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Fig. 39. Distribution map of Late Saxon Sculpture in East Anglia (©Reed, 2007).
Appendix 1
Gazetteer of Late Saxon Sculpture in East Anglia

This gazetteer employs Fox’s sequential identifiers only when referencing those lost monuments from Cambridge Castle, Fulbourn and Peterborough Cathedral (all C); all other sculptures are distinguished by site-name and number (determined by extant evidence). Five sites preserving Late Saxon funerary sculpture—Houghton, St Mary’s (Nf); Barnack, St John the Baptist; Conington, All Saints’; Maxey, St Peter’s; and Orwell, St Andrew’s (all C)—were inaccessible, though they are included here.

A. Norfolk

A.i. Barrett or “Little” Ringstead, St Peter’s. TF 70554067.

1. Barrett Ringstead 1: Cross-head or grave-marker (fragment) (Pls. 1-3).

PRESENT LOCATION: Norwich Castle Study Centre.

EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: Recovered from the ruins of St Peter’s, Barrett Ringstead (donated to Norwich Castle Museum ca 1953).

Dia. 37 cm  D. 8 cm

STONE TYPE: Barnack shelly oolite (limestone).2

PRESENT CONDITION: The carving on both broad faces is well-preserved. The fragment is mounted in a twentieth-century, conjectural, reconstruction.

DESCRIPTION: Faces A and C preserve the vertical and lateral arm of a type “E-6” cross, extending to the stone’s edge and delineated by a relief-carved border replicating the “E-6” form.3

1 Fox, “Anglo-Saxon Monumental Sculpture”, pp. 16, 19-21, 23-27
2 See Everson and Stocker, CASSS vol. 5, p. 47
3 Cramp, Grammar of Anglo-Saxon Ornament, p. xvi, fig. 2.
DISCUSSION: Based on formal and stylistic similarities with the Fenland Group of recumbent and associated monuments, Barrett or “Little” Ringstead 1 is likely a fragment of a monolithic, free-standing cross or grave-marker of modest scale. Evidence from Cambridge Castle suggests that such monuments were associated with cemeteries; though their form and decoration are evocative of Late Saxon eschatological belief, whether they functioned as memorials or boundary markers is unclear (see vol. 1, p. 157). *Domesday* suggests that Ringstead was a wealthy settlement in the eleventh century, supporting many free land-holders. Like Cringleford 1-7 (see below), it is possible that this sculpture is associated with the settlement’s tenurial lord or with one or more of his *sokemanii*.

DATE: Mid-tenth to mid-eleventh century.

REFERENCES: Unpublished.


2. Beachamwell 1: Grave-marker (fragment) (Pls. 4-5, 7).

PRESENT LOCATION: See 1.

EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: Recovered in 1989 from the ruins of All Saints’, Beachamwell.

H. 28 cm W. 11.5 < 19 cm D. 7.5 cm

STONE TYPE: Barnack shelly oolite (limestone).

PRESENT CONDITION: This semi-circular fragment has been broken along its lower and lateral edge. Its rounded edge is worn, as is the carving on both broad faces.

---

4 See vol. 1, figs. 14-18, pp. 139, 146, 154-155; and Fox, “Anglo-Saxon Monumental Sculpture”, pls. 1-2, 7.

DESCRIPTION: Face A preserves the vertical and a lateral arm of a type “E-6” cross, executed in low-relief and extending to the stone’s edge;⁶ the cross is delineated by a relief-carved border, akin to Barrett or “Little” Ringstead 1. The decoration on Face C is particularly worn, though the outline of the vertical and lateral arm of an “E-6” cross is discernible.

DISCUSSION: See 3.

DATE: Mid-tenth to mid-eleventh century.

REFERENCES: Unpublished.

3. Beachamwell 2: Grave-marker (fragment) (Pls. 4, 6-7).

PRESENT LOCATION: See 1.

EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: See 2.

H. 26 cm  W. 14 < 18.5 cm  D. 7.5 cm

Stone Type: Barnack shelly oolite (limestone).

PRESENT CONDITION: See 2.

DESCRIPTION: Face A preserves an edge of the vertical and the lateral arm of a type “E-6” cross.⁷ The decoration on Face C is badly worn, though the partial outlines of “E-6” cross-arms are visible. See 2.

DISCUSSION (2-3): Acknowledging consistencies of stone type, decoration and damage, Beachamwell 1-2 likely derive from the same monument. Based on Fox’s typology, this sculpture was a “Type B” grave-marker.⁸ Evidence from Cambridge Castle, Peterborough Cathedral, Hunston (St Michael’s) and Helpston (St Botolph’s) suggests that such markers were associated with recumbent monuments, functioning as head- and/or foot-stones (see vol. 1, pp. 141-154). Similar funerary “suites”,

⁶ Cramp, *Grammar of Anglo-Saxon Ornament*, p. xvi, fig. 2.
⁸ See vol. 1, fig. 14, p. 139; Fox, “Anglo-Saxon Monumental Sculpture”, pl. 7.
comprising recumbent and vertical monuments, are documented from the Anglo-Scandinavian cemetery beneath York Minster. Beachamwell is not recorded in Domesday Book, though wealth was obviously concentrated at the site, evidenced by the presence of stone sculpture.

DATE: Mid-tenth to mid-eleventh century.

REFERENCES: Unpublished.

A.iii. Bodney, St Mary’s. TL 83269872.

4. Bodney 1: Recumbent monument (fragment) (Pl. 8).

PRESENT LOCATION: Northeast buttress of chancel.

EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: Unknown.

H. 16 < 17.5 cm W. 19 < 21 cm D. (measurable) 2 cm

STONE TYPE: Barnack shelly oolite (limestone).

PRESENT CONDITION: Weathered.

DESCRIPTION: This fragment has apparently been broken or cut along each of its edges. Its decoration comprises a layered register of four-cord interlace, positioned horizontally.

DISCUSSION: According to Domesday Book, Bodney was a royal vill in the mid-eleventh century held by seven sokemanii, one of whom is identified as “Bondi”.\(^9\) Domesday implies that Bodney was a form of royal inland, supplying “H[arold]” (probably King Harold Godwinson, d. 1066) with six days annual produce, likely akin to the “food-rent” programme instituted by Abbot Leofsige of Ely post-1029.\(^10\)

Acknowledging its sixteen indentured peasants and the size and diversity of its

---


agricultural enterprise, Bodney was probably a wealthy vill.\textsuperscript{11} Thus, Bodney 1 is likely associated with one of its free land-holders; its decoration (consistent with the Fenland Group's) can perhaps be interpreted in the context of royal benefaction of religious houses, manifested at Bodney through the king's possession of sake and soke.

DATE: Mid-tenth to mid-eleventh century.


A.iv. Cringleford, St Peter's. TG 19840586.

5. Cringleford 1: Recumbent monument (fragment) (Pl. 9).

PRESENT LOCATION: Nave interior, west wall.

EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: Recovered in 1898 from the fabric of the rood-loft staircase.

H. 27 cm W. 33 < 37.5 cm D. (measurable) .5 < 1 cm\textsuperscript{12}

STONE TYPE: Barnack shelly oolite (limestone).\textsuperscript{13}

PRESENT CONDITION: The extant carving is well-preserved with the exception of slight damage to the upper left corner of the right interlaced band and the upper right corner of the central bar.

DESCRIPTION: This fragment's upper and lower edges have been cut; slight tapering and roll-mouldings are visible on its lateral edges. Its decoration comprises two interlaced registers (one four-cord, the other three-) separated by a vertical bar; cord-layering is discernible at crossing-points.

\textsuperscript{11} Domesday Book (Williams and Martin, eds., 2002), pp. 1093, 1150-1151.

\textsuperscript{12} According to Cogswell, some of the Cringleford stones (1-3, 5-7) exceed six inches in thickness. See T. Cogswell, "On some Ancient Stone fragments found in Cringleford Church", Norfolk Archaeology 14 (1901), pp. 1-4, at 2.

\textsuperscript{13} Cogswell terms this "hard sandstone". See Cogswell, "On some Ancient Stone fragments", p. 2.
DISCUSSION: See 11.

DATE: Mid-tenth to mid-eleventh century.

REFERENCES: See 11.

6. Cringleford 2: Recumbent monument or monuments (fragments) (Pls. 10-11).

PRESENT LOCATION: See 5.

EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: See 5.

H. 19.5 cm  W. 23 cm  D. (measurable) 2.5 cm

STONE TYPE: Barnack shelly oolite (limestone).

PRESENT CONDITION: Gouges and chips are also visible on the fragment’s lower left corner and edge.

DESCRIPTION: The fragment’s left edge has been cut, and the upper edge has been broken, resulting in a prominent sloping fracture to its upper left corner. Its decoration comprises a centrally-placed register of (?) four-cord interlace, framed by high-relief, rectangular mouldings on the left edge and base; a shallow-relief rectangular bar (distinct from the lower moulding) frames the register’s right edge. Cord-layering is visible at crossing-points.

DISCUSSION: See 11.

DATE: Mid-tenth to mid-eleventh century.

REFERENCES: See 11.

7. Cringleford 3: Recumbent monument or monuments (fragments) (Pls. 10, 12).

PRESENT LOCATION: See 5.

\[^{14}\text{See n. 12.}\]
EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: See 5.

H. 16.5 cm  W. 22 cm  D. (measurable) 2 cm\(^{15}\)

STONE TYPE: Barnack shelly oolite (limestone).

PRESENT CONDITION: This rectilinear fragment’s upper edge has been broken, and its lateral edges are worn.

DESCRIPTION: Like Cringleford 2, this fragment comprises a centrally-placed register of (?) four-cord interlace framed by rectangular mouldings. Its lateral edges and base may have been cut, though their weathered condition prohibits definitive assessment.

DISCUSSION: See 11.

DATE: Mid-tenth to mid-eleventh century.

REFERENCES: See 11.

8. Cringleford 4: Recumbent monument (fragment) (Pl. 13).

PRESENT LOCATION: See 5.

EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: See 5.

H. 93.9 cm  W. 20.3 < 34.2 cm  D. 13.9 cm (measurable) 1.5 < 2 cm\(^{16}\)

STONE TYPE: Barnack shelly oolite (limestone).

PRESENT CONDITION: This fragment is slightly weathered. Its left edge has been cut, and gouging and chipping are visible along the right edge.

DESCRIPTION: This rectilinear stone preserves roll-mouldings on its upper, lower and right edges and exhibits slight tapering. Its decoration comprises two panels of four-cord interlace (exhibiting cord-layering), delineated from each other and the

\(^{15}\) Ibid.

\(^{16}\) Cogswell records that the fragment’s thickness is 5½” (13.9 cm). *Ibid.*, p. 2.
fragment's right edge by low-relief, rectangular borders. The upper panel is surmounted by the right side of a type “B-6” cross, also executed in low-relief.

DISCUSSION: See 11.

DATE: Mid-tenth to mid-eleventh century.

REFERENCES: See 11.


PRESENT LOCATION: Chancel interior, south wall.

EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: See 5.

H. 22 cm  W. 17 cm  D. (measurable) 1.5 cm

STONE TYPE: Barnack shelly oolite (limestone).

PRESENT CONDITION: This fragment is generally well-preserved, exhibiting only slight evidence of weathering.

DESCRIPTION: This fragment's base and its right edge have been cut; the top and the left edge apparently preserve original roll-mouldings. Its decoration comprises the upper left quadrant of a circular type “E-6” cross, occupying the fragment’s lower right corner. Ooliths are prominent on the stone’s surfaces.

DISCUSSION: See 11.

DATE: Mid-tenth to mid-eleventh century.

REFERENCES: See 11.


PRESENT LOCATION: See 9.

EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: See 5.

---

H. 22 cm  W. 17.5 cm  D. (measurable) 1.5 cm

STONE TYPE: Barnack shelly oolite (limestone).

PRESENT CONDITION: The fragment's upper, lower and left edges have been cut; its right edge is seemingly intact, preserving evidence of a roll-moulding.

DESCRIPTION: This fragment comprises the lower right quadrant of a circular type “E-6” cross, surmounting a rectilinear shaft. A panel of (?) four-cord interlace abuts the shaft, the terminus of which is preserved. Ooliths are prominent on the stone's surfaces.

DISCUSSION: See 11.

DATE: Mid-tenth to mid-eleventh century.

REFERENCES: See 11.

11. Cringleford 7: Recumbent monument (fragment) (Pl. 17).

PRESENT LOCATION: See 9.

EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: See 5.

H. 29.5 cm  W. 25.5 cm  D. (measurable) 2 cm

STONE TYPE: Barnack shelly oolite (limestone).

PRESENT CONDITION: The fragment's condition is generally good, though evidence of gouging and chipping is visible on its upper, lower and right edges.

DESCRIPTION: This fragment's upper, lower and right edges have been either broken or cut. A vertical bar, executed in low-relief, delineates the fragment's right edge. A wedge-shaped projection extends from the bar, with adorsed “step”-patterns on either side.

---

18 Ibid.
19 Ibid.
DISCUSSION (5-11): Based on formal and decorative evidence (including spatial relationships), the Cringleford fragments likely comprise four or five recumbent funerary monuments characteristic of the Fenland Group. In Fox's typology, Cringleford 1 is representative of Types "2"-"4" and "6". Cringleford 2-3 are probably remnants of the same monument (also corresponding to Fox's Types "2"-"4" and "6") and could, conceivably, derive from the same monument as Cringleford 1. Cringleford 4 is a "Type 4" recumbent monument, analogous to Little Shelford 1, whereas Cringleford 5-6 (probably from the same monument) are examples of "Type 6" stones, akin to Cambridge Castle 1, Whittlesford 1 and Willingham 1. Cringleford 7, with its distinctive adorsed "step"-pattern, is seemingly derivative of "Type 5" slabs and is related to Little Shelford 2 and Aldham 1.

As discussed in Chapters 4-5, the Fenland Group is characterized by a limited repertoire of motifs and motif-combinations which seemingly evoke tenth- and eleventh-century eschatology. Its associated monuments are probable expressions of lordly status and tenurial privilege and may represent founder- or dynastic-burials associated with manorial churches. Acknowledging the paucity of workable stone in East Anglia, oolite was probably imported from the Barnack quarries through the Fenland waterways, though Cringleford's isolation from the Barnack region vis à vis riverine communication suggests that stone was also trans-shipped (using both riverine and sea routes) via the Wash. Such importation undoubtedly increased both the cost and prestige of stone sculptures in East Anglia. Domesday records that Cringleford was a wealthy settlement in the eleventh century with "Alfred" (a

---

20 See vol. 1, figs. 11-13, pp. 136-138; Fox, "Anglo-Saxon Monumental Sculpture", pls. 3-5.
21 Ibid., fig. 12, p. 137; pl. 4.
22 Ibid., fig. 13, p. 138; pl. 5.
23 Everson and Stocker, CASSS, vol. 5, pp. 48-49.
sokeman priest) holding one carucate of land. Twenty-four other sokemanii are also recorded at Cringleford with various holdings. It is possible that the Cringleford fragments are associated with the settlement’s tenurial lord or with one or more of these free land-holders.

DATE: Mid-tenth to mid-eleventh century.


A.v. Houghton, St Mary’s. TF 871052.


PRESENT LOCATION: North face of church tower. 

EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: Unknown.

H. ? W. ? D. ?

STONE TYPE: Unknown.

PRESENT CONDITION: Weathered.

DESCRIPTION: According to Davey, the fragment comprises a partial panel of four-cord interlace.

DISCUSSION: Though Houghton is mentioned in Domesday, no reference to its pre-Conquest tenurial history is recorded. One sokeman with thirty acres and six indentured peasants is recorded in 1086, as is a landless church (presumably, St Mary’s) held by “Ralph”. Ralph was probably a lord, as Domesday mentions that

25 Ibid.
26 R. Davey, per. com. 15/10/06.
27 Ibid.
28 Ibid.
30 Ibid.
he "holds" nine other *sokemanii* in the area. It is possible that a similar organization of land-holding existed in the pre-Conquest *vill*; if so, then Houghton 1 could be associated with either a wealthy *sokeman* or a lord, perhaps a relative of Ralph.

**DATE:** Mid-tenth to mid-eleventh century.

**REFERENCES:** Unpublished. Personal reference from R. Davey (15/10/2006).

A.vi. North Pickenham, St Andrew's, TF 86560694.


**PRESENT LOCATION:** East face of west tower.

**EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY:** Unknown.

H. (approx.) 10.16 cm  W. (approx.) 30.48 cm  D. (measurable, approx.) 1.27 cm

**STONE TYPE:** Barnack shelly oolite (limestone).

**PRESENT CONDITION:** Badly weathered.

**DESCRIPTION:** This fragment has been broken or cut along each of its edges. Its decoration seemingly comprises a horizontal, interlaced register of indeterminate form and cord-number.

