inseparable. The continuing elevation of the status of Mary as mother of God is implied, triumphantly, in the Kells image by the fusion of the imperial and iconic styles of representation. The embedded chi-rho visually presents the messiah and mother as the chi-rho, and as such, is positioned as preatory to the gospel in the Book of Kells.

In a continuum of images of mother and child, the withdrawn pose of the child, that excludes communication between the child and the viewer, is the distinctive change that distinguishes the Kells image from all surviving images of the mother and child in late seventh- to early ninth-century Insular iconography. Mary is portrayed as the intermediary between the worshipper and the incarnate word, as the mediatix. In the detail of the visual representation of the Kells mother and child, the elevated status of Mary becomes obvious, and provides evidence that the integral role of mother of God was understood. Through the use of human figures and symbolism within the complex design of the Kells image, theology is conveyed in a way not expressed in any other representation of the mother and child.

In a period when fear of idolatry proved destructive of religious art as the Byzantine empire was caught in the iconoclast crisis, Insular iconography displayed an independent and creative element. Culminating c800 CE in the image of the Kells mother and child, Mary was visually elevated in Insular iconography as integral to both Christ's glory and his suffering, while positioned as mediatix to encounter supplicants. The Kells mother and child, in its iconography, is a sophisticated interpretation of the theology which had, at Ephesus in 431 CE, acknowledged Mary as theotokos.

National religions and the survival of stone sculpture: some preliminary observations

Pamela O'Neill

I am not a student of the early modern period, and do not pretend to know a great deal about it. I have been until now a student of the early medieval period, and in the course of examining early medieval stone sculpture in the United Kingdom and Ireland have been interested by the wide variation in survival and condition of that material. In this paper I wish to make some preliminary observations about the physical effects of the political and religious developments of the early modern period on the stone sculpture of the early medieval.

England

'From the 1530s onwards', according to Alastair MacLachlan, 'nationhood was most clearly focussed around the idea of a national church, and national consciousness was equated with Protestantism.' 1 1533 marked a distinct point of divergence from Rome, partly as a result of Henry VIII's offquoted marital difficulties, when the Church of England decided that it was 'sufficient and meet of itself'. 2 In the early 1530s there was what Eamon Duffy calls 'a minor epidemic' of destruction of images within churches and wayside crosses, although such acts were still considered tokens of heresy. 3

In July 1536, a convocation of clergy passed Ten Articles, the sixth of which discussed the proper use of images in religion, which was to represent virtue and good example and to kindle and stir observers to remember and lament their sins. It was acceptable to cense, kneel to, offer to or worship before images, provided it was recognised that these acts were directed to God and not to the images themselves. 4

In August 1536, a set of royal Injunctions was issued. The fourth directed that parsons, vicars and the like should not 'set forth or extol any

---

1 Alastair MacLachlan, "Patriotic scripture": the making and unmaking of English national identity", Parergon ns14/1 (July 1996) 1-30, p15.
4 ibid p392.
images, relics or miracles for any superstition or lucre, nor allure the people by any enticements to the pilgrimage of any saint, otherwise than is permitted in the Articles lately put forth. 5 It went on to explain that rather than make pilgrimages or offerings, the people would please God more by working hard, providing for their families, and performing acts of charity. This injunction did not address the propriety of the presence of images in churches, but merely their proper use. Nonetheless, over the next two years, apparently by royal command, monasteries were dissolved and cult images were suppressed. Roods and images of the Virgin within churches were dismantled and degraded.

A second set of Injunctions, issued in 1538, took the rather stronger position that offerings and pilgrimages to images were to be denounced as superstitious and tending to idolatry. The clergy of local parishes were directed to ‘take down and delay’ any images that were abused with pilgrimages or offerings. Those that were not so abused were to be left alone. It is, and possibly was, unclear whether delay meant destroy or simply remove. Certainly many assumed that it meant destroy, and the difficulties of determining whether an image was abused allowed radicals some additional leeway. The same year, 1538, saw the public burning in London of the statue of St Derfel, taken with some difficulty from the local community in Llandderfel, Wales.6

