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Abstract
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Preface
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INTRODUCTION

It is now thirty five years since T.D. Kendrick wrote that "no department of our national antiquities is more urgently in need of organised study than the English crosses...and I find it an excessively embarrassing fact that the principal problems of chronology and stylistic development are not likely to be solved before a complete survey of the material has been accomplished".¹ Fifty-three years earlier Bishop G.F. Browne had recognised the same need.² This thesis is a contribution to the survey which both scholars demanded.

The geographical boundaries of the material in this dissertation are those of the modern counties of Cumberland and Westmorland together with Lancashire North of the Sands (see map 1). The final establishment of these administrative units was later than the Anglo-Saxon and Viking periods:³ nevertheless they form a physical unity to which geographers have given the name Cumbria.⁴ At the centre of the area are the Lakeland mountains. The Pennines and the Irish Sea form natural boundaries to east and west whilst the Solway Firth and Morecambe Bay define sections of the northern and southern limits of the region.

---

¹ T.D. Kendrick 1928, 126-7. (Books and articles are cited in an abbreviated form giving the name(s) of the author(s) and the stated date of publication. The only exceptions to this system are the volumes of the Victoria County History and the inventories of the Royal Commission on Historical Monuments which are respectively abbreviated VCH and RCHM. Full details are given in the Bibliography.)
² G.F. Browne 1885, 259.
⁴ R. Hogg 1972 provides a useful account of the area's topography and geology.
Between the estuary of the Solway Firth and the Pennines there is no natural frontier but one of the conclusions of this thesis is that there is a very real cultural divide between the northern and southern flanks of the Carlisle plain. It is therefore only on the southern side of the Lake District massif that the geographical boundaries of this work are, in any important sense, conventional. As a result, the sculpture from such Lancashire sites as Heysham, Halton, Bolton-le-Sands and Melling has not been given detailed study in this thesis though it can only be fully understood in relation to the Cumbrian material.

The chronological limits of the following discussion are those of the Viking period in Cumbria, between the early years of the tenth century and the beginning of Norman activity in the second half of the following century. This represents a narrowing of the original scope of the thesis which had been planned to cover all sculpture produced in the area between the Roman and Norman periods. It eventually became clear, however, that this limitation could be fruitful. There is, of course, much of interest in the sculpture of the pre-Viking period: a later chapter, for example, points to the existence of a rare type of Celtic memorial, identifies the stylistic characteristics of a western group of Anglian vine-scrolls and emphasises both the variety of monumental types and their iconographic interest. Nevertheless it remains true that the Anglian material, notably the shaft at Bewcastle, has received a great deal of scholarly attention. In addition, many of the conclusions which can be drawn from a study of the Cumbrian crosses are ones which have already been made for the near-identical art on the eastern side of the Pennines. By contrast, the later sculpture of the Viking period has received less attention. Even the Gosforth sculptures, whilst the subject of individual papers, have never been treated as a group or seen in relation to contemporary carving in the area.

The work produced during the tenth and eleventh centuries does not deserve this neglect. The majority of Cumbria's pre-Norman carving belongs to this period and it survives in sufficient quantity to justify the isolation of sculptural schools and individual artists. The number of monuments still in
existence, moreover, allows some limited deductions to be made from their geographic distribution. It will be argued that these sculptures reflect the artistic taste of the village and of the laity and are important evidence from a period for which little documentary information has survived — a period which saw the Cumbrian peninsular at the junction of Danish, Norwegian, English, Strathclyde and Scottish power.

The chronological limitation seemed justified but, not least because Viking-period sculpture inherited an Anglian tradition in both motifs and types of monument, the catalogue in the second part of this thesis covers work from the whole of the post-Roman, pre-Norman, period. The second chapter also summarises some important aspects of pre-tenth century carving in the area.

The sculpture listed in the catalogue is the product of several years of field-work in Cumbria, stemming back to a preliminary corpus of the Cumberland material carried out in 1958/9 as part of an M.A. thesis.1 Since that date it has been possible not only to enlarge the