**DISCUSSION:** *Domesday* records that North and South Pickenham were a *berewick* of Sporle, a manor in the *demesne* of King Edward in the mid-eleventh century. Twenty-six free land-holders are recorded in the *berewick*, including "Godwine" and "Asforthr". Its thirty-eight indentured peasants, coupled with its diverse economy (including agriculture, milling and fishing) suggest that the *berewick*’s land-holders were considerably wealthy. North Pickenham 1 is possibly a manifestation of that

---

31 Ibid.
32 Ibid., p. 1059.
34 Ibid.
wealth. Though its apparent interlaced decoration could be derivative of the Fenland Group, its weathered condition prevents definitive association.

DATE: ?Mid-tenth to mid-eleventh century.


14. Norwich, St Martin-at-Palace 1: Recumbent monument (fragment) (Pl. 19).

PRESENT LOCATION: Norfolk Archaeology.

EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: Recovered in 1987 from a post-hole during excavation of St Martin-at-Palace.

H. 16 < 31cm W. 5.5 < 22 cm D. 13 cm

STONE TYPE: Barnack shelly oolite (limestone).

PRESENT CONDITION: This fragment is broken on each edge; a deep gouge extends diagonally across the upper right corner of the decorated surface.

DESCRIPTION: See 16.

DISCUSSION: See 16.

DATE: ca early eleventh century.\(^{35}\)

REFERENCES: See 16.

15. Norwich, St Martin-at-Palace 2: Recumbent monument (fragment) (Pl. 19).

PRESENT LOCATION: See 14.

EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: See 14.

H. 11 < 12 cm W. 7.5 < 9.5 cm D. 13 cm

STONE TYPE: Barnack shelly oolite (limestone).

\(^{35}\) See Beazley and Ayers, *Two Medieval Churches in Norfolk*, pp. 1-14.
PRESENT CONDITION: This fragment is broken on its upper and lateral edges; its lower edge may have been cut.

DESCRIPTION: See 16.

DISCUSSION: See 16.

DATE: *ca* early eleventh century.

REFERENCES: See 16.


PRESENT LOCATION: See 14.

EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: See 14.

H. 13 < 14 cm  W. 4 cm  D. 13 cm

STONE TYPE: Barnack shelly oolite (limestone).

DESCRIPTION: See vol. 1, p. 277.

DISCUSSION (14-16): The fragments' interlace, analogous to “Type F”, is similar to Granchester 1 and Cambridge, Little St Mary’s 1.

DATE: *ca* early eleventh century.


A.viii. Norwich, St Vedast’s. TG 23740859.


PRESENT LOCATION: Norwich Castle Museum.
EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: Recovered from the fabric of a house on Rose Lane, Norwich, in 1896.\textsuperscript{36}

H. 88 cm  W. 30.5 < 43 cm  D. 21 < 30 cm

STONE TYPE: Barnack shelly oolite (limestone).

PRESENT CONDITION: The upper shaft has been broken, and the base and lateral edges exhibit gouging and chipping. Face A preserves evidence of polychrome, and Face B is badly weathered.


DISCUSSION: The St Vedast Cross had been built into the fabric of a house on Rose Lane, approximately 310 m northwest of Norwich Castle. Antiquarian accounts describe the stone positioned horizontally in one of the building's exterior walls, heavily whitewashed, and resting on what is now its narrow, undecorated face.\textsuperscript{37} The house had been erected on the site of the Church of Sts Vedast and Amant (demolished in 1540) and had incorporated part of the churchyard wall into which the stone had been built.\textsuperscript{38} When Rose Lane was widened in 1896, the architectural fabric preserving the St Vedast Cross was demolished; the monument was recovered by Mr. F.B. Crowe who subsequently donated it to the Norwich Castle Museum.\textsuperscript{39}

See \textit{vol. 1}, pp. 276-279.

DATE: \textit{ca} mid-tenth to mid-eleventh century.


\textsuperscript{36} W. Hudson, "On a Sculptured Stone recently removed from a House on the Site of the Church of St Vedast, Norwich", \textit{Norfolk Archaeology} 13 (1898), pp. 116-124, at 117.

\textsuperscript{37} \textit{Ibid}. It is likely that the St Vedast Cross was sculpted on each of its sides; those faces which no longer exhibit decoration were re-cut, facilitating the stone's use as building material. The modification of the shaft's undecorated broad face (together with the sides of its two narrow faces) was observed in May, 2006 when the monument was inspected and photographed by the author.

\textsuperscript{38} Margeson, \textit{Vikings in Norfolk}, p. 24.

\textsuperscript{39} Hudson, "On a Sculptured Stone", p. 117.
24-25, fig. 30; Margeson, Seillier and Rogerson (1994), p. 3, fig. 2; Reed (2007), pp. 122-124, 132-134, pls. 1-2.


18. Rockland 1: Recumbent monument (Pl. 25).

PRESENT LOCATION: Built into the chancel floor.

EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: Recovered in two pieces ca 1860 from beneath the porch floor and from the south side of the tower.  

H. 161.29 cm W. 38.10 < 53.34 cm D. 10.16 < 12.7 cm

STONE TYPE: “Coarse strong sandstone”.  

PRESENT CONDITION: The monument’s carved surface is weathered.

DESCRIPTION: This slab is tapered and preserves a subtle coped ridge. It exhibits a centrally-placed cross-shaft, the ends of which terminate in circular, type “E-6” cross-heads. Panels of four-cord interlace are disposed on either side of the cross-shaft at the narrow end; panels of similar size and proportion seemingly framed four quadripartite knots at the slab’s wider end. According to Fox’s typology, this monument is a “Type 6” slab; its closest parallels are Whittlesford 1 and Willingham 4.

DISCUSSION: According to Domesday Book, the soke of Rockland (All Saints’ or St Andrew) was held by the royal manor of Buckenham (near Attleborough) in the mid-eleventh century. Ten free land-holders (one identified as “Broddi”) and twenty-seven indentured peasants are recorded in the vill, participating in diverse agricultural enterprise. The vill’s size and prosperity, coupled with its

---

commendation to a royal manor, suggests that Rockland 1 is associated with one of the vill's free land-holders and is likely informed, stylistically, by traditions of royal benefaction of religious houses.

DATE: Mid-tenth to mid-eleventh century.


A.x. Thetford, ?St John's. TL 865828.


PRESENT LOCATION: Norfolk Museums and Archaeology Service, Gressenhall.

EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: Recovered in 1963 from the grounds of Queensway Primary School, Thetford, then displayed in Charles Burrell High School, Thetford, until 2002 when it was donated to the Norfolk Museums and Archaeology Service.

H. 230 cm  W. 57 cm  D. 17 cm

STONE TYPE: Barnack shelly oolite (limestone).

PRESENT CONDITION: The monument's general condition is excellent, though a prominent, diagonal fracture is visible on one narrow face.

DESCRIPTION: This monument exhibits a centrally-placed cross-shaft, the ends of which terminate in circular, type "E-6" cross-heads. Panels of four-cord interlace are disposed on either side of the cross-shaft, and weathered, roll-mouldings are visible on each edge.

DISCUSSION: Stylistically, Thetford 1 is an example of Fox's "Type 6" recumbent monuments; its closest parallels are Cambridge Castle 1, Whittlesford 1 and Willingham 1, demonstrating that this form circulated widely throughout East
Anglia. As recounted in Liber Eliensis, Ælfwaru bequeathed lands and fisheries at Thetford to the monks of Ely ca 1007. Fairweather has observed that the "Thetford" mentioned in Ælfwaru's bequest is ambiguous, perhaps referencing Thetford, Nf, or Little Thetford, C. Domesday records that both Thetfords were dependencies (either whole or in part) of Ely ca 1086. Three churches, a house and two messuages in Thetford (Nf) are attributed to the Abbot of Ely, while Little Thetford is identified as a berewick (outlying estate) of the monastery. Thus, Thetford 1 is a possible manifestation of Ely's cultural influence in a specific hinterland, perhaps acquired in the early eleventh century.

DATE: Mid-tenth to mid-eleventh century.


A.xi. Whissonsett, St Mary’s. TF 91902336.


PRESENT LOCATION: East nave wall, South side.

EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: Excavated in 1902 from St Mary’s churchyard.

H. 64.5 cm W. (shaft) 28 < 28.2 cm D. (shaft) 12 < 14 cm Dia. 43 cm D. (Head) 9 < 12 cm

44 Liber Eliensis, II.61 (Blake, ed., 1962), p. 133; Liber Eliensis, II.61 (Fairweather, trans., 2005), p. 159. Ælfwaru’s benefaction, including land at Hingham, Weeting, Rattlesden and Munford, included two gold crosses, supporting the author’s contention that precious objects—especially altar crosses—signified tenurial privilege through gifts of land. See vol. 1, p. 113. "lnsuper addidit Hengeham et Vetinge et Ratlesdene et Mundeford et scrinium cum reliquis, quod gradatum feretrum vocabant, et duas cruces operatas ex auro et argento et gemmis pretiosis, quas Nigel/us episcopus postea tu/it et contrivit."

45 Liber Eliensis, II.61 (Fairweather, trans., 2005), p. 159, n. 294

STONE TYPE: Barnack shelly oolite (limestone).

PRESENT CONDITION: The cross-shaft has been broken or cut. The carving is well-preserved, exhibiting slight abrasions and chipping on raised surfaces and edges.

DESCRIPTION: See vol. 1, pp. 155-156.

DISCUSSION: See vol. 1, pp. 302-304.

DATE: Mid-tenth to mid-eleventh century.

REFERENCES: Collingwood (1904), passim; Fox (1920-1921), pp. 16-19, pl. 2; Cozens-Hardy (1934-1935), p. 330, pl. 16; Plunkett (1984), pp. 172, 358, pl. 56.

B. Suffolk

B.i. Aldham, St Mary’s. TM 04084445.

21. Aldham 1: Recumbent monument (fragment) (Pl. 33).

PRESENT LOCATION: Internal splay of the second window in the south wall of the nave.

EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: Recovered ca 1881-1891 during restoration of the tower, nave and chancel.

H. 26 < 33 cm  W. 30 cm  D. (measurable) 2.5 < 3.5 cm

STONE TYPE: Barnack shelly oolite (limestone).

PRESENT CONDITION: The carved surfaces exhibit slight weathering and are generally well-preserved.

DESCRIPTION: The top, right and bottom edges of this fragment have been cut, the latter probably to facilitate its positioning in the window splay in the nineteenth century. The fragment’s decoration comprises a centrally-placed bar, semi-circular in profile and executed in high relief, with rectilinear panels of four-cord interlace.
disposed on either side. A compressed step-motif, akin to Cramp’s “Step 1”, is visible at the base of the left interlaced register, suggesting that Aldham 1 is an inverted example of Fox’s “Type 5” recumbent monuments.\textsuperscript{47} A flat moulding is discernible on the fragment’s left edge.

DISCUSSION: See 22.

DATE: Mid-tenth to mid-eleventh century.


\begin{itemize}
\item 22. Aldham 2: Architectural detail (fragment) (Pl. 34).
\item PRESENT LOCATION: Exterior southwest corner of nave.
\item EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: See 21.
\item H. 50 cm  W. 18 cm  D. (measurable) 8.5 cm
\item STONE TYPE: Barnack shelly oolite (limestone).
\item PRESENT CONDITION: The fragment’s carved decoration is weathered.
\item DESCRIPTION: This rectilinear stone’s upper edge has been cut; its lateral edges have been broken. The relief-carved decoration, comprising a median-incised two-strand “twist” with cord-layering at crossing-points, is displayed in a rectangular panel, demarcated by a plain, raised moulding, distinct from the monument’s edges.\textsuperscript{48} This is the only example of ribbon ornament with median-incision in Suffolk.\textsuperscript{49} Plunkett suggests that Aldham 2 derives either from an architectural context or from a recumbent monument.\textsuperscript{50}
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{47} This contention is supported by the fragment’s upward tapering. See Cramp, \textit{Grammar of Anglo-Saxon Ornament}, p. xlv, fig. 27; and Fox, “Anglo-Saxon Monumental Sculpture”, pl. 5.


\textsuperscript{49} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{50} Ibid.
DISCUSSION (21-22): Aldham 1, with its high-relief, central bar, rounded in profile, is analogous to Blaxhall 1 and Grantchester 1-2, while its compressed step-motif is characteristic of Little Shelford 1-2, perhaps demonstrative of experimentation within the formal and stylistic parameters of the Fenland Group. Aldham 2 is unique among East Anglia’s Late Saxon sculpture. Its median-incised, two-strand “twist” and its “foreshortened” moulding have no exemplars among the Fenland recumbent monuments, perhaps suggesting that the fragment derives from an architectural context. 51

According to Domesday Book, Aldham was a wealthy manor in the mid-eleventh century held by Wulfwine, though by 1086, it had apparently become a dependency of Bury St Edmunds. 52 It is likely that Aldham 1-2 are associated with the lordship of Wulfwine, perhaps remnants of his or his family’s interments and Aldham’s manorial church. With the ascendancy of Bury St Edmund’s jurisdiction at Aldham sometime in the late eleventh century, it is also possible that Aldham 1-2 are manifestations of Bury’s influence in its hinterlands.

DATE: Mid-tenth to mid-eleventh century.


B.ii. Blaxhall, St Peter’s. TM 35675698.

23. Blaxhall 1: Recumbent monument (fragment) (Pl. 35).

PRESENT LOCATION: West nave wall, south side.

51 Median-incised interlace is discernible, however, on one upright slab (Helpston 2) and one small cross (Whissonsett 1).

EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: Unknown (perhaps associated with restoration work in 1863).
H. 33 cm  W. 35 < 42 cm  D. (measurable) 6 cm
STONE TYPE: Barnack shelly oolite (limestone).
PRESENT CONDITION: Much of the carved decoration is badly damaged.
DESCRIPTION: This fragment’s upper and, possibly, left edges have been cut; severe gouging and chipping is visible on the lower edge and on the central and left portions of the carved surface. The right edge preserves an apparent chamfered moulding. The fragment’s decoration comprises two rectilinear panels of four-cord interlace, disposed on either side of an incised—or very low-relief—bar. The stone slab mounted above Blaxhall 1, with a prominent rounded edge, is of unknown date and function.
DISCUSSION: Though Blaxhall 1 exhibits formal and stylistic elements associated with the Fenland Group (moulded edges—usually rounded—and interlaced panels arranged on either side of a centrally-placed bar), its damage prohibits definitive identification vis à vis Fox’s typology. Domesday records that the Half-Hundred of Parham (in which Blaxhall is located) was held by Ælfric, a thegn of King Edward, in the mid-eleventh century. By 1086, the Abbot of Ely held the soke of Blaxhall, though when this was acquired is unclear. Domesday also mentions numerous sokemanii at Blaxhall in the mid-eleventh century, many with substantial holdings. Thus, Blaxhall 1 is probably attributable to the thegn Ælfric of Parham or to the various freemen mentioned as land-holders at Blaxhall (“Brothir”, “Eadric” “Grim”, “Wulfric” or “Huna”). Acknowledging Blaxhall’s subsequent association with the

53 Ibid., pp. 1198-1199.
54 Ibid., p. 1205.
55 Ibid., pp. 1198-1199, 1205, 1228, 1234, 1257, 1289.
Abbot of Ely, its form and decoration are perhaps illustrative of contact with, and/or the influence of, Ely ateliers.

DATE: Mid-tenth to mid-eleventh century.


B.iii. Bury St Edmunds, St Edmund’s Abbey. TL 85886428.

24. Bury St Edmunds 1: Recumbent or composite monument (fragment) (Pls. 36-37).

PRESENT LOCATION: Outer wall of the ambulatory of the eleventh-century crypt.

EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: Recovered in 1955 during site clearance.

H. 33.5 < 40 cm  W. 24.5 cm  D. (measurable) 8.5 cm

STONE TYPE: Barnack shelly oolite (limestone).

PRESENT CONDITION: The carving is well-preserved.

DESCRIPTION: The upper and lateral edges of this stone have been broken. Its decoration comprises a panel of three-strand interlace, delimited by a roll-moulding on one longitudinal edge and a strip-moulding on the other. An in situ iron fitting is visible in the stone’s strip-moulding.

DISCUSSION: Plunkett suggests this fragment derives from a recumbent monument, of indeterminate form, whereas Gem and Keen posit that it is a remnant of a composite object, possibly a screen.56 Stylistically, the fragment is consistent with the Fenland Group. For a discussion of Bury St Edmunds in the Late Saxon period, see vol. 1, pp. 116-119.

DATE: Mid-tenth to mid-eleventh century.

---


B.iv. Frmsden, St Mary’s. TM 20045980.

25. Frmsden 1: Figural plaque (Pl. 38).

PRESENT LOCATION: Internal splay of northwest chancel window.

EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: Unknown.

H. 24.5 cm

STONE TYPE: Barnack shelly oolite (limestone).

PRESENT CONDITION: The carving is well-preserved; some chipping is visible on the panel’s edges.


DATE: ?Eleventh or twelfth century.\(^7\)


PRESENT LOCATION: Garden of Great Ashfield House.

EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: See vol. 1, pp. 162-163.

H. 320.04 cm  W. 35.56 cm  D. 30.48 cm

STONE TYPE: Barnack shelly oolite (limestone).

PRESENT CONDITION: The cross was repaired and relocated to Great Ashfield House in the nineteenth century. Further repairs were undertaken ca 1984.

DESCRIPTION: This monolithic cross exhibits relief-carved asymmetrical vinescroll on its narrow faces, characterized by plain pendant leaves, analogous to the "half-moon" variety.58 One broad face exhibits the vestiges of a more complex foliate scroll, possibly with zoomorphic elements.59 The decorative programmes of both broad faces are badly worn through deployment of the upper portion of the monument as a footbridge.60 Ornament is preserved, however, on those sections that escaped this secondary use (the lower third of each).

The Great Ashfield cross-shaft is surmounted by a circular, unpierced head. Both faces of the cross-head have been worn smooth and hollowed through the aforementioned secondary use; thus, the equilateral cross carved in low-relief on one face might be a recent addition (cf. Kedington 1).61 Beneath the cross-head are a series of three graduated imposts. These project laterally from the shaft's narrow faces, forming a distinct transition between the cross-head and the shaft's chamfered edges. See vol. 1, p. 159.

DISCUSSION: See vol. 1, pp. 159, 162-164, 304-305.

DATE: ?Mid to late tenth century.62


58 Cramp, Grammar of Anglo-Saxon Ornament, p. xxvi, fig. 11.
62 Ibid., p. 324.
B.vi. Hunston, St Michael's. TL 97586806.

27. Hunston 1: Grave-marker (Pls. 45-46).

PRESENT LOCATION: South transept, east wall.

EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: Unknown.

H. 37 < 48 cm  W. (shoulder) 6 < 28.5 cm  Dia. 31 cm  D. 6.5 < 7.5 cm

STONE TYPE: Barnack shelly oolite (limestone).

PRESENT CONDITION: The carving is well-preserved; some chipping is visible on
the stone’s edges.

DESCRIPTION: One of the monument’s lateral edges (including both shoulder and
rounded head) has been broken; its base has been cut diagonally. Its head exhibits a
low-relief type “E-6” cross, extending to the monument’s edge, embellished with a
second, incised cross, replicating the internal contour of the type “E-6” form. This
decoration is preserved on both broad faces.

DISCUSSION: See 32.

DATE: Mid-tenth to mid-eleventh century.

REFERENCES: See 32.

28. Hunston 2: Recumbent monument or grave-marker (fragment) (Pl. 47).

PRESENT LOCATION: South transept, west wall.

EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: Unknown.

H. 47 < 54 cm  W. 33 < 43 cm  D. 8 cm

STONE TYPE: Barnack shelly oolite (limestone).

PRESENT CONDITION: The stone is badly weathered; most of the carving is
eroded.
DESCRIPTION: This fragment has been broken along its lower and right edges. The upper edge is seemingly rounded, and the left edge might preserve evidence of a roll-moulding. The vestiges of a relief-carved cruciform (of indeterminate type) are preserved on the fragment’s broad face.

DISCUSSION: See 32.

DATE: Mid-tenth to mid-eleventh century.

REFERENCES: See 32.

29. Hunston 3: Recumbent monument or grave-marker (fragment) (Pl. 48).

PRESENT LOCATION: See 28.

EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: Unknown.

H. 4.5 < 44 cm W. 8 < 31 cm D. 9 cm

STONE TYPE: Barnack shelly oolite (limestone).

PRESENT CONDITION: Like Hunston 2, this fragment is badly weathered.

DESCRIPTION: This fragment has been broken along its upper and lower edges, though its left edge preserves evidence of a roll moulding. The stone might preserve evidence of relief-carved decoration, demarcated by the lower edge of a rectilinear border. Its pattern of breakage is consistent with Hunston 2, perhaps suggesting they derive from the same monument.

DISCUSSION: See 32.

DATE: Mid-tenth to mid-eleventh century.

REFERENCES: See 32.


PRESENT LOCATION: See 28.
EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: Unknown.
H. 48.3 < 55.9 cm  W. 21.6 < 30.5 cm  D. 3 < 3.5 cm
STONE TYPE: Barnack shelly oolite (limestone).
PRESENT CONDITION: The stone's surfaces are badly weathered.
DESCRIPTION: This fragment has been broken along each of its three edges, though its longest exhibits apparent evidence of partial oblique cut; it has no discernible decoration or finished edges.
DISCUSSION: See 32.
DATE: Mid-tenth to mid-eleventh century.
REFERENCES: See 32.

31. Hunston 5: Recumbent monument or grave-marker (fragment) (Pl. 50).
PRESENT LOCATION: See 28.
EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: Unknown.
H. 18.5 < 23 cm  W. 24.8 < 25.5 cm  D. 5 < 6 cm
STONE TYPE: Barnack shelly oolite (limestone).
PRESENT CONDITION: Like Hunston 2-4, this stone is badly weathered.
DESCRIPTION: This fragment has been broken along its upper and lateral edges. Its lower edge is not moulded, though it does appear finished. The stone's broad surface is uneven; this might constitute eroded, relief-carved decoration.
DISCUSSION: See 32.
DATE: Mid-tenth to mid-eleventh century.
REFERENCES: See 32.

32. Hunston 6: Grave-marker (fragment) (Pl. 51).
PRESENT LOCATION: See 28.

EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: Unknown.

H. 13 < 26.5 cm  W. 14 < 25 cm  D. 4.5 cm

STONE TYPE: Barnack shelly oolite (limestone).

PRESENT CONDITION: This stone is weathered; its edges are chipped and gouged.

DESCRIPTION: This fragment has been broken or cut along its upper and left edges. Its lower and right edges are apparently finished though it exhibits no discernible decoration; however, its form is suggestive of the shoulder of an upright monument (akin to Hunston 1).

DISCUSSION (27-32): As discussed in Chapter 5, upright slabs with cruciform decoration are characteristic of the Fenland Group and were likely erected in association with recumbent monuments. Evidence of such funerary “suites” is suggested at Hunston, Cambridge Castle, Helpston and Peterborough Cathedral. The Anglo-Scandinavian cemetery beneath York Minster preserved evidence of similar memorial traditions (see vol. 1, pp. 149-150). According to Domesday, Hunston was held in the mid-eleventh century as a manor by Edith, possibly in demesne of the Abbot of St Edmund’s.63 Hunston 1-6 could, therefore, be associated with Edith or, perhaps, with one of the seven sokemanni in her commendation; if Bury can, indeed, be associated with Hunston in the mid-eleventh century, then Hunston 1-6 might also be manifestations of the abbey’s artistic and religious influence.

DATE: Mid-tenth to mid-eleventh century.


B.vii. Huntingfield, St Mary the Virgin. TM 33617436.

33. Huntingfield 1: Recumbent monument (fragment) (Pl. 52).

PRESENT LOCATION: Internal east wall of tower.

EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: Unknown.

H. 20.5 cm W. ? D. ?

STONE TYPE: Barnack shelly oolite (limestone).

PRESENT CONDITION: The carving is generally well-preserved, though some surface abrasions are discernible.

DESCRIPTION: This fragment has been cut along its lower and left edges; its upper edge may have been broken. Its decoration comprises the end closure of a continuous panel of three-strand interlace demarcated by a square moulding.

DISCUSSION: See 35.

DATE: Mid-tenth to mid-eleventh century.


34. Huntingfield 2: Recumbent monument (fragment) (Pls. 52-53).

PRESENT LOCATION: See 33.

EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: Unknown.

H. 33.5 cm W. ? D. ?

STONE TYPE: Barnack shelly oolite (limestone).

PRESENT CONDITION: See 33.

DESCRIPTION: This fragment has been broken along its lower and left edges; its upper edge may have been cut. Its decoration comprises what is likely a low-relief, type "B-6" cross. Panels of four-cord interlace occupy the interstices formed by the convergence of the cross-arms and -shaft.

DISCUSSION: See 35.
DATE: Mid-tenth to mid-eleventh century.


35. Huntingfield 3: Recumbent monument (fragment) (Pls. 52-53).

PRESENT LOCATION: See 33.

EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: Unknown.

H. 22.5 cm  W. ?  D. ?

STONE TYPE: Barnack shelly oolite (limestone).

PRESENT CONDITION: See 33.

DESCRIPTION: This stone has been cut along its upper edge; its lower edge may have been cut or broken. Its visible face exhibits a panel of three-strand interlace, the lateral edges of which are delimited by plain and squared mouldings.

DISCUSSION (33-35): Though Lang suggests that Huntingfield 2 is an example of Fox’s “Type 2” recumbent monuments, its closest parallel is Little Shelford 1, a “Type 4” slab.64 Plunkett interprets Huntingfield 2’s “elegant” and “delicately refined” carving as evidence of early manufacture, contrasting it with the “coarse [delineation]” of Ixworth 1.65 As mentioned in Chapter 1 (see p. 5, n. 9), such theorization, informed by a linear interpretation of style, is counterproductive concerning the Fenland Group. Plunkett also suggests that Huntingfield 1 and 3 possibly derive from the narrow faces of a free-standing cross.66 Crosses characteristic of the Fenland Group are not decorated with interlace on their narrow faces; if Plunkett’s hypothesis is correct, then the monument from which Huntingfield 1 and 3 derive is unrelated to the Fenland Group and would be anomalous in the East Anglian corpus.

64 J. Lang, per. comm. to J. Griffin, 08/06/91.
66 Ibid.
According to *Domesday Book*, considerable wealth was concentrated at Huntingfield in the mid-eleventh century. “Eadric” held the area as a manor; his jurisdiction included two hundred additional acres (held by twenty-one freemen) and Lindeast (Magna and Parva, held as a manor by “Wulfric”).

Huntingfield is very remote in relation to the Barnack quarries. Thus, importation of stone or finished monuments would have required considerable effort and expense; the subsequent display of such objects would have proclaimed and reinforced their patrons’ wealth and status.

DATE: Mid-tenth to mid-eleventh century.


B.viii. Ipswich, St Nicholas'. TM 16154432.

36. Ipswich 1: Figural plaque (Pl. 54).

PRESENT LOCATION: Internal northeast corner of nave.

EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: Discovered built into the fabric of St Nicholas' in 1848.

H. 53.5 cm  W. 86.8 < 88.4 cm  D. (measurable) 6 cm

STONE TYPE: Caen limestone.

PRESENT CONDITION: The plaque is weathered, and its edges and carved surface are gouged and chipped.

DESCRIPTION: See vol. 1, p. 168.

DISCUSSION: See vol. 1, pp. 186, 193-196, 199.

---

68 “[Huntingfield] is one of the most remote from the production centres and that in itself is interesting, especially as the other Suffolk examples (at Ixworth) were probably brought there through the Fenland river systems. [The Huntingfield sculptures], however, [are] more likely to have come round by sea as, we presume, did the single example in London”. D. Stocker, per. comm. to J. Griffin, 25.06.91.
DATE: ?Late-eleventh or early twelfth century.⁷⁰


37. Ipswich 2: Tympanum (Pls. 55-56).

PRESENT LOCATION: See 36.

EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: See 36.

H. (at apex) 54.5 cm W. (base) 99.5 cm D. 14 cm

STONE TYPE: Barnack or Ancaster limestone.⁷¹

PRESENT CONDITION: See 36.

DESCRIPTION: See vol. 1, p. 168.

DISCUSSION: See vol. 1, pp. 184-186, 193, 199.

DATE: ?Late-eleventh or early twelfth century.


38. Ipswich 3: ?Frieze or sarcophagus (fragment) (Pls. 57-58).

PRESENT LOCATION: See 36.

EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: See 36.

⁷¹ Ibid., p. 328.

PRESENT LOCATION: See 36.

EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: See 36.

H. 56 cm W. 22.5 < 24.6 cm D. 6 < 7 cm

STONE TYPE: Barnack shelly oolite (limestone).

PRESENT CONDITION: See 36; traces of original paint are visible.


DATE: ?Late-eleventh or early twelfth century.

REFERENCES: See 40.

40. Ipswich 5: ?Frieze or sarcophagus (fragment) (Pls. 57, 60).

PRESENT LOCATION: See 36.

EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: See 36.

H. 43.5 < 56 cm W. 2 < 21.5 cm D. (measurable) 5 < 5.5 cm

STONE TYPE: Barnack shelly oolite (limestone).

72 Plunkett identifies this as "Barnack" stone. Ibid.
PRESENT CONDITION: See 36; traces of original paint are visible.


DATE: ?Late-eleventh or early twelfth century.

REFERENCES (38-40): Drummond (1848), pp. 24-26, pl. 3; Clarke [1848], n.p.; Bisshopp (1886), p. 479; Galbraith (1968), pp. 178-180, pl. 27; Okasha (1970), passim; Plunkett (1998), pp. 328, 355, pl. 17 (2).

B.ix. Ixworth, St Mary’s. TL 93167041.

41. Ixworth 1: Recumbent monument (fragment) (Pls. 61-63).

PRESENT LOCATION: Moyse’s Hall Museum, Bury St Edmunds.

EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: Found joined beneath the floor of St Mary’s church in 1855 and subsequently moved to Ixworth Priory. The stones were acquired by Moyse’s Hall Museum in 1958.

H. 88 < 98.5 cm W. 52.5 < 56 cm D. 11.5 < 12.7 cm

STONE TYPE: Barnack shelly oolite (limestone).

PRESENT CONDITION: This stone is weathered; its carved surface is worn and chipped.

DESCRIPTION: This is a “Type 4” recumbent slab. See vol. 1, pp. 272-275.


DATE: Mid-tenth to mid-eleventh century.

REFERENCES: Warren (1863), p. 298; Plunkett (1998), pp. 329, 345-346, pl. 13 (1b); Reed (forthcoming, 2009), passim.

42. Ixworth 2: Recumbent monument (fragment) (Pls. 61, 64-65).
PRESENT LOCATION: See 41.

EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: See 41.

H. 81.8 < 90 cm  W. 54.8 < 60 cm  D. 15.8 < 16.3 cm

STONE TYPE: Barnack shelly oolite (limestone).

PRESENT CONDITION: See 41.

DESCRIPTION: This is a “Type 5” recumbent slab. See vol. 1, pp. 272-275.


DATE: Mid-tenth to mid-eleventh century.


B.x. Kedington, SS Peter’s and Paul’s. TL 70484702.

43. Kedington 1: Cross-head and −shaft (fragment) (Pls. 66-67).

PRESENT LOCATION: Above east window of chancel.

EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: Apparently unearthed in SS Peter’s and Paul’s ca 1230, though this cannot be substantiated. 73

H. 94.5 cm  W. (shaft) 25.4 cm  Dia. 45.7 cm  D. 15.2 cm

STONE TYPE: Barnack shelly oolite (limestone).

PRESENT CONDITION: Excellent; some minor abrasions are visible on the edges and carved face.

DESCRIPTION: This fragment constitutes the unpierced head and upper shaft of a monolithic cross. See vol. 1, p. 160.

DISCUSSION: See vol. 1, pp. 164, 231-236.

DATE: ?Mid to late tenth century.


B.xi. **Little Wratting, St Mary’s. TL 69034764.**

44. **Little Wratting 1: Dedication stone (fragment)** (Pls. 68-69).

PRESENT LOCATION: Above south entrance, functioning as a lintel.

EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: Unknown.

H. (est.) 27.9 cm  W. (est.) 111.8 cm  D. ?

STONE TYPE: Barnack shelly oolite (limestone).

PRESENT CONDITION: This stone is badly weathered; its inscription is eroded.


DATE: ?Twelfth century).74


B.xii. **Santon Downham, St Mary’s. TL 81648765.**

45. **Santon Downham 1: Recumbent monument (fragment)** (Pl. 70).

PRESENT LOCATION: Moyse’s Hall Museum, Bury St Edmunds.

EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: Found *ca* 1985 in St Mary’s churchyard, against the east wall of the north porch.

H. 26 cm  W. 18.5 < 25.8 cm  D. 6 < 8 cm

STONE TYPE: Barnack shelly oolite (limestone).

PRESENT CONDITION: This fragment is badly weathered; its edges and decorated surface are gouged and chipped.

DESCRIPTION: This stone has been broken along its lower and lateral edges; its upper edge may have been cut. Its decoration comprises a centrally-placed, relief-carved bar which terminates against an apparent square moulding at the lower edge. Two downward-curving bars project from this central upright, forming a semicircular motif. Two panels of four-cord interlace are disposed on either side of the central upright, occupying the interstices formed by its convergence with the semicircular terminus. Cord-layering is visible at crossing points.

DISCUSSION: This fragment’s semicircular motif is analogous to Fox’s “Type 2” and “Type 5” recumbent monuments. However, the apparent extension of the central upright through the semicircular terminus is not paralleled on other Fenland sculptures. Its closest exemplar is Milton Bryan 1 (Bd; see Appendix 2, pl. 163) and South Elmham 1 (see 46).