Official edicts under Henry varied in their attitude to images, ranging from Henry’s letter from Hull directing bishops to remove shrines and monuments from their churches to the King’s Book of 1543 which explicitly approved the setting up of images in churches.7 Archbishop Cranmer’s brother broke the arms and legs of a rood at Canterbury, and Commisary Nevinson directed that images be disfigured.8

Henry’s successor, the nine-year-old Edward VI, in 1547, the year of his coronation, issued a new set of Injunctions, the third of which ordered the clergy to have all abused images taken down and destroyed.9 While this order remained restricted to abused images, it made it absolutely clear that such images were to be destroyed, and destroyed by the parish clergy. It also directed that no one other than clergy was to direct the destruction. The twenty-eighth of Edward’s Injunctions directed that the clergy should destroy all ‘monuments of feigned miracles, pilgrimages, idolatry and superstition’, and that they should exhort their parishioners to do the same in their own homes.10 Early in 1548, the privy council removed the restriction and ordered the removal of all images from churches and chapels.11

An Act of 1550 dictated fines and imprisonment for those who had ‘any images of stone, timber, alabaster, or earth, graven or painted, which heretofore have been taken out of any church or chapel, or yet stand in any church or chapel’ and did not cause them to be defaced and destroyed.12 All images had to be rendered incapable of ever serving their original function. If total destruction was not possible, they were to be severely mutilated. The word ‘deface’ apparently meant quite literally what it said: to remove the face. At this time, figures in Exeter cathedral lost their noses.13 The early medieval panel at Hovingham, which probably belonged to a shrine, appears to have had the heads of some figures deliberately removed while the bodies remained. This is particularly evident in the two figures to left of centre (figure 1).

Edward was succeeded in 1553 by the Roman Catholic Mary. During her short reign, considerable attempts were made to repair and replace the images of which the churches had been stripped. Parishes were required specifically to have a rood with Mary and John, and a statue of their patron, all of at least five feet in height.14 From a Roman Catholic viewpoint, this was a period of restoration. However, from the viewpoint of a student of early medieval stone sculpture, it might be seen as one of continued destruction, albeit of another kind. Many parishes had never had sculpture which met the new requirements, and so if their original sculpture

5 ibid p398.
6 Margaret Aston, ‘Iconoclasm in England: Official and Clandestine’ in C Davidson and A E Nichols (eds), Iconoclam vs Art and Drama (Kalamazoo, 1989) 47-91, p66. The statue is noted for being consigned to the same fire as burn the ‘heretic’
John Forest
7 Duffy, pp429ff.
8 ibid pp434, 440.
10 ibid p256.
12 Aston, England’s Iconoclasts p267.
14 Phillips, p102.
had been fortunate enough to have survived, it had now to be altered or replaced.

In 1558, Elizabeth I ascended the throne, and in 1559 issued her injunctions. These withdrew slightly from Edward's position. Once again, abused images were to be abolished, but images per se were quietly avoided. The visitation articles of the same year once again urged the removal, abolition and destructions of 'monuments of feigned and false miracles, pilgrimages, idolatry, and superstition'. Most visitors seem to have interpreted this as covering the destruction of all images.

Abbot Foskett in the House of Lords complained in the House of Lords on the 'scrunching and cutting off the face and legs of the crucifix'.

This contemporary comment on the treatment of images links directly to the physical evidence of some surviving pieces of early medieval stone sculpture, where the face and legs of the crucifix show clear toolmarks. The rood at Romsey shows signs of having been attacked with a chisel or more probably a point, particularly about the right knee and the face (figure 2). The figure of Christ, which is not a crucifix or rood, at Jevington, has been attacked with what seems to be a chisel on the lower legs and face, and also has a few isolated chip marks on the remainder of the body (figure 3). The rood at Walkern, whose stomach was apparently removed to make way for a beam, has had the lower part of the face very thoroughly removed, again probably with a chisel (figure 4). One might conjecture that the upper part of the face survived because of the rood's position high in the wall and the unavailability of ladders, possibly reflecting an unhelpful local congregation.

Open-air monuments also came under attack. In October 1571, rural deans in the diocese of York were ordered to ensure that no relics of crosses remain in any church or chapel yard. In 1578, reports from the diocese of Chester suggest that some parishes still had their churchyard crosses while others had only stumps or headless monuments.

