 1880-81a. 'Monday, 13th December 1880: Donations to the Museum, (10.)'. *PSAS,* XV, 8-9.
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