Domesday suggests that the abbots of St Edmund’s and Ely held land at Santon Downham in the mid-eleventh century. Based on the extent and diversity of agricultural activity in the manor at the time of the inquest, it is likely that the settlement was also affluent earlier in the century. Thus, Santon Downham 1 is possibly associated with a wealthy freeman or an unnamed lay-elite under commendation to St Edmund’s and/or Ely.

DATE: Mid-tenth to mid-eleventh century.


---

75 Fox, “Anglo-Saxon Monumental Sculpture”, pls. 3, 5.
76 Domesday Book (Williams and Martin, eds., 2002), pp. 1238, 1256.

46. South Elmham 1: Recumbent monument (fragment) (Pl. 71).

PRESENT LOCATION: Suffolk Archaeological Unit Stores, Bury St Edmunds.

EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: Found in 1963-1964 during excavations of the “Old Minster” built into the southeast corner of the nave as a quoin (below ground-level).

H. 43.2 cm  W. 15.2 < 17.8 cm  D. 10.2 cm

STONE TYPE: Barnack shelly oolite (limestone).

PRESENT CONDITION: Considerably weathered.77

DESCRIPTION: This fragment’s upper, lower and right edges have been cut; its left edge has been broken. Its decoration comprises a relief-carved bar, positioned at 45° from the stone’s lower edge. Two shorter bars, cut into the stone’s surface, are positioned at 45° to the diagonal’s fragmentary upper terminus, partially bisecting the slab horizontally. The lower bar exhibits two small holes. The terminal of an apparent panel of three-cord interlace abuts the broad edge of the upper horizontal bar.

DISCUSSION: This stone’s diagonal bar and its associated interlaced panel are analogous to the motifs and orientation of Milton Bryan 1 (Appendix 2, pl. 163). South Elmham 1, Santon Downham 1 and Milton Bryan 1 seemingly constitute a seventh category of recumbent monument related to the Fenland group, characterized by central cruciforms that extend through their rounded or angular terminals to the monuments’ narrow edges.

Domesday records that South Elmham was an episcopal benefice in the mid-eleventh century, though others, including the Abbot of St Edmund’s, are listed as

soke-holders and perhaps vied for jurisdiction in the area.\textsuperscript{78} Its various manors supported diverse agriculture, and their value had appreciated from the mid- to late eleventh century.\textsuperscript{79} Sufficient wealth was obviously concentrated at South Elmham for sculptural patronage, and considering South Elmham 1’s affinity with Santon Downham 1 (both associated with sites linked to St Edmund’s Abbey) their decoration might reflect specific monastic influence.\textsuperscript{80}

DATE: Mid-tenth to mid-eleventh century.\textsuperscript{81}


\textbf{B.xiv. Wickhambrook, All Saints’. TL 75335448.}

\textbf{47. Wickhambrook 1: Figural plaque (Pl. 72).}

PRESENT LOCATION: Exterior southwest wall of nave.

EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: Unknown.

H. 30 cm  W. 26 cm  D. (measurable) 2 cm

STONE TYPE: Barnack shelly oolite (limestone).

PRESENT CONDITION: Weathered (now protected by a plexi-glass cover).

DESCRIPTION: See vol. 1, p. 172, 190.

DISCUSSION: See vol. 1, pp. 190, 197-198, 203.

\textsuperscript{78} The church of Rumburgh is also listed as a land-holder at South Elmham, adding to its modest holdings at Aldburgh and, perhaps, Mundham. See \textit{Domesday Book} (Williams and Martin, eds., 2002), pp. 1081, 1100-1101.

\textsuperscript{79} \textit{Ibid.}, pp. 1200, 1236, 1254-1255.

\textsuperscript{80} However, the Abbot of St Edmund’s is not listed as a land-holder at Milton Bryan in \textit{Domesday Book}. See \textit{Domesday Book} (Williams and Martin, eds., 2002), pp. 563, 572.

\textsuperscript{81} Smedley and Owles contend that South Elmham 1 was reused in an architectural context “probably” in the eleventh century. They state that the stone “showed signs of considerable weathering before being broken and put to its present use”; and, therefore, suggest that the stone “could hardly be of earlier date than the 9\textsuperscript{th} century”. This assumption is not supported by discourse on the Fenland Group. For example, Kendrick concurs with Fox’s assertion that the Fenland Group is a late development, attributing Milton Bryan 1 to “the first half of the eleventh century”. See Smedley and Owles, “Excavations at South Elmham”, p. 10; Kendrick, \textit{Late Saxon and Viking Art}, p. 82.
DATE: ?Post-Conquest.\(^{82}\)


**B.xv. Wordwell, All Saints’. TL 82807204.**

48. **Wordwell 1: Tympanum** (Pl. 73).

PRESENT LOCATION: Above blocked north interior nave door.

EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: Unknown.

H. (apex) 52.5 cm W. (base) 105.5 cm D. (measurable) 2 cm

STONE TYPE: ?Caen limestone.

PRESENT CONDITION: The extant carving is well-preserved.

DESCRIPTION: See vol. 1, pp. 169, 172.


DATE: ?Twelfth century.\(^{83}\)

REFERENCES: See 49.

49. **Wordwell 2: Cushion capital** (Pls. 74-76).

PRESENT LOCATION: South doorway, east side.

EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: Unknown.

H. 21 cm W. 13.5 < 14.5 cm D. 5 cm

STONE TYPE: ?Caen limestone.

PRESENT CONDITION: See 48.

DESCRIPTION: See vol. 1, pp. 169, 172.

DISCUSSION: See vol. 1, pp. 196-197, 202-203.


\(^{83}\) Ibid.

C. North and East Cambridgeshire

C.i. Balsham, Holy Trinity. TL 58795086.

50. Balsham 1: Recumbent monument (fragment) (Pl. 77).

PRESENT LOCATION: Interior west nave wall.

EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: Found *ca* 1932 at Holy Trinity church (specific context unknown).\(^{84}\)

H. 109.2 cm  W. 58.4 cm  D. ?

STONE TYPE: Barnack shelly oolite (limestone).

PRESENT CONDITION: The carved decoration is well-preserved; some chipping and gouging is visible on the monument’s edges.

DESCRIPTION: The fragment’s decoration is executed in low-relief and comprises a plain cross-shaft which bisects the slab longitudinally and terminates in a circular cross-head of type “E-6” form. Rectilinear panels of four-cord interlace are disposed on either side of the cross-shaft (cord-layering is not visible). The monument’s edges are finished, apparently preserving evidence of square mouldings. Typologically, this fragment is an example of Fox’s “Type 6” recumbent slabs.

DISCUSSION: As discussed in Chapter 3 (see vol. 1, pp. 108-109), Leofsgie initiated a programme of royally-sanctioned “food-rent”, in which *vills* provisioned Ely with agricultural products or their monetary equivalent, following his consecration as Abbot of Ely in 1029. This system and its various participants

---

(including Balsham) are recorded in Liber Eliensis.\textsuperscript{85} Domesday Book, however, explicitly defines Balsham’s association with Ely, identifying it as the abbot’s personal benefice;\textsuperscript{86} this is corroborated by Edward the Confessor’s (1042-1066) charter, also documented in Liber Eliensis, which lists those royal endowments (including Balsham) granted to the abbey (see vol. 1, pp. 106-108).\textsuperscript{87} It is likely that Balsham 1 is associated with one of the named elite land-holders at Balsham (“Leofflæd” or “Eadgifu”) or a wealthy sokeman.\textsuperscript{88} Acknowledging its similarities of form and decoration with other sculptures (for example, Willingham 4) extant at sites identified as Ely’s dependencies, it is probable that the decoration of Balsham 1 is informed by the intellectual \textit{milieu} of eleventh-century Ely.

\textbf{DATE:} Mid-tenth to mid-eleventh century.

\textbf{REFERENCES:} Fox (1932), p. 51 (and unnumbered plate); Everson and Stocker (1999), p. 47, fig. 13.

\textbf{C.ii. Barnack, St John the Baptist. TF 07930050.}

\textbf{51. Barnack 1: Recumbent monument (fragment).} Unillustrated.

\textbf{PRESENT LOCATION:} Unknown.

\textbf{EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY:} Unknown.

H. ? W. ? D. ?


\textsuperscript{86} “The abbot [of Ely] himself holds Balsham. There are 9 hides. [There is] land for 19 ploughs. In demesne [are] 5 hides, and there are 5 ploughs, and there can be 2 more. There are 12 villans and 12 bordars with 12 ploughs. There are 2 slaves, and 1 mill [rendering] 4S, woodland for 200 pigs, and 12 acres of meadow, [and] 32d. from pasture. In all it is worth £17; when received, £10; TRE £12. This manor pertains and always pertained to the demesne of the Church of Ely ... “. \textit{Domesday Book} Williams and Martins, eds., 2002), pp. 523, 534. The phrase “This manor pertains and always pertained to the demesne of the Church of Ely” is repeated (sometimes in variant form) in Domesday’s references to the \textit{vills} named in \textit{Liber Eliensis} as providers of food-rent. See, for example, \textit{ibid.}, pp. 522-525, 539, 545, 553, 983, 1087, 1089, 1131-1132, 1194, 1256-1258.


\textsuperscript{88} \textit{Domesday Book} (Williams and Martin, eds., 2002), p. 534.
STONE TYPE: Unknown.

PRESENT CONDITION: Unknown.

DESCRIPTION: Everson and Stocker (1999) note that a recumbent monument characteristic of the Fenland Group is preserved at Barnack (identified as "Barnack 11"). Unlike the Middle Saxon (see Appendix 2, pl. 158) and Post-Conquest sculpture at the site, this fragment has not been discussed in earlier sources.

DISCUSSION: Barnack is first recorded in 664 when Wulfhere of Mercia granted the vill to Medeshamstede. Domesday Book records that “Bondi” (a Scandinavian name) had held the manor “freely” before “Otbert” in 1086. This implies that Bondi was a lord or a wealthy sokeman. Thus, it is possible that the Barnack 1 is associated with Bondi or his family. Though Barnack’s “diocesan” affiliation is not recorded in Domesday, Baxter suggests that it was still a benefice of Medeshamstede in 1086.

DATE: Mid-tenth to mid-eleventh century.


C.iii. Cambridge, St Benet’s. TL 44825804.

52. Cambridge, St Benet’s 1: Zoomorphic plaque (Pls. 78-80).

PRESENT LOCATION: Above the left impost of the western tower arch.

EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: N/A (in situ).

STONE TYPE: Barnack shelly oolite (limestone).

---


PRESENT CONDITION: Good.

DESCRIPTION: See vol. 1, p. 166.

DISCUSSION: See vol. 1, p. 166, 199.


REFERENCES: See 53.

53. Cambridge, St Benet’s 2: Zoomorphic plaque. (Pls. 78, 81-82).

PRESENT LOCATION: Above the right impost of the western tower arch.

EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: See 50.

STONE TYPE: Barnack shelly oolite (limestone).

PRESENT CONDITION: See 50.

DESCRIPTION: See vol. 1, p. 166.

DISCUSSION: See vol. 1, p. 166, 199.


54. Cambridge Castle 1: Recumbent monument (fragment) (Pl. 83).

PRESENT LOCATION: Cambridge University Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology.

EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: See vol. 1, pp. 141-147.

H. 98 cm  W. 45 < 46 cm  D. 8.3 cm

STONE TYPE: Barnack shelly oolite (limestone).

PRESENT CONDITION: Weathered with chipping and gouging on all surfaces.
DESCRIPTION: This is a "Type 6" recumbent slab. See vol. 1, p. 137.


DATE: Mid-tenth to mid-eleventh century.

REFERENCES: Masters (1786a), passim; idem (1786b), p. 66; Kerrich (1813), p. 228, pls. 15; Fox (1920-1921), pp. 19-21, pls. 5, 8 ("Map A"); Everson and Stocker (1999), p. 47, fig. 13.

55. Cambridge Castle 2: Recumbent monument (fragment) (Pl. 84).

PRESENT LOCATION: See 54.

EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: See 54.

H. 177.8 cm  W. 48.3 < 55.9 cm  D. 15.2 cm

STONE TYPE: Barnack shelly oolite (limestone).

PRESENT CONDITION: See 54.

DESCRIPTION: This is a "Type 1" recumbent slab. See vol. 1, p. 135.


DATE: Mid-tenth to mid-eleventh century.

REFERENCES: Masters (1786a), passim; idem (1786b), p. 66; Kerrich (1813), pl. 15; Fox (1920-1921), pp. 19-21, pls. 3, 8 ("Map A"); Everson and Stocker (1999), p. 47, fig. 13.


PRESENT LOCATION: See 54.

EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: See 54.

H. 39.7 < 44 cm  W. 12.2 < 19.8 cm  Dia. 36.4 cm  D. 10.3 cm

STONE TYPE: Barnack shelly oolite (limestone).
PRESENT CONDITION: See 54.

DESCRIPTION: See vol. 1, pp. 155-156.

DISCUSSION: See vol. 1, pp. 150-154, 156-157, 228-231.

DATE: Mid-tenth to mid-eleventh century.

REFERENCES: Fox (1920-1921), pp. 15-17; pls. 1, 8 ("Map A").

C.v. Cambridge, Little St Mary's. TL 44855819.

57. Cambridge, Little St Mary's 1: Recumbent monument (fragment) (Pl. 88).

PRESENT LOCATION: Exterior south wall.

EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: Unknown.

H. 66 cm  W. 17.5 < 21 cm  D. (measurable) 1 cm

STONE TYPE: Barnack shelly oolite (limestone).

PRESENT CONDITION: Weathered; all visible surfaces are gouged and chipped.

DESCRIPTION: This fragment comprises a single, longitudinal register of four-cord interlace. An apparent square moulding is preserved on its upper, lower and left edges. Cord-layering is visible at crossing-points, as is cutting along the right edge (the monument's upper and lower edges may have been cut, though the left appears intact).

DISCUSSION: See 58.

DATE: Mid-tenth to mid-eleventh century.

REFERENCES: See 58.

58. Cambridge, Little St Mary's 2: Recumbent monument (fragment) (Pl. 89).

PRESENT LOCATION: See 57.

EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: See 57.
H. 22 cm  W. 47 cm  D. (measurable) 1.5 cm

STONE TYPE: Barnack shelly oolite (limestone).

PRESENT CONDITION: See 57.

DESCRIPTION: This fragment has been cut along its upper edge. Its lateral edges may also have been cut or modified, though the lower edge, preserving evidence of a square moulding, appears intact. The fragment’s decoration comprises two rectilinear panels of four-cord interlace, disposed on either side of a vertical bar.

DISCUSSION (57-58): Little St Mary’s was dedicated by the Bishop of Ely in 1352, replacing the Norman church of St Peter at Trumpington Gate of ca 1140. St Peter’s remained in private patronage until ca 1206 when it was acquired by the Hospital of St John. In 1284, Hugh de Balsham, Bishop of Ely, transferred the church and its benefices to the new foundation of Peterhouse. Little St Mary’s 1-2 suggest that a Saxon church (or its cemetery) had occupied the site prior to the construction of St Peter at Trumpington Gate. These fragments, albeit of indeterminate type vis à vis Fox’s typology, are characteristic of the Fenland Group. They suggest that the site was a monastic dependency in the mid-eleventh century—perhaps of Ely, suggested by its association with the site in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries and by their formal and stylistic affinities with sculpture from other East Anglian sites that have demonstrable pre-Conquest associations with Ely (including Balsham, Little Shelford and Willingham).

DATE: Mid-tenth to mid-eleventh century.


---

93 Ibid.
94 Ibid.
95 Fox, “Anglo-Saxon Monumental Sculpture”, pl. 6.
C.vi. Caxton. St Andrew's. TL 30005788.


PRESENT LOCATION: West face of tower.

EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: Unknown.

H. (approx.) 5.08 < 10.16 cm  W. (approx.) 22.86 cm  D. (measurable, approx.) .5 cm

STONE TYPE: Barnack shelly oolite (limestone).

PRESENT CONDITION: Badly weathered.

DESCRIPTION: This fragment has been broken or cut along each of its edges. Its decoration seemingly comprises a horizontal, interlaced register of indeterminate form and cord-number.

DISCUSSION: See 60.

DATE: ?Mid-tenth to mid-eleventh century.

REFERENCES: See 60.

60. Caxton 2: ?Recumbent monument (fragment) (Pl. 91).

PRESENT LOCATION: North exterior nave wall.

EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: See 59.

H. (approx.) 7.62 cm  W. (approx.) 20.32 cm  D. (measurable, approx.) 1.27 < 3.81 cm

STONE TYPE: Barnack shelly oolite (limestone).

PRESENT CONDITION: Weathered.
DESCRIPTION: This fragment has been broken or cut along each of edges. Its decoration seemingly comprises a horizontal register of either interlace or linear ornament of indeterminate form.