In 1603 charges were brought against men who had thrown down with staves a stone cross standing in the churchyard of Wharton. These were obviously sturdy staves, as a stone cross would not be easy to throw down. A good proportion of the stone crosses standing in churchyards must have dated from the early medieval period. My observations suggest that such crosses would have been firmly rooted in the ground, often with a stone socket around the base, and would usually be of a thickness difficult to fracture with a force less than their own weight. The difficulty of destruction would apply equally to a free-standing stone cross of early medieval type as to the more elaborate later market crosses. Witness Hatfield High Cross, where two stonemasons were required to perform the demolition, or Cheapside, destroyed during the civil war, where a contemporary drawing suggests that four or more men with large picks were assisted by ladders, ropes, horses and a large crowd.

With the advent of civil war in the 1640s, the parliamentary forces led by Oliver Cromwell were on the side of strict reform, and accordingly opposed to religious images. However, there is no doubt that the destruction brought about in the early part of the English civil war period was not all doctrinally motivated. In the fierce battle for possession of territory, any fortifiable position was put to work. This included churches, as being frequently large, generally stone structures. In the process of fortification, and then of giving and receiving fire, it is inevitable that some destruction would occur.

A royalist account reports that in May 1644, having been unable to defeat the royalist forces at Newbridge, parliamentary soldiers fell back to Abingdon, whose cross they 'most manfully assaulted and pulled downe to the ground, for feare lest any monument of the religion and piety of our Ancestors or this present age should be left remaining'.

In August 1643, a parliamentary ordinance directed the demolition and removal of altars, altar-rails, chancler steps, images of the Trinity, Virgin, and saints, crucifixes and crosses. Not only did the order apply to the interior of church buildings, but also to any open or public place. A conscientious agent reported of his work at Gorleston that he 'brake down a cross on the steeple, and three stone crosses in the chancel, and a stone cross in the porch'.

15 Aston, England's Iconoclasts p300.
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The fragments of a large stone cross from Easby demonstrate the thoroughness of these attacks (see figure 5). Not only was the monument broken into small pieces, of which not all have been recovered, but the faces on one panel have been painstakingly removed with a pick, or more likely, given the precision of the job, a mallet and point.

Ireland

The reformation in Ireland, while ostensibly similar to that in England, was in effect rather different, as can be seen by the relatively high survival rate of stone sculpture. The well-known high crosses at Durrow, Clonmacnoise and Monasterboice are somewhat typical of the condition of a large proportion of surviving early medieval stone crosses in Ireland. In 1536, the same year as England’s Ten Articles and first Injunctions, the Irish parliament abrogated papal supremacy and recognised Henry VIII as head of the Church of Ireland. The Irish monasteries were nominally dissolved over a period from the 1520s to the 1540s, but those outside the areas under English control continued in existence into the seventeenth century.

The Annals of Connaught record that in 1537, the miraculous image of Mary at Trin, which had been venerated for ages by all the Irish, which used to heal the blind and the deaf and the lame, and all other sufferers; and the Staff of Jesus, which was in Dublin, where it worked miracles and wonders renowned in Ireland from the time of Patrick to this time ... were burnt by the English. More than this, there was no holy Cross or effigy of Mary or famous image in Ireland which they did not burn if it fell into their power.24

This last part is significant, as the evidence suggests that while a considerable amount of portable church property and relics may have fallen into their power, by no means all of it did. Furthermore, a quantity of non-portable material, like much stone sculpture, was apparently left alone. Allowance must also be made for some bias leading to exaggeration in the annals. In the time of Elizabeth, according to GV Jourdan,

the alienation of Church property became a recognised means of acquiring wealth for those who were bold enough, or mean enough to lay hands on it. Corruption and intimidation were the means most commonly employed; and all classes shared in the plunder - even the clergy.25

The implication is that churches were relieved of valuable property such as plate, rather than of images as such, and this may in part account for the survival of much sculpture.