DISCUSSION (59-60): Domesday suggests that Caxton was a de facto royal vill, administered by Thorger, King Edward's thegn.96 Twenty-two free land-holders are recorded in the vill in the mid-eleventh century, four commended to King Edward and eighteen to Earl Ælfgar of East Anglia (d. 1062); the Domesday account also suggests that the vill's agricultural enterprise was productive and diverse.97 Thus, if Caxton 1-2 are fragments of recumbent funerary monuments (perhaps derivative of the Fenland Group), then they are likely associated with the vill's free land-holders, though their weathered decoration prevents definitive association with particular cultural or intellectual milieux.

DATE: ?Mid-tenth to mid-eleventh century.


C.vii. Conington, All Saints'. TL 181859.

61. Recumbent monument (fragment) (Unillustrated).

PRESENT LOCATION: Unknown.

EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: Unknown.

H. ? W. ? D. ?

STONE TYPE: Unknown.

PRESENT CONDITION: Unknown.

97 Ibid.
DESCRIPTION: Everson and Stocker (1999) record that a recumbent monument characteristic of the Fenland Group is preserved at Conington.\(^9\)

DISCUSSION: *Domesday Book* does not mention a church in Conington (All Saints’ is probably a fifteenth-century construction),\(^9\) although it does record twelve pre-Conquest *sokemanni*, three of whom are identified as “the men of King Edward”, and a further three were apparently aligned with “Ulf” (a Scandinavian name).\(^1\) It is possible that Conington 1 is associated with one of these wealthy, free-landholders.

DATE: Mid-tenth to mid-eleventh century.


---

C.viii. Fletton, St Margaret’s. TL 19789714.

62. Fletton 1: Cross (fragmentary) (Pl. 92).

PRESENT LOCATION: In St Margaret’s cemetery, near the exterior north wall of the nave.

EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: Unknown.

STONE TYPE: Barnack shelly oolite (limestone).

PRESENT CONDITION: Badly weathered.

DESCRIPTION: This monolithic cross comprises a rectilinear shaft with a projecting, chamfered collar, bisecting each of the four faces laterally, and a pierced, circular type “E-6” head. In the zone delimited by the lower edge of the cross-head and the upper border of the chamfered collar is an inscription in Latin capitals: “RADVLF FILIVS WILIELMI” (“Radulf son of William”). Though the carving is

---

\(^{98}\) Everson and Stocker, *CASSS*, vol. 5, p. 47, fig. 13.


\(^{100}\) *Domesday Book* (Williams and Martin, eds., 2002), pp. 536-537, 541.
badly weathered, a canine or leonine quadruped is discernible in a roundel on the base of Face A, above which, the lower edge of an eroded roundel is also visible. Foliate decoration occupies the surrounding field. The "finial" atop the fragmentary cross-head is not contemporaneous with the monument.

DISCUSSION: Typologically, this cross is analogous to Raunds Furnells 1 (see vol. 1, p. 177, fig. 24; Appendix 2, pl. 165). While these monuments exhibit formal affinities with the crosses characteristic of the Fenland Group, Plunkett contends that Fletton 1 is a "local East Midland [development] of the wheel-head and round-shaft ... type, which may show functional continuity from the older monastic type of standing cross". The cross's inscription and its zoomorphic decoration might also derive from this earlier tradition. Domesday records that Fletton was a dependency of Medeshamstede, though no specific land-holders are identified. Whether the "Radulf" and "William" named on the monument are contemporaneous with its manufacture is unknown.

DATE: ca early to mid-tenth century.


C.ix. Grantchester, SS Andrew's and Mary's. TL 43345548.

63. Grantchester 1: Recumbent monument (fragment) (Pls. 93-94).

PRESENT LOCATION: Exterior south aisle wall.

101 Plunkett, "Mercian and West Saxon Stone Sculpture", p. 166.
102 Domesday Book (Williams and Martin, eds., 2002), pp. 556, 561. Raunds institutional association in the mid-eleventh century is not explicitly identified in Domesday Book. It does state, however, that "Gytha" held both sake and soke of the manor of Higham Ferrers which included Raunds. In 1086, Raunds is identified as a royal vill, administered by the Bishop of Coutances. Whether Raunds was associated with Medeshamstede in the mid-eleventh century, however, is unclear; considering its geographic proximity to monastery, it is possible that sculpture in the vill was influenced by, or a product of, the intellectual and artistic milieu of Medeshamstede.
103 Plunkett contends that the inscription is "probably secondary". See Plunkett, "Mercian and West Saxon Stone Sculpture", p. 166.
104 Ibid., pp. 171-172.
EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: Discovered during nineteenth-century rebuilding.\textsuperscript{105}

H. 14 < 15.3 cm  W. 29 < 31 cm  D. (measurable) 1 cm

STONE TYPE: Barnack shelly oolite (limestone).

PRESENT CONDITION: Weathered.

DESCRIPTION: This fragment has been broken along its upper and left edges,\textsuperscript{106} while its lower edge preserves a square-moulding. A low-relief, vertical bar segments the fragment into two discrete units, comprising a remnant of three-strand interlace to its left and two incised bars (with rounded edges) to its right.

DISCUSSION: See 66.

DATE: ?Mid-tenth to mid-eleventh century.

REFERENCES: See 66.

64. Grantchester 2: ?Recumbent monument (fragment) (Pls. 93, 95).

PRESENT LOCATION: See 63.

EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: See 63.

H. (approx.) 20 cm  W. (approx.) 15 < 19 cm  D. (measurable; approx.) 1.5 cm

STONE TYPE: Barnack shelly oolite (limestone).

PRESENT CONDITION: See 63.

DESCRIPTION: This fragment has been cut or broken along its upper, right and left edges. Its lower edge might preserve evidence of a square-moulding. The fragment's decoration comprises an apparent single strand, half-pattern "A" plait, oriented horizontally and delimited by two incised lines.\textsuperscript{107}

\textsuperscript{105} S. Walters, Grantchester Church and its Churchyards (1988; Cambridge 1996), pp. 4-5.
\textsuperscript{106} Fox contends that the right edge has also been cut. See Fox, "Anglo-Saxon Monumental Sculpture", pl. 6.
\textsuperscript{107} Cramp, Grammar of Anglo-Saxon Ornament, p. xxxix, fig. 21.
DISCUSSION: See 66.

DATE: Mid-tenth to mid-eleventh century.


65. Grantchester 3: Recumbent monument (fragment) (Pls. 93, 96).

PRESENT LOCATION: See 63.

EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: See 63.

H. 23 cm  W. 29 < 30 cm  D. (measurable) 1 < 3 cm

STONE TYPE: Barnack shelly oolite (limestone).

PRESENT CONDITION: See 63.

DESCRIPTION: This fragment has been broken or cut along its upper and lateral edges. Its lower edge seemingly preserves an intact square-moulding. Its decoration comprises a horizontal band of three-cord interlace, delimited longitudinally, by a high-relief bar and the apparent square moulding.

DISCUSSION: See 66.

DATE: Mid-tenth to mid-eleventh century.


66. Grantchester 4: Recumbent monument (fragment) (Pls. 93, 97).

PRESENT LOCATION: See 63.

EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: See 63.

H. 25 cm  W. 30 < 31 cm  D. (measurable) 1.5 < 3 cm

STONE TYPE: Barnack shelly oolite (limestone).
PRESENT CONDITION: See 63.

DESCRIPTION: See 65. This fragment's lower left corner, including both the interlaced register and the square-moulding, has been damaged. The fragment is also composite; the high-relief bar positioned above the interlaced register is distinct from the interlaced stone.

DISCUSSION (63-66): While exhibiting stylistic and formal associations with the Fenland Group, Fox identifies Granchester 1 as an anomalous fragment. Its incised bars with rounded edges are not represented in the Fenland typology, though they are suggestive of “Type 5” slabs (cf. Little Shelford 2). Grantchester 2’s apparent single-strand, half-pattern “A” interlace is also atypical of Fenland sculptures. These fragments, together with Fletton 1 and Raunds 1, are demonstrative of greater diversity and artistic experimentation than Fox’s typology. Granchester 3-4 likely derive from the same “Type 2” recumbent monument, comprising sections of the lower interlaced panels and the central cross-shaft. 108

Acknowledging the apparent conflation of the variant forms of “Cambridge” and “Grantchester” in Liber Eliensis, including “Cantebrigia”, “Cantebria”, “Grantecester”, “Grantancester”, “Grantabrigge”, “Grantebrige” and “Grantebrige”, 109 the variant forms may refer to the same place or general location. If these terms are loosely synonymous, then the Abbot of Ely held land at “Grantchester”. 110 According to Domesday Book, “Grantchester” was, in part, a royal manor in the mid-eleventh century with several other named land-holders in the vicinity. 111 While the apparent conflation of “Cambridge” and “Grantchester” in
Liber Eliensis obfuscates Grantchester's tenurial history, it seems likely that this was a wealthy, perhaps de facto royal vill in the mid-eleventh century, possibly associated with Ely. Thus, Grantchester 1-4 might constitute evidence of Ely's artistic and intellectual influence.

DATE: Mid-tenth to mid-eleventh century.


C.x. Helpston, St Botolph’s. TF122055.

67. Helpston 1: Recumbent monument (fragment) (Pl. 98).

PRESENT LOCATION: Unknown.\(^{112}\)

EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: Recovered in 1864-1865 during rebuilding of the church tower.\(^{113}\)

H.? W.? D. ?

STONE TYPE: Unknown.

PRESENT CONDITION: Unknown.

DESCRIPTION: Based on Reid's illustration, Helpston 1 is broken along its narrow edges; parts of its lateral edges are seemingly intact, perhaps preserving evidence of a square moulding. The fragment's decoration comprises a central bar (perhaps rounded in profile), bisecting the stone longitudinally. Panels of four-cord interlace exhibiting cord-layering at crossing-points are disposed on either side of the central bar.

\(^{112}\) According to Reid, Helpston 1-3 were "preserved in front of the Rectory House" in 1889. See Reid, "Wednesday, 17th April 1889", p. 179. Everson and Stocker record that a Fenland recumbent monument is preserved at Helpston, implying that Helpston 1 is still at that site. See Everson and Stocker, CASSS, vol. 5, p. 47, fig. 13. Whether Helpston 2-3 are still preserved at or near St Botolph's is unknown.

DISCUSSION: See 69.

DATE: Mid-tenth to mid-eleventh century.

REFERENCES: Reid (1889), p. 179, pl. 1 (B); Fox (1920-1921), p. 24, pl. 8 ("Map B"); Everson and Stocker (1999), p. 47, fig. 13.

68. Helpston 2: Grave-marker (fragment) (Pl. 99).

PRESENT LOCATION: Unknown.

EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: Unknown.

H.? W.? D.?

STONE TYPE: Unknown.

PRESENT CONDITION: Unknown.

DESCRIPTION: This stone has been recut longitudinally and laterally; the surviving fragment comprises most of the slab's circular head and the upper portion of its shouldered base. Like Hunston 1, Helpston 2 exhibits a low-relief type "E-6" cross on both of its broad faces. However, unlike Hunston 1, the Helpston 2 cross exhibits two lower arms; on one face, these "arms" are reduced to two pendent scrolls, similar, spatially, to Willingham 2. Furthermore, its shouldered base preserves evidence of median-incised interlace (akin to Whissonsett 1) contrasting with Hunston 1's undecorated base.

DISCUSSION: See 69.

DATE: Mid-tenth to mid-eleventh century.

REFERENCES: See 69.

69. Helpston 3: Grave-marker (fragment) (pl. 100).

---

114 Cramp, *Grammar of Anglo-Saxon Ornament*, p. xvi, fig. 2.
PRESENT LOCATION: Unknown.

EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: Unknown.

H. ? W. ? D. ?

STONE TYPE: Unknown.

PRESENT CONDITION: Unknown.

DESCRIPTION: Based on Fox's illustration, this monument has been broken, diagonally, across its upper, shouldered base; its circular head is apparently undamaged. Like Hunston 1, Helpston 3 is decorated with a relief-carved type “E-6” cross that extends to the monument's edges. Whether this decoration is replicated on its other broad face is unclear from Fox's study. Its shouldered base is apparently undecorated.

DISCUSSION (67-69): Though Helpston is not recorded in Domesday Book, its apparent evidence of funerary “suites” (akin to Hunston, Cambridge Castle and Peterborough Cathedral), comprising recumbent and upright slabs characteristic of the Fenland Group, suggests that considerable wealth was concentrated in the vill in the Late Saxon period. Its proximity to Peterborough (approximately six kilometres northwest of the city) suggests it was likely influenced by (or was a benefice of) Medeshamstede.

DATE (64-66): Mid-tenth to mid-eleventh century.

REFERENCES (68-69): Reid (1889), p. 179, pl. 2 (C1-C2); Fox (1920-1921), p. 27, pls. 7-8 (“Map B”).

C.xi. Little Shelford, All Saints'. TL 45375167.

70. Little Shelford 1: Recumbent monument (fragments) (Pl. 101).

---

115 Fox, “Anglo-Saxon Monumental Sculpture”, p. 27; pl. 7.
PRESENT LOCATION: West exterior wall of south porch.

EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: Recovered in 1878 during church restoration.\textsuperscript{116}

H. 155.5 < 166 cm W. 22.5 < 29.7 cm D. (measurable) 1 < 2 cm

STONE TYPE: Barnack shelly oolite (limestone).

PRESENT CONDITION: Weathered.

DESCRIPTION: This stone has been cut along its upper broad edge. Its decoration comprises a low-relief, centrally-placed cross-shaft, either end of which terminates in a type “B-6” head. A third pair of cross-arms, roughly equidistant from either cruciform terminus, bisects the slab laterally. Three- and four-cord interlaced panels occupy the interstices formed by the convergence of the cross-shaft, its termini and the third pair of cross-arms. Square mouldings are visible along the fragments’ lower, left and right edges.

DISCUSSION: See 78.

DATE: Mid-tenth to mid-eleventh century.


71. Little Shelford 2: Recumbent monument (fragment) (Pl. 102).

PRESENT LOCATION: East exterior wall of south porch.

EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: See 70.

H. 139 < 140 cm W. 17 < 23 cm D. 1 < 2 cm

STONE TYPE: Barnack shelly oolite (limestone).

PRESENT CONDITION: See 70.

DESCRIPTION: This stone has been cut along its upper broad edge. Its decoration comprises (from left to right): the lower half of a concave semicircular motif, apparently preserving evidence of a geometric form within it; the lower half of an angular concave motif; a rectangular bar with a narrow rectilinear recess; a short, four-cord (layered) panel of median-incised interlace; a broad, rectangular panel, bordered by two others of similar shape and orientation but narrower in width; a second rectangular bar with a narrow rectilinear recess; and a longer panel of four-cord interlace, also exhibiting cord-layering. Evidence of an apparent chamfered moulding is visible on the lower and lateral edges.

DISCUSSION: See 78.

DATE: Mid-tenth to mid-eleventh century.


72. Little Shelford 3: Recumbent monument (fragment) (Pl. 103).

PRESENT LOCATION: South exterior chancel wall.

EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: See 70.

H. 39 cm  W. 10.2 < 11. 4 cm  D. (measurable) 1 cm

STONE TYPE: Barnack shelly oolite (limestone).

PRESENT CONDITION: See 70.

DESCRIPTION: This fragment has been cut along its upper, lower and left edges. Its extant decoration comprises (from top to bottom): a fragmentary three- or four-cord knot or interlaced register; a wedge motif projecting laterally from the cut left edge; a broad rectangular motif; a second, narrower, rectilinear element; and a
second three- or four-cord interlaced knot or register. The fragment’s gouged right edge apparently preserves a square moulding.

DISCUSSION: See 78.

DATE: Mid-tenth to mid-eleventh century.

REFERENCES: See 76.

73. Little Shelford 4: Recumbent monument (fragment) (Pl. 104).

PRESENT LOCATION: South exterior chancel wall, forming the left jamb of reassembled Saxon window.

EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: See 70.

H. (approx.) 25 cm  W. (approx.) 12.7 cm  D. 10.2 cm

STONE TYPE: Barnack shelly oolite (limestone).

PRESENT CONDITION: See 70.

DESCRIPTION: This rectilinear fragment has been cut along each of its edges. Its decoration comprises a four-cord interlaced panel, delimited on its upper and left edges by a plain broad border. Cord-layering is visible at crossing-points.

DISCUSSION: See 78.

DATE: Mid-tenth to mid-eleventh century.

REFERENCES: See 76.

74. Little Shelford 5: Recumbent monument (fragment) (Pl. 104).

PRESENT LOCATION: South exterior chancel wall, forming the right jamb of a reassembled Saxon window.

EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: See 70.

H. (approx.) 23 cm  W. (approx.) 12.7 cm  D. 10.2 cm
STONE TYPE: Barnack shelly oolite (limestone).

PRESENT CONDITION: See 70.

DESCRIPTION: Like Little Shelford 4, this fragment has been cut along each of its edges. Its decoration comprises an incised bar that arcs toward the left edge, forming a concave profile; a vertical bar (also incised) projects from the resultant "bowl".

DISCUSSION: See 78.

DATE: Mid-tenth to mid-eleventh century.

REFERENCES: See 76.

75. Little Shelford 6: Recumbent monument (fragment) (Pls. 105-106).

PRESENT LOCATION: South exterior chancel wall.

EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: See 70.

H. 14 < 16.5 cm  W. 45 < 46 cm  D. (measurable) 1 < 2 cm

STONE TYPE: Barnack shelly oolite (limestone).

PRESENT CONDITION: See 70.

DESCRIPTION: This fragment’s upper and lower edges have been broken; its lateral edges may have been cut or modified. The stone’s decoration comprises a central bar, executed in high-relief, and the remnants of two panels of four-cord interlace, disposed on either side of the central bar and delimited by linear borders.

DISCUSSION: See 78.

DATE: Mid-tenth to mid-eleventh century.

REFERENCES: See 76.

76. Little Shelford 7: Recumbent monument (fragment) (Pls. 105, 107).

PRESENT LOCATION: See 75.
EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: See 70.

H. 14 < 16.5 cm  W. 48.5 < 49.5 cm  D. (measurable) 1 < 3 cm

STONE TYPE: Barnack shelly oolite (limestone).

PRESENT CONDITION: See 70.

DESCRIPTION: See 75.

DISCUSSION: See 78.

DATE: Mid-tenth to mid-eleventh century.


77. Little Shelford 8: Recumbent monument (fragment) (Pls. 108-109).

PRESENT LOCATION: See 75.

EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: See 70.

H. 12 < 14.5 cm  W. 40.4 cm  D. (measurable) 1.5 cm

STONE TYPE: Barnack shelly oolite (limestone).

PRESENT CONDITION: See 70.

DESCRIPTION: This stone has been cut along its upper and lateral edges; its lower edge may have been cut or modified. Its decoration comprises (from left to right): a panel of layered, four-cord interlace; a vertical, broad rectangular bar delimited by two narrower bars; and a four-cord, median-incised, interlaced panel.

DISCUSSION: See 78.

DATE: Mid-tenth to mid-eleventh century.

78. Little Shelford 9: Recumbent monument (fragments) (Pls. 108, 110).

PRESENT LOCATION: See 75.

EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: See 70.

H. 13 < 15 cm  W. 57.5 < 59.6 cm  D. (measurable) 1.5 cm

STONE TYPE: Barnack shelly oolite (limestone).

PRESENT CONDITION: See 70.

DESCRIPTION: This stone has been cut along its upper and lateral edges; its lower edge preserves evidence of a square- or chamfered moulding. Its decoration comprises (from left to right): an apparent quadripartite knot; a vertical, rectilinear bar delimited by two narrower bars; a second quadripartite knot; and a low-relief curved bar.

DISCUSSION (70-78): Little Shelford 1-9 are all examples of recumbent monuments characteristic of the Fenland Group. Little Shelford 1-2 are illustrative of Types “4” and “5” slabs respectively. Little Shelford 3 is of indeterminate type, but the compressed appearance of its interlace is similar to that of Little Shelford 2 and 9, perhaps suggesting that this fragment also derives from a “Type 5” slab. Little Shelford 5 is also seemingly derivative of a “Type 5” monument; whether Little Shelford 4 is from the same or a similar monument, however, is unclear. Considering the patterns of breakage along their upper and lower edges, Little Shelford 6-7 likely derive from the same monument, though these fragments preserve no distinctive typological characteristics. Little Shelford 8 is equally ambiguous, though Fox suggests it might constitute a variant form.117

As discussed above (see vol. 1, pp. 108-109), “Shelford” is identified in Liber Eliensis as a dependency of Ely and as a participant in Abbot Leofsige’s “food-rent”

programme. According to *Domesday*, Little Shelford was a particularly wealthy manor in the mid-eleventh century with the Abbot of Ely and three earls ("Gyrth", "Æfgar" and "Harold") identified as soke-holders. Hart has observed that Little Shelford might also have been held as an estate by a ninth-century jarl, suggested by evidence of minting. Coupled with its abundance of Late Saxon sculpture, Hadley has interpreted Little Shelford as a mercantile centre, influenced by Stocker's contention that exceptional quantities of stone sculpture at specific sites (for example, SS Mark and Mary le Wigford in Lincoln, St Mary Bishophill Senior in York and Yarm, Kirklevington and Lythe, all YN) are perhaps indicative of social competition amongst elite mercantile populations. However, in the context of Little Shelford—specifically identified as a productive agricultural centre in *Liber Eliensis* (see vol. 1, pp. 108-109)—social competition (if it existed) was likely governed by tenurial rather than mercantile interests. While concentration of wealth at Little Shelford in the ninth and tenth centuries is seemingly irrefutable, the *Domesday* reference to a minster at Little Shelford, held by the Abbot of Ely, might explain the particular form and style of sculpture at the site. If Hadley’s contention is correct—that the abundance of stone sculpture at Little Shelford is attributable to competing mercantile elites—then it is probable that the form and style of these expressions of elite identity were influenced by Ely’s latent or active lordship at the site, particularly in the context of its apparent ownership of the vill’s minster. While

---

121 The assumptions implicit in Hadley’s adoption of Stocker’s mercantile hypothesis *vis à vis* Little Shelford demonstrate that models of sculptural patronage (often associated with pre-Conquest urbanized settlements such as Lincoln and York) are not readily applicable to East Anglia’s agrarian villis. While elite status in urban centres was often the product of lucrative trade networks, in agrarian settlements it was seemingly associated with tenurial privilege.
elite competition can potentially explain quantities of sculpture at Little Shelford, its form and style is probably associated with Ely’s artistic and intellectual milieu.

DATE: Mid-tenth to mid-eleventh century.


C.xii. Maxey, St Peter’s. TF 119079.

79. Maxey 1: Recumbent monument (fragment) (Pl. 111).

PRESENT LOCATION: Sweeting Museum, St Peter’s Church, Maxey.

EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: Excavated from Maxey churchyard in the 1890s.\(^{123}\)

H. 4.4 < 8.9 cm (max.) W. ? D. ?\(^{124}\)

STONE TYPE: Unknown.

PRESENT CONDITION: Unknown.

DESCRIPTION: Based on Reid’s illustrations (1889), the fragment has been broken along each of its edges, though one lateral edge might preserve evidence of a square moulding. The fragment’s decorative programme is difficult to ascertain from Reid’s drawings, though it appears to comprise a raised, central bar (bisecting the slab longitudinally) with bordered designs analogous to “Meander 2” disposed on either side.\(^{125}\)

DISCUSSION: Reid’s drawings suggest that the decoration of Maxey 1 is anomalous in the context of East Anglia’s Late Saxon recumbent slabs, exhibiting

---


few affinities with the formulaic designs of the Fenland Group. Together with other anomalous examples, specifically Cambridge Castle 2 (see below, pl. 84) and Peterborough Cathedral 14 (lost; Fox’s identifier), Maxey 1 is seemingly illustrative of greater variety and experimentation in East Anglia’s pre-Conquest slab sculpture than has been previously acknowledged. Its closest stylistic exemplar is the font preserved in Penmon Priory Church, Anglesey. Nash-Williams terms the font’s decoration “Square T-fret pattern” (Cramp’s “Meander 2”), a “Viking Age motif”, and suggests the sculpture dates to the late tenth or eleventh century.

Though Maxey is not recorded in Domesday Book, Sweeting states (quoting an unnamed source) that Maxey is first mentioned in 1013 when, as a benefice of Peakirk, it was apparently destroyed by Danes. In the mid-eleventh century, ca 1048, an “Edmer” or “Edmund” took possession of the vill. Whether Maxey 1 is associated with the period predating its purported Danish destruction or with its later history under “Edmer”/“Edmund” is unknown.

DATE: ?Late tenth to eleventh century.


C.xiii. Orwell, St Andrew’s. TL 362504.

80. Orwell 1: Recumbent monument (fragment) (Unillustrated).

PRESENT LOCATION: Unknown.

EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: Unknown.

---

126 See above, vol. 1, fig. 11, p. 136.
128 See Nash-Williams, Early Christian Monuments of Wales, fig. 12.
129 Ibid., p. 51.
130 Sweeting, “Maxey Church and Parish”, p. 106.
131 Ibid.
H. W. D.?

STONE TYPE: Unknown.

PRESENT CONDITION: Unknown.

DESCRIPTION: Everson and Stocker (1999) mention that a recumbent monument characteristic of the Fenland Group is preserved at Orwell.\footnote{Everson and Stocker, CASSS, vol. 5, p. 47, fig. 13.}

DISCUSSION: Orwell's pre-Conquest tenurial history is mentioned in some detail in Domesday Book. It records that soke was held in the area by both ecclesiastical and secular interests, including the Church of Chatteris, King Edward, Eadgifu and Earl Harold; eleven sokemanni are also mentioned, three of whom are identified by name: "Thorbiorn", "Aki" and "Sigar" (Scandinavian appellations).\footnote{Domesday Book (Williams and Martin, eds., 2002), pp. 528-529, 531, 535-537, 540, 543, esp. 531, 535, 537.} The presence of such diverse and influential soke-holders in Orwell, coupled with the survival of Orwell 1, suggests that sufficient means were concentrated in the vill for sculptural patronage, likely proclaiming/reinforcing tenurial privilege either by a lord or a free landholder.

DATE: ?Mid-tenth to mid-eleventh century.


81. Peterborough Cathedral 1: Recumbent monument (fragment) (Pls. 112-114).

PRESENT LOCATION: Peterborough Cathedral undercroft.


H. 58.5 < 75.5 cm  W. 38.5 < 44 cm  D. 8.5 cm

STONE TYPE: Barnack shelly oolite (limestone).
PRESENT CONDITION: The carved surface is generally well-preserved though chipping and gouging is visible.

DESCRIPTION: One of this fragment’s narrow edges has been broken; the other has apparently been cut. Its lateral edges are intact, preserving square mouldings. The stone’s decoration comprises a central cross-shaft with arms of type “B-6” form. Bands of layered, four-cord interlace occupy the interstices formed by the convergence of the cross-arms and -shaft.

DISCUSSION: See 84.

DATE: Mid-tenth to mid-eleventh century.


82. Peterborough Cathedral 2: Recumbent monument (Pls. 115-117).

PRESENT LOCATION: See 81.

EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: See 81.

H. 101 cm  W. 32.5 < 42.5 cm  D. 10 cm

STONE TYPE: Barnack shelly oolite (limestone).

PRESENT CONDITION: Extremely weathered; the monument’s edges and decorated face are chipped and gouged. The monument is complete, though it exists in two pieces.

DESCRIPTION: This monument’s decorative programme comprises a centrally-placed cross-shaft, bisecting the slab longitudinally, terminating in type B-6 heads. A horizontal bar, roughly equidistant from the slab’s narrow ends, bisects the decorated face laterally, delineating four rectilinear panels. Registers of three- and
four-cord interlace occupy these interstices. Square mouldings are visible on each of the monument’s edges.

DISCUSSION: See 84.

DATE: Mid-tenth to mid-eleventh century.


83. Peterborough Cathedral 3: ?Recumbent monument, cross-shaft or architectural decoration (fragment) (Pls. 118-119).

PRESENT LOCATION: South face of southwest pier of the lantern crossing.

EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: See 81.

H. 6 < 15 cm  W. 39 < 46.5 cm  D. (measurable) 1 cm

STONE TYPE: Barnack shelly oolite (limestone).

PRESENT CONDITION: Weathered; chipping and gouging are visible on the decorated face and along the fragment’s edges.

DESCRIPTION: The fragment’s right edge is broken; its left edge has apparently been cut. Whether its upper and lower edges have been modified, however, is unclear.135 The fragment’s decoration comprises a single panel of median-incised, six-cord, “Turned Pattern” interlace with a prominent “V-bend”, analogous to “Type D”.136 This panel is framed by a plain rectilinear border.

DISCUSSION: See 84.


135 Irvine’s description is vague and does not include any hypotheses about the stone’s modification. See Irvine, “Account of the Pre-Norman Remains”, p. 283.

136 Cramp, Grammar of Anglo-Saxon Ornament,” p. xxxiv, fig. 16.

84. Peterborough Cathedral 4: Cross-shaft (fragment) (Pls. 120-123).

PRESENT LOCATION: Presently displayed in the nave’s north aisle as part of “The Story of Peterborough Cathedral” exhibit.

EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: Unknown.\(^{137}\)

H. 97 < 98 cm  W. 29.5 < 34 cm  D. 8 < 23 cm

STONE TYPE: Barnack shelly oolite (limestone).

PRESENT CONDITION: Extant carving is generally well-preserved.

DESCRIPTION: This tapered shaft has been broken along its upper edge; face D has apparently been cut longitudinally. The surviving monument exists in three pieces which have been reassembled. Face A is decorated with a recessed, vertical panel of layered, four-cord interlace (analogous to Stapleford 1) exhibiting a prominent bar-terminal. Face B exhibits a recessed, vertical panel of layered, three-cord interlace, also with a bar-terminal. The decoration on Face C, comprising the outer edges of apparently concentric circles (arranged vertically) is partially preserved. Face D preserves no sculpted decoration, though its surface has been carefully smoothed.

DISCUSSION (81-84): Based on Fox’s typology, Peterborough Cathedral 1-2 are examples of “Type 4” recumbent monuments. Stylistically, Peterborough Cathedral 3 is anomalous among Fenland sculptures. Its complex interlace is unparalleled in the region and is likely illustrative of a distinct (perhaps temporal) sculptural

\(^{137}\) This shaft is not included in Irvine’s accounts of the excavation of the Saxon abbey, though he does mention that “one arm of a cross and ... [another] small fragment with interlacing ornament” were recovered; the latter could refer to one of the fragments which now comprise Peterborough Cathedral 4. See Irvine, “Account of the Discovery”, p. 52. The exhibit “The Story of Peterborough Cathedral” implies the shaft was associated with Medeshamstede.
tradition. Though Irvine observes that Peterborough Cathedral 3 is undecorated on its reverse face and, thus, contends that it cannot derive from a cross-shaft, its refined carving is suggestive of monastic production; acknowledging its fragmentary state and its apparent modification, all contexts for use derivative of monastic ateliers, including commemoration and architectural decoration, should be considered. Thus, Peterborough Cathedral 3 could derive from a recumbent monument, a freestanding cross, a screen or an architectural context.

Peterborough Cathedral 4 is an example of a monumental, possibly monolithic, cross. Its size, and its apparent association with the Saxon abbey, seemingly suggests that it, too, is derivative of a monastic milieu. Its closest parallel, stylistically, is Stapleford 1, supporting the contention that the Fenland Group is likely a product of monastic ateliers.

Fox contends that Peterborough Cathedral 1-2 (discovered, in situ, on the north side of the Saxon abbey) demarcated lay-interments, noting that the monks’ cemetery was on the south side of the building. Though Domesday records that Medeshamstede was a substantial soke-holder in the mid-eleventh century, with numerous freemen, few are explicitly identified (notable exceptions include “Alnoth”, “Eskil” and “Roth”). If Fox’s contention that Peterborough Cathedral 1-2 commemorated lay-burials is correct, then it is probable that the deceased were either wealthy benefactors of the house (perhaps akin to Bryhtnoth’s association with Ely) and/or land-holders within Medeshamstede’s jurisdiction.

139 Irvine suggests that Peterborough Cathedral 3 may have formed part of a string-course. Ibid., p. 280.
DATE (Peterborough Cathedral 1-2): Mid-tenth to mid-eleventh century; Peterborough Cathedral 3: ?ca ninth to tenth century; Peterborough Cathedral 4: ? Mid-tenth to mid-eleventh century.

REFERENCES: Unpublished.


85. Rampton 1: Recumbent monument (fragment) (Pl. 124).

PRESENT LOCATION: East chancel wall.

EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: Recovered during church restoration, pre-1920.\(^{142}\)

H. 9.8 < 19 cm   W. 9.3 < 16 cm   D. (measurable) 1.7 cm

STONE TYPE: Barnack shelly oolite (limestone).

PRESENT CONDITION: Weathered.

DESCRIPTION: This wedge-shaped fragment has been broken along its diagonal edge. Its right edge preserves evidence of an apparent roll-moulding and a low-relief rectilinear border, from which projects an arced bar, terminating at the diagonal break. The corner of an interlaced register (of indeterminate cord-number) is preserved in the interstice formed by the convergence of the vertical border and the arced bar.

DISCUSSION: See 95.

DATE: Mid-tenth to mid-eleventh century.

REFERENCES: See 88.

86. Rampton 2: Recumbent monument (fragment) (Pl. 124).

PRESENT LOCATION: See 85.

\(^{142}\) Fox, “Anglo-Saxon Monumental Sculpture”, p. 22.
EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: See 85.

H. 21.8 < 40 cm  W. 8 < 24.2 cm  D. (measurable) 1.7 cm

STONE TYPE: Barnack shelly oolite (limestone).

PRESENT CONDITION: See 85.