It is claimed that at the Restoration in 1660 many Irish churches were in a state of ruin.26 A contemporary observer recorded that ‘there were very many crosses in publique Roads ... which, wherever found, were totally defaced, broken or burned by Cromwellian soldiers’.27 This might again be a case of biased reporting leading to exaggeration. The high cross at Dysert O’Dea, known as St Tola’s high cross, was purportedly ‘knocked down by the Cromwellsians’,28 but is nonetheless in quite good condition, particularly when compared with its English counterparts (figure 6). It is possible that the thoroughness of the job was dictated by the degree of local support or the time available to the perpetrators - in this case apparently minimal. No specialised tools have been employed here. The large horizontal crack is actually on the line of an original join. The bishop’s arm, extended in blessing, and probably always removable, has been lost, not necessarily in the Cromwellian era. Christ’s face has been chipped, but as the head too was removable, it was not necessarily Cromwell’s people who were responsible for this either. Given that the removable parts were for the specific purpose of performing miracles of healing, one would expect this monument to have attracted particular violence. This example shows a marked contrast between the treatment of sculpture in England and in Ireland.

The Irish Church Act of 1869 saw the disestablishment of the Church of Ireland, meaning that it was no longer connected with the State and was a voluntary association. The Act was also one of disendowment, where churches in use were able to be vested in the Church, but disused or ruinous churches became national monuments.29 National monument status contributed to the survival of some examples of early medieval stone sculpture, but arguably contributed to the deterioration of others. The high cross in the churchyard at Durrow, although a national monument, is not

27 John Synnott quoted in Meigs, pp120ff.
28 Risteard Us Croinin, Dysert O’Dea A History Trail (Corofin, nd)
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well looked after. Neglect, and the trees on the privately owned property within which the churchyard is contained, have caused considerable damage to one face in particular (figure 7). By contrast, the high crosses at Clonmacnoise, which became a national monument in 1877, are in superb condition. Those in the grounds of the Church of Ireland which is still in use at Castledermot are in similarly good condition (figure 8), showing that national monuments are not necessarily better cared for than their ecclesiastical counterparts.

Scotland
The reformation in Scotland was achieved less at the instigation of its king than in defiance of him. In August 1560, following some isolated examples of destruction of images, the Scottish Parliament declared that the church of Rome would no longer be the national church of Scotland, and later that year the first General Assembly of the Church of Scotland took place. We can assume that the dissolution of the monasteries resulted in some loss of stone sculpture. Part of what was probably a shrine, discovered at Jedburgh Abbey, suggests the destruction of such objects, although there is no evidence that in this case destruction was deliberate (figure 9).

The period of more serious upheaval in the Scottish church began not long before the outbreak of civil war in England. In March 1638, the National Covenant was signed at Greyfriars' Church in Edinburgh. The Glasgow Assembly in November of the same year abolished episcopacy.

The General Assembly of July 1640, in Aberdeen, passed an 'Act Anent the Demolishing of Idolatrous Monuments', whose text was short and to the point:

Forasmuch as the Assembly is informed, that in divers parts of this Kingdom, and specially in the North parts of the same, many Idolatrous Monuments, erected and made for Religious worship, are yet extant, Such as Crucifixes, Images of Christ, Mary, and Saints departed, ordaines the saids Monuments to be taken down, demolished, and destroyed, and that with all convenient diligence: And that the care of this work shall be incumbent to the Presbyteries and Provinciall Assemblies

within this Kingdome: and their Commissioners to report their diligence herein to the next Generall Assembly.\[31\]

In one case at least, a presbytery clearly did not comply with this Act, for in July 1642 at St Andrews, the General Assembly issued another instruction:

Anent the report of idolatrous monuments in the Kirk of Ruthwell the Assemblie finds that the monument therein mentioned is idolatrous, and therefore recommends to the Presbytery that they carefully urge the order prescried by the Acts of Parliament anent the abolishing of these monuments, to be put to execution.\[32\]

Whatever the reason for Ruthwell's previous non-compliance, subsequently the Ruthwell Cross was certainly taken down, demolished, and not quite destroyed (figure 10). Despite a fairly accomplished restoration, there are clear signs of faces, hands and an entire crucifixion being chiselled off, as well as the breaking of the monument into pieces. The largest piece, though, was allowed to remain inside the church for over a hundred years, until it was removed to allow a new floor to be laid around 1780.\[33\]