DESCRIPTION: This fragment has been broken along its upper and lower edges; its left edge may have been cut, and its right preserves evidence of an apparent roll-moulding. Its decoration comprises a vertical panel of layered four-cord interlace, framed by the apparent roll-moulding on its right and by a broad rectilinear bar on its left.

DISCUSSION: See 95.

DATE: Mid-tenth to mid-eleventh century.

REFERENCES: See 88.

87. Rampton 3: Recumbent monument (fragment) (Pl. 124).

PRESENT LOCATION: See 85.

EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: See 85.

H. 10 < 21.1 cm  W. 21 < 27 cm  D. (measurable) 1.7 cm

STONE TYPE: Barnack shelly oolite (limestone).

PRESENT CONDITION: See 85.

DESCRIPTION: This fragment preserves evidence of an apparent roll-moulding along its upper left edge; its remaining edges have either been cut or broken. Its decoration comprises the terminal of a layered, four-cord interlaced panel, framed by the apparent roll-moulding on its left and by a broad rectilinear bar on its right.

DISCUSSION: See 95.

DATE: Mid-tenth to mid-eleventh century.
REFERENCES: See 88.

88. Rampton 4: Recumbent monument (fragment) (Pl. 124).

PRESENT LOCATION: See 85.

EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: See 85.

H. 20 < 22.8 cm  W. 18 cm  D. (measurable) 1.7 cm

STONE TYPE: Barnack shelly oolite (limestone).

PRESENT CONDITION: See 85.

DESCRIPTION: This fragment preserves evidence of an apparent roll-moulding along its left edge; its remaining edges have been either broken or cut. Its decoration comprises a panel of layered, four-cord interlace, bordered along its left edge by the apparent roll-moulding.

DISCUSSION: See 95.

DATE: Mid-tenth to mid-eleventh century.


89. Rampton 5: ?Recumbent monument or cross-shaft (fragment) (Pl. 125).

PRESENT LOCATION: See 85.

EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: See 85.

H. 46 cm  W. 12 < 14.5 cm  D. (measurable) 2 < 3 cm

STONE TYPE: Barnack shelly oolite (limestone).

PRESENT CONDITION: See 85.

DESCRIPTION: This fragment has been cut along its upper, lower and right edges; its left edge preserves evidence of an apparent square- or roll-moulding. Its
decoration comprises a vertical register of layered, four-cord interlace, framed by a rectilinear border along its left and lower edges.

DISCUSSION: See 95.

DATE: Mid-tenth to mid-eleventh century.

REFERENCES: Fox (1920-1921), pp. 15, 19, pls. 6, 8 ("Map A"); Everson and Stocker (1999), p. 47, fig. 13.

90. Rampton 6: Recumbent monument (fragment) (Pl. 126).

PRESENT LOCATION: See 85.

EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: See 85.

H. 17.7 < 21.5 cm W. 25 < 27.5 cm D. (measurable) 2 cm

STONE TYPE: Barnack shelly oolite (limestone).

PRESENT CONDITION: See 85.

DESCRIPTION: This fragment has been broken along its right edge; its lower edge has been either broken or cut. Square-mouldings are preserved along the stone's upper and left edges. Its decoration comprises the terminus of a layered, four-cord interlaced register, framed by a rectilinear border.

DISCUSSION: See 95.

DATE: Mid-tenth to mid-eleventh century.

REFERENCES: See 91.

91. Rampton 7: Recumbent monument (fragment) (Pl. 127).

PRESENT LOCATION: See 85.

EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: See 85.

H. 10.8 < 14.6 cm W. 8.7 < 14.9 cm D. (measurable) 2 cm
STONE TYPE: Barnack shelly oolite (limestone).

PRESENT CONDITION: See 85.

DESCRIPTION: This fragment has been broken or cut along each of its edges. Its conjectured decoration comprises (from left to right): the outer cord of an interlaced register; a vertical, rectilinear bar; and three cords of a second interlaced panel.

DISCUSSION: See 95.

DATE: Mid-tenth to mid-eleventh century.


92. Rampton 8: Recumbent monument (fragment) (Pl. 128).

PRESENT LOCATION: See 85.

EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: See 85.

H. 43.3 cm  W. 15.8 < 17.3 cm  D. 1.8 < 1.9 cm

STONE TYPE: Barnack shelly oolite (limestone).

PRESENT CONDITION: See 85.

DESCRIPTION: This fragment has been cut along its upper, lower and left edges. Its decoration comprises a layered, vertical panel of four-cord interlace, framed along its right edge by an apparent square-moulding.

DISCUSSION: See 95.

DATE: Mid-tenth to mid-eleventh century.


93. Rampton 9: Recumbent monument (fragment) (Pl. 129).
PRESENT LOCATION: See 85.

EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: See 85.

H. 6 < 16 cm  W. 6 < 13.2 cm  D. (measurable) 2.5 < 4 cm

STONE TYPE: Barnack shelly oolite (limestone).

PRESENT CONDITION: Badly weathered.

DESCRIPTION: This fragment has been broken or cut along each of its three edges.
Its decoration comprises the right half of a layered, four-cord plait, exhibiting a vertical, rectilinear border along its right edge.

DISCUSSION: See 95.

DATE: Mid-tenth to mid-eleventh century.

REFERENCES: See 95.

94. Rampton 10: Recumbent monument (fragment) (Pl. 129).

PRESENT LOCATION: See 85.

EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: See 85.

H. 18 < 20.1 cm  W. 4 < 15 cm  D. (measurable) 2.5 < 4 cm

STONE TYPE: Barnack shelly oolite (limestone).

PRESENT CONDITION: See 85.

DESCRIPTION: This fragment has been broken or cut along its upper, lower and right edges; its left edge preserves evidence of a square-moulding. Its decoration comprises a vertical panel of four-cord interlace, framed by a vertical bar along its left edge.

DISCUSSION: See 95.

DATE: Mid-tenth to mid-eleventh century.

REFERENCES: See 95.
95. Rampton 11: Recumbent monument (fragment) (Pl. 129).

PRESENT LOCATION: See 85.

EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: See 85.

H. 30.6 < 41.5 cm W. 17 < 23 cm D. (measurable) 2.5 < 4 cm

STONE TYPE: Barnack shelly oolite (limestone).

PRESENT CONDITION: See 85.

DESCRIPTION: This fragment has been broken along its upper, lower and right edges; its left edge preserves evidence of a square moulding. Its decoration comprises a vertical panel of layered, four-cord interlace, apparently delimited by rectilinear borders along either longitudinal edge.

DISCUSSION (85-95): Rampton 1-4 derive from the same monument, identified by Fox as a “Type 4” recumbent slab.\textsuperscript{143} He suggests Rampton 5 is the fragmentary narrow face of a cross-shaft,\textsuperscript{144} though crosses characteristic of the Fenland Group do not exhibit interlace on their narrow faces; if this fragment does derive from a free-standing cross, it is typologically distinct from the Fenland Group, perhaps akin to Peterborough Cathedral 3. Rampton 6-7 and 9-11 are examples of “Type 3” recumbent monuments,\textsuperscript{145} whereas Rampton 8 exhibits no typologically-distinct characteristics.

Though Rampton is not mentioned in Liber Eliensis, Domesday records that the Abbot of Ely was the manor’s partial soke-holder, with five of the manor’s six freemen in his commendation (the sixth was commended to “Eadgifu”, probably the mother of King Eadred).\textsuperscript{146} Rampton is also approximately 3.5 km southeast of

\textsuperscript{143} Ibid., p. 22; pl. 4
\textsuperscript{144} Ibid., pp. 15, 19; pl. 6.
\textsuperscript{145} Ibid., pp. 19, 22; pl. 6.
\textsuperscript{146} Domesday Book (Williams and Martin, eds., 2002), p. 546.
Willingham—a manor identified as a participant in Leofsige’s food-rent programme (see vol. 1, pp. 108-109). Based on its location, it is likely that Rampton was also a productive agricultural centre and, thus, possessive of wealth. However, Rampton’s apparent absence from the food-rent programme could suggest that its production was temporarily impaired or that its contributions were submitted to, and collected from, Willingham.\(^\text{147}\) It is equally possible that Rampton’s absence from the Liber Eliensis’ account is attributable to scribal error or oversight. Nonetheless, Rampton 1-11 are illustrative of the manor’s wealth in the mid-eleventh century and its landholders’ apparent association with Ely.

DATE: Mid-tenth to mid-eleventh century.


C.xvi. Stapleford, St Andrew’s. TL 47105212.

96. Stapleford 1: Cross-shaft (Pls. 130-133).

PRESENT LOCATION: On a window-sill in the west wall of the nave.

EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: Unknown (perhaps associated with a restoration campaign in 1866).\(^\text{148}\)

H. 53.7 < 56.3 cm  W. 31.2 < 33.1 cm  D. 10.8 < 17.9 cm

STONE TYPE: Barnack shelly oolite (limestone).

PRESENT CONDITION: Weathered (the carved decoration on Face C is badly eroded).

DESCRIPTION: This monolithic sculpture exhibits relief-carved decoration on each of its four faces, while its base is only decorated on its narrow sides. Faces A and C

\(^{147}\) If this can be demonstrated, then Rampton could be considered a berewick of Willingham.

preserve evidence of layered, four-strand interlaced registers, positioned vertically, set against raised, rectangular panels. Faces B and D exhibit vertical "battlement" motifs, framed by plain, rectilinear borders; quadripartite knots, delimited by square borders, decorate the narrow ends of the cross-base.

DISCUSSION: *Liber Eliensis* confirms that Stapleford was a dependency of Ely and a participant in Leofsige's programme of royally-sanctioned food-rent (see vol. 1, pp. 108-109). While *Domesday's* Stapleford reference is illustrative of the vill's wealth and diverse resources, no free land-holders are recorded. However, acknowledging its twenty indentured peasants and seven slaves, one or more freemen (suggested by Stapleford 1) would have managed the vill, including its agricultural production. Though a specific Stapleford charter exists (preserved in *Liber Eliensis* and dated *ca* 956), its authenticity has been challenged by Kennedy, though he does concede that it is likely derivative of an original landbook.

According to this charter, Stapleford was granted by King Eadred (*ca* 923-955) and his mother, Eadgifu (d. *ca* 966) to "Deo sanctoque Petro apostolo necnon et sancte Æðelredē virgini et sancte eius prosapie in Elyensi ecclesia"/"God and St Peter the Apostle, and also to St Æthelthryth the virgin and the progeny of this saint reposing in the church of Ely". The reference in Stapleford's dedication to "Deo sanctoque Petro apostolo necnon" is perhaps indicative of an association with Winchester, the Wessex capital and the site of Eadred's burial in the Old Minster of SS Peter and Paul. It also contributes to the literary and artistic evidence of Peter's importance in Late Saxon England (see vol. 1, pp. 217-221), specifically associating the saint with Ely where Cambridge Castle 1 (lost; Fox's identifier; see Appendix 2, pl. 164),

---

150 Ibid.
151 Quoted in *Liber Eliensis* (Fairweather, trans., 2005), n. 136, p. 124.
apparently exhibiting Petrine iconography, may have been produced. Thus, Stapleford’s charter, as preserved in Liber Eliensis, is seemingly demonstrative of the vill’s relationship with both monastic and royal authority.

DATE: Mid-tenth to mid-eleventh century.

REFERENCES: Benton (1910), pp. 229-230, fig. 1; Fox (1920-1921), pp. 15-17, pls. 1, 8 (“Map A”).

C.xvii. Stretham, St James’. TL 51157462.

97. Stretham 1: Recumbent monument (fragment) (Pl.134).

PRESENT LOCATION: West inner wall of south porch.

EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: Unknown (perhaps associated with a restoration campaign in 1874-1876).153

H. 31 < 31.2 cm  W. 23.3 < 23.5 cm  D. (measurable) .9 < 1.3 cm

STONE TYPE: Barnack shelly oolite (limestone).

PRESENT CONDITION: Good; some chipping and gouging is visible on the stone’s edges and carved surface.

DESCRIPTION: This fragment has been cut along its lateral edges; its upper and lower edges may also have been cut or modified. Its decoration comprises a single register of layered, four-cord interlace framed by horizontal, rectilinear borders of discordant width. The lower “border” could be a square-moulding, though nineteenth-century mortar partially conceals its outer edge.

DISCUSSION: According to Liber Eliensis, both Æthelwold, bishop of Winchester and Abbot Byrhtnoth of Ely acquired land at Stretham in the late tenth century (the account implies that Æthelwold’s purchases were either made for Ely or later ceded

to the monastery).\textsuperscript{154} This is corroborated by \textit{Domesday} which confirms the manor was a dependency of Ely in the mid-eleventh century.\textsuperscript{155} Like \textit{Domesday}'s account of Stapleford, no free land-holders are identified at Stretham, though its record of thirty-three indentured peasants and two slaves is indicative of significant agricultural production.\textsuperscript{156} It is probable that this enterprise was managed by one or more freemen at Stretham, with whom Stretham 1 is likely associated.

DATE: Mid-tenth to mid-eleventh century.


\textit{C.xviii. Whittlesford, SS Mary's and Andrew's. TL 47374857.}

98. Whittlesford 1: Recumbent monument (fragment) (Pls. 135-138).

PRESENT LOCATION: Displayed on the chancel floor, near the north wall.

EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: Unknown (possibly associated with a restoration campaign completed ca 1920).\textsuperscript{157}

H. 20.0 < 21.0 cm W. 18.0 < 18.5 cm D. 11 cm

STONE TYPE: Barnack shelly oolite (limestone).

PRESENT CONDITION: Weathered (gouging and chipping are visible on the stone's decorated surface and along its edges).

DESCRIPTION: This stone has been broken along its upper, lower and right edges; its left edge appears finished, though a deep gouge is visible along its left narrow edge (Face B). The fragment's decoration comprises the terminus of a layered, four-

\textsuperscript{154} \textit{Liber Eliensis}, II.10 (Blake, ed., 1962), pp. 82-84; \textit{Liber Eliensis}, II.10 (Fairweather, trans., 2005), pp. 106-107.

\textsuperscript{155} \textit{Domesday Book} (Williams and Martin, eds., 2002), p. 525.

\textsuperscript{156} Ibid.

cord, interlaced panel, framed along its right edge by an apparent cross-shaft, terminating in circular head of type “E-6” form, of which the lower left quadrant is extant.

DISCUSSION: See 100.

DATE: Mid-tenth to mid-eleventh century.

REFERENCES: See 99.

99. Whittlesford 2: Recumbent monument (fragment) (Pls. 139-142).

PRESENT LOCATION: See 98.

EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: See 98.

H. 22.2 < 23.2 cm  W. 20.8 < 22.2 cm  D. 11.8 cm

STONE TYPE: Barnack shelly oolite (limestone).

PRESENT CONDITION: See 98.

DESCRIPTION: This fragment has apparently been cut or modified along each of its edges. Its decoration comprises the terminus of a recessed, layered panel of four-cord interlace.

DISCUSSION: See 100.

DATE: Mid-tenth to mid-eleventh century.


100. Whittlesford 3: ?Cross-head (Pls. 143-147).

PRESENT LOCATION: See 98.

EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: See 98.

Dia. 17 cm  D. 5.4 < 7.0 cm
STONE TYPE: Barnack shelly oolite (limestone).

PRESENT CONDITION: Badly weathered (the carved decoration is eroded).

DESCRIPTION: This stone has been cut along its lower edge. Carved decoration, executed in high relief, apparently ornamented Face A; its remnants are vaguely anthropomorphic and seemingly depict two figures arranged hierarchically (one, possibly, with outstretched arms).

DISCUSSION (98-100): Based on Fox’s typology, Whittlesford 1 is a fragment of a “Type 6” recumbent slab. Its interlace is similar in both form and execution to Whittlesford 2’s; together with the stones’ apparent stratigraphic consistency, this suggests that Whittlesford 1-2 might derive from the same monument. Whittlesford 3 is anomalous among East Anglia’s Late Saxon carved stones. Its form and apparent decoration have no parallels in the region, perhaps suggesting that its manufacture might pre- or post-date the Late Saxon period. If, indeed, Whittlesford 3 preserves figural decoration, then its apparent spatial arrangement is suggestive of a Crucifixion, witnessed either by Stephaton or Longinus. However, acknowledging the condition of Whittlesford 3’s carved decoration, this hypothesis is entirely conjectural. Whittlesford 3 has apparently been recut, perhaps even machine-tooled.

According to Domesday Book, Eadgifu, mother of King Eadred, and Gyrô Godwinson (ca 1032-1066), Earl of East Anglia, held land at Whittlesford in the tenth and eleventh centuries respectively.\(^{158}\) Liber Eliensis also suggests that a hundred-court was convened at the site post-975, where “omnes meliores concionatores de comitatu Grantebrygge” (“all the more highly regarded spokesmen of Cambridgeshire”)\(^{159}\) gathered to mediate a tenurial dispute. This account also records that the lands in question—Swaffham Prior or Swaffham Bulbeck (both C)

\(^{158}\) Domesday Book (Williams and Martin, eds., 2002), pp. 530, 539, 549.
and possibly Barley (Hrt)\textsuperscript{160}—were ultimately ceded to the Abbot of Ely. Though there is no textual evidence of land-ownership at Whittlesford by the Abbot of Ely, the decoration of Whittlesford 1-2 is consistent with the monastery’s apparent intellectual \textit{milieu}, and thus, perhaps suggests that a Late Saxon elite held land in the \textit{vill} whose \textit{soke} was retained by the monastery.