The village of St Vigeans displays an interesting collection of early medieval stone sculpture. Allen and Anderson identified fragments of at least 17 cross-slabs, two free-standing crosses, three other monuments with crosses, and assorted other fragments.\[34\] Many of the fragments here have been reshaped for reuse, primarily as construction material. It is likely that the pieces were already damaged when this reshaping occurred. Interestingly, of the larger reshaped pieces, none contains a recognisable cross or image of a saint. I would suggest that these items (eg St Vigeans No 1, figure 11)\[35\] were considered suitable for leaving in large, and


\[33\] John Dinwiddie, The Ruthwell Cross and its story (Dumfries, 1927) p98.


\[35\] St Vigeans No 1 and St Vigeans No 1a were cemented together in the nineteenth century. Curiously, Allen and Anderson report this work as having already been carried out, although their photographs show the pieces separately. This leads me to suspect that they may have been involved in the cementing project. Their photographs of the individual pieces accurately display the extent of each fragment, which is considerably exaggerated in the combined object.
therefore useful, pieces because they no longer contained offensive material. The pieces where such matter as cross-heads or human figures can be identified are not reshaped and are in general much smaller, suggesting that they were discarded as rubble or perhaps buried (eg St Vigeans No 1a, figure 12).

Curiously, some early medieval stone sculpture in Scotland remained untouched, including several high crosses on the western Isles and isolated examples on the mainland. Perhaps the General Assembly was not well informed about the situation in these outlying areas.

Survival
From these very preliminary observations, it seems that national religions, and the ways in which they developed, had considerable effect on the survival of early medieval stone sculpture in England, Ireland and Scotland. England's Reformation was protracted and ambivalent, the civil war period one of considerable violence and religious fanaticism, and sculpture suffered various indignities over a long period. Individuals and congregations, as well as officials, were urged or forced to damage or destroy stone sculpture, and employed whatever tools were to hand. Ireland's Reformation was imposed from the outside, and perhaps never wholly espoused by the people. Accordingly, while the opportunity to plunder church plate may have been exploited, much stone sculpture was left fairly well alone. Some monuments that were attacked suffered only minimal damage. The disestablishment of the Church of Ireland meant that some monuments became neglected while others were well maintained. In Scotland, reform of religion was extreme, and the fate of sculpture dictated centrally. Arguably the intact survivals were unknown to the authorities. In general, sculpture with offending material was severely damaged or destroyed, while it seems that once those portions had been dealt with the remaining portions were made available for more utilitarian purposes, meaning that in many cases quite large fragments survive.

36 A notable exception is St Vigeans No 7, which still bears a clear, though severely trimmed cross, and was purportedly re-used as a grave marker. It appears to be assumed (eg Anna Ritchie, The Picts (Edinburgh 1985) p37) that the trimming was to obtain a more suitable size and shape for a grave marker, but I would suggest the possibility that the trimming was done in order to remove signs of (possibly deliberate) damage.
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David Jones: the battle of the psyche – lost and won!

Marian Marcatili

Introduction
The Welsh artist and poet David Jones experienced debilitating periods of mental illness or neurosis throughout his life. This illness not only interrupted and prevented him from following his vocation and passion, painting, but also from completing literary works. Ironically it may well have been this neurosis that gave him the creative drive and conceptual vision that generated his many enigmatic works of visual art and literary works as well.

I will be exploring the development and impact that this illness may have had on Jones’ life as well as analysing selected works completed by Jones, from the post-World War I period to the drawing made for the Frontispiece to In Parenthesis, published in 1937. This period takes in paintings made prior to his first major neurotic episode or breakdown, and I will examine images and motifs that may prove insightful in detecting deeper emotional disturbances that culminated in the inevitable.

As well, I will be comparing some images and motifs with those from a collection of psychiatric art made by Eric Cunningham Dax. This collection of psychiatric art works began in the early 1950s from the beginnings of art therapy for returned prisoners of war in Birmingham after World War II. A move to Australia and a subsequent appointment in 1952 to the Victorian Mental Health Authority allowed Cunningham Dax to establish a studio and gallery in the Royal Park Psychiatric Hospital, where patients produced paintings, models and tapestries. Over the years, works were donated from other hospitals, clinics and practitioners as well as artists, patients and anonymous donations. The collection holds approximately nine thousand works and from around 1984, these were housed at Melbourne University, given official recognition by the Vice-Chancellor, Professor Pennington, and used in the teaching, diagnosis and research of psychiatric illness.