REFERENCES: Unpublished.

\textbf{C.xix. Willingham, SS Mary’s and All Saints’, TL 40507052.}

\textbf{101. Willingham 1: Recumbent monument (fragment) (Pls. 148-149).}

PRESENT LOCATION: Cemented to the inner south wall of the south porch, forming the upper third of a Norman column.

EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: Recovered \textit{ca} 1891-1894 during a restoration campaign.\textsuperscript{161}

\begin{tabular}{lrr}
 H. & 25.2 cm & W. 12.5 < 13.4 cm \text{D. 10 < 10.3 cm} \\
\end{tabular}

STONE TYPE: Barnack shelly oolite (limestone).

PRESENT CONDITION: Weathered (gouging and chipping are visible along the fragment’s edges and carved surface).

DESCRIPTION: This stone has apparently been cut along each of edges. Its decoration comprises a single, vertical register of layered, three-cord interlace; remnants of a longitudinal square border or rectilinear bar are seemingly preserved along the register’s left side.

DISCUSSION: See \textbf{104}.

\textsuperscript{160} \textit{Liber Eliensis}, ii.34 (Fairweather, trans., 2005), p. 132, ns. 169-170.

\textsuperscript{161} Cited in Fox, “Anglo-Saxon Monumental Sculpture”, p. 17, n. 4.
DATE: Mid-tenth to mid-eleventh century.


PRESENT LOCATION: Cemented to the inner south wall of the south porch, forming the central third of a Norman column.

EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: See 101.

H. 24.4 cm  W. 11 < 11.5 cm  D. 11.5 < 11.7 cm

STONE TYPE: Barnack shelly oolite (limestone).

PRESENT CONDITION: See 101.

DESCRIPTION: This fragment has been cut or modified along each of its edges. Its decoration comprises an irregular, two-cord, interlaced pattern, seemingly exhibiting two layered, pendent loops.

DISCUSSION: See 104.

DATE: Mid-tenth to mid-eleventh century.

REFERENCES: See 103.


PRESENT LOCATION: Cemented to the inner south wall of the south porch, forming the lower third of a Norman column.

EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: See 101.

H. 24.5 cm  W. 11.8 < 12.2 cm  D. 11.6 < 12.2 cm

STONE TYPE: Barnack shelly oolite (limestone).

PRESENT CONDITION: See 101.
DESCRIPTION: This fragment has been cut along each of its edges. It decoration comprises a vertical panel of layered, four-cord interlace.

DISCUSSION: See 104.

DATE: Mid-tenth to mid-eleventh century.


104. Willingham 4: Recumbent monument (fragment) (Pl. 152).

PRESENT LOCATION: Inner south wall of south porch.

EVIDENCE FOR DISCOVERY: See 101.

H. 14.5 < 26.8 cm  W. 16 < 27 cm  D. (measurable) 2.6 cm

STONE TYPE: Barnack shelly oolite (limestone).

PRESENT CONDITION: See 101.

DESCRIPTION: This irregularly-shaped fragment has been broken along its upper, lower and left edges; its upper right edge preserves a worn square- or rounded-moulding. The stone's decoration comprises the terminus of an apparent vertical, recessed panel of layered, four-cord interlace, seemingly delineated along its left edge by a rectilinear bar, a remnant of which is preserved to the left of the interlace. This bar apparently terminated in a circular form, evidenced by what is probably the lower quadrant of a circle, preserved above the interlace.

DISCUSSION (101-104): According to Fox's typology, Willingham 1 (though of indeterminate type) derives from a recumbent monument of the Fenland Group. Willingham 4 is also a recumbent monument, corresponding to Fox's "Type 6" slabs.162 Willingham 2-3 probably derive from a small, monolithic cross, comprising

---

the lower “arm” of the cross-head and the interlaced register of the cross-shaft, respectively.\textsuperscript{163}

According to \textit{Liber Eliensis}, Willingham was bequeathed to Ely by “Uvi” sometime in the late tenth or early eleventh century.\textsuperscript{164} It is confirmed as a dependency of Ely in Edward the Confessor’s charter and was also a participant in Abbot Leofsige’s food-rent programme (see vol. 1, pp. 106-109). \textit{Domesday} records two free land-holders at Willingham in the mid-eleventh century, one explicitly commended to Eadgifu,\textsuperscript{165} perhaps suggesting that she held or managed territory whose \textit{soke} was retained by the abbot (this hypothesis could explain Eadgifu’s tenurial role at Whittlesford and Rampton; see above). Thus, acknowledging the form and decoration of Willingham 1-4, it is possible that these fragments are associated with one or more of the \textit{vill}’s named land-holders, “Uvi”, “Oswulf” or “Golda”, and reflect Ely’s tenurial lordship.

DATE: Mid-tenth to mid-eleventh century.


\textsuperscript{163} \textit{Ibid.}, pp. 17-19; pl. 2
\textsuperscript{165} \textit{Domesday Book} (Williams and Martin, eds., 2002), pp. 524, 532, 546.
Gazetteer Plates

(All images © Michael F. Reed, 2005-2008, unless noted)

All photographs in Appendices 1-2 were taken with an Olympus AF Zoom 5.8-17.4mm 1:2.9-5.0 digital lens, augmented by halogen cross-lighting, and manipulated with Olympus Master, version 1.00 © Olympus Imaging Corp., 2004.

A. Norfolk

A.i. Barrett or "Little" Ringstead, St Peter's (Norwich Castle Study Centre).

Pl. 1. Barrett or "Little" Ringstead 1. Face A
Pl. 2. Barrett or "Little" Ringstead 1. Face B.
Pl. 3. Barrett or “Little” Ringstead 1. Face C.
A.ii. Beachamwell, All Saints’ (Norwich Castle Study Centre).

Pl. 4. Beachamwell 1-2. Faces A.
Pl. 5. Beachamwell 1. *Face B.*
Pl. 6. Beachamwell 2. Face B.
Pl. 7. Beachamwell 2-1. *Faces C.*
A.iii. Bodney, St Mary’s.

A.iv. Cringleford, St Peter's.

Pl. 9. Cringleford 1.
Pl. 10. Cringleford 2-3.
Pl. 11. Cringleford 2.

Pl. 15. Cringleford 5.
Pl. 17. Cringleford 7.
A vi. North Pickenham, St Andrew's.

Pl. 18. North Pickenham 1.
A.vii. Norwich, St Martin-at-Palace (Norfolk Archaeology).

A.viii. Norwich, St Vedast’s (Norwich Castle Museum).

Pl. 20. Norwich, St Vedast 1 ("St Vedast Cross"). Face A.
Pl. 21. Norwich, St Vedast 1 ("St Vedast Cross"). *Face A, detail.*
Pl. 22. Norwich, St Vedast 1 ("St Vedast Cross"). Face B.
Pl. 23. Norwich, St Vedast 1 ("St Vedast Cross"). Face D.
Pl. 24. Norwich, St Vedast 1 (“St Vedast Cross”). Face D, detail.
A.ix. Rockland, All Saints'.
A.x. Thetford, ?St John’s (Norfolk Museums and Archaeology Service, Gressenhall).

Pl. 27. Thetford 1. Broad face.
Pl. 28. Thetford 1. *Broad face.*
Pl. 29. Thetford I. Narrow end.
A.xi. Whissonsett, St Mary's.

Pl. 30. Whissonsett 1 ("Whissonsett Cross"). *Face A.*
Pl. 31. Whissonsett l ("Whissonsett Cross"). *Faces A, B.*
Pl. 32. Whissonsett 1 ("Whissonsett Cross"). Faces A, D.
B. Suffolk

B.i. Aldham, St Mary's.

Pl. 33. Aldham 1.
Pl. 34. Aldham 2. © S. Plunkett, 1998.
B.ii. Blaxhall, St Peter's.

Pl. 35. Blaxhall 1.
B.iii. Bury St Edmund's, St Edmund’s Abbey.

Pl. 36. Bury St Edmunds 1.
Pl. 37. Bury St Edmunds 1 showing iron fitting. © R. Gem and L. Keen, 1981.
B.iv. Framsden, St Mary’s.

B.v. Great Ashfield, ?All Saints’ (Great Ashfield House).

Pl. 39. Great Ashfield 1 ("Great Ashfield Cross"). Face A.
Pl. 40. Great Ashfield 1 ("Great Ashfield Cross"). Face A, detail.
Pl. 41. Great Ashfield 1 ("Great Ashfield Cross"). Face B.
Pl. 42. Great Ashfield 1 ("Great Ashfield Cross"). Face C, detail.
Pl. 43. Great Ashfield 1 ("Great Ashfield Cross"). *Face D.*
Pl. 44. Great Ashfield 1 ("Great Ashfield Cross"). Face D, detail.
B.vi. Hunston, St Michael's.

Pl. 45. Hunston 1. Broad face.
Pl. 46. Hunston 1. Narrow face.
Pl. 47. Hunston 2.
Pl. 48. Hunston 3.
Pl. 49. Hunston 4.
Pl. 50. Hunston 5.
B.vii. Huntingfield, St Mary the Virgin's.


B.viii. Ipswich, St Nicholas'.

Pl. 54. Ipswich 1 ("St Michael and the Dragon").
Pl. 55. Ipswich 2 ("Boar Tympanum"). Face A.
Pl. 56. Ipswich 2 ("Boar Tympanum"). *Face B.*
Pl. 57. Ipswich 3-5 ("Apostles").
Pl. 58. Ipswich 3 ("Apostle").
Pl. 59. Ipswich 4 ("Apostle").
Pl. 60. Ipswich 5 ("Apostle").
B.ix. Ixworth. St Mary's (Moyse's Hall Museum, Bury St Edmunds).

Pl. 61. Ixworth 1-2.
Pl. 62. Ixworth 1.
Pl. 63. Ixworth 1. *Narrow face.*
Pl. 64. Ixworth 2.
Pl. 65. Ixworth 2. Narrow face.
Pl. 66. Kedington 1 ("Kedington Cross"). *Face A.*
Pl. 67. Kedington 1 ("Kedington Cross"). Faces A, B.
B.xi. Little Wratting, St Mary's.

Pl. 68. Little Wratting 1 ("Dedication Stone").

B.xii. Santon Downham, St Mary’s (Moyse’s Hall Museum, Bury St Edmunds).

Pl. 70. Santon Downham 1. © Moyse’s Hall Museum.
B.xiii. South Elmham, St Cross, "Old Minster" (Suffolk Archaeological Unit Stores, Bury St Edmunds).

Pl. 71. South Elmham 1. © Suffolk Archaeology.
B.xiv. Wickhambrook, All Saints'.

Pl. 72. Wickhambrook 1.
B.xv. Wordwell, All Saints’.

Pl. 73. Wordwell 1.
Pl. 74. Wordwell 2. *Broad face.*
Pl. 75. Wordwell 2. *Broad face*. 
Pl. 76. Wordwell 2. Narrow face.
C. North and East Cambridgeshire

C.i. Balsham, Holy Trinity.

C.iii. Cambridge, St Benet's.

Pl. 78. Cambridge, St Benet's, 1-2.
Pl. 79. Cambridge, St Benet's, 1. *Broad face.*
Pl. 80. Cambridge, St Benet's, 1. Narrow face from south.
Pl. 81. Cambridge, St Benet's, 2. Broad face.
Pl. 82. Cambridge, St Benet's, 2. Narrow face from north.
C.iv. Cambridge Castle (Cambridge University Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology).

Pl. 83. Cambridge Castle 1 (no. “2” in Fox’s study).
Pl. 84. Cambridge Castle 2 (no. "3" in Fox's typology).
Pl. 86. Cambridge Castle 3. Face B.
Pl. 87. Cambridge Castle 3. *From above.*
C.v. Cambridge, Little St Mary’s.

Pl. 88. Cambridge, Little St Mary’s, 1.
Pl. 89. Cambridge, Little St Mary's, 2.
C.vi. Caxton, St Andrew's.

Pl. 90. Caxton 1.
Pl. 91. Caxton 2.
C.viii. Fletton, St Margaret's.

Pl. 92. Fletton 1. Face A.
C.ix. Grantchester, SS Andrew’s and Mary’s.

Pl. 94. Grantchester 1.
Pl. 95. Grantchester 2.
Pl. 96. Grantchester 3.
C.x. Helpston, St Botolph's.

C.xi. Little Shelford, All Saints'.
Pl. 102. Little Shelford 2.
Pl. 103. Little Shelford 3.
Pl. 104. Little Shelford 4-5.
Pl. 105. Little Shelford 6-7.
Pl. 106. Little Shelford 6.
Pl. 107. Little Shelford 7.
Pl. 108. Little Shelford 8-9.
Pl. 109. Little Shelford 8.
Pl. 110. Little Shelford 9.
C. xii. Maxey, St Peter's.

C.xiv. Peterborough, Peterborough Cathedral.

Pl. 112. Peterborough Cathedral 1. *Broad and narrow face.*
Pl. 113. Peterborough Cathedral 1. Broad and narrow face.
Pl. 114. Peterborough Cathedral 1. *Broad and narrow face.*
Pl. 115. Peterborough Cathedral 2. *Broad and narrow face.*
Pl. 116. Peterborough Cathedral 2. *Broad and narrow face.*
Pl. 117. Peterborough Cathedral 2. Narrow face.
Pl. 118. Peterborough Cathedral 3.
Pl. 119. Peterborough Cathedral 3. Detail.
Below is part of a monument in Peterborough Cathedral. The carving, often of Ruthwell type, dates as much as two centuries earlier than the Anglo-Saxon wars mentioned. This particular piece, which is the most remarkable in the church (notably at Gosford), is one of the earliest examples of flat faces and architectural forms.
Pl. 121. Peterborough Cathedral 4. Face B.
Pl. 122. Peterborough Cathedral 4. *Faces B, C.*
Pl. 123. Peterborough Cathedral 4. *Face D.*
C.xv. Rampton, All Saints'.

Pl. 124. Rampton 1-4.
Pl. 125. Rampton 5.
Pl. 127. Rampton 7.
Pl. 128. Rampton 8.
Pl. 129. Rampton 9-11.
Pl. 130. Stapleford 1 ("Stapleford Cross"). *Face A.*
Pl. 131. Stapleford 1 ("Stapleford Cross"). *Face B.*
Pl. 132. Stapleford 1 ("Stapleford Cross"). Face C.
Pl. 133. Stapleford 1 ("Stapleford Cross"). Face D.
C.xvii. Stretham, St James'.

Pl. 134. Stretham 1.
C.xviii. Whittlesford, SS Mary’s and Andrew’s.

Pl. 135. Whittlesford 1. Face A.
Pl. 136. Whittlesford 1. *Face B.*
Pl. 137. Whittlesford 1. *Face C.*
Pl. 138. Whittlesford I. *Face D.*
Pl. 139. Whittlesford 2. *Face A.*
Pl. 140. Whittlesford 2. *Face B.*
Pl. 141. Whittlesford 2. *Face C.*
Pl. 142. Whittlesford 2. Face D.
Pl. 143. Whittlesford 3. Face A.
Pl. 144. Whittlesford 3. Face A.
Pl. 145. Whittlesford 3. Face B.
Pl. 146. Whittlesford 3. *Face C.*
Pl. 147. Whittlesford 3. *Face D.*
C.xix. Willingham, St Mary’s and All Saints’

Pl. 148. Obverse face of Norman column preserving Willingham 1-3.
Pl. 149. Willingham 1.
Pl. 150. Willingham 2.
Pl. 151. Willingham 3.
Pl. 152. Willingham 4.
Appendix 2

Comparative Material

Pl. 153. Iken 1. *Face A.*
Pl. 154. Iken 1. *Faces B, C.*
Pl. 156. Peterborough Cathedral, "Hedda Stone".
Pl. 158. Barnack, St John the Baptist's, panels (unknown photographer). Retrieved 01/01/08 from <http://www.megalithic.co.uk/article.php?sid=16769>.
Pl. 159. Fletton, St Margaret’s, ?St Michael.

Pl. 162. London, B.L. Stowe 944, f. 6. Cnut and Ælfgyfu. Temple, Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts, fig. 244.
Pl. 164. Cambridge Castle I (lost; Fox’s identifier). Thompson, *Dying and Death*, p. 130, pl. 3.

Pl. 177. Silver disc-brooch from Sutton, Isle of Ely. British Museum, reg. no. 1951, 10-11, I. Obverse and Reverse faces. Wilson, Anglo-Saxon Ornamental Metalwork, p. 175, fig. 34, no. 83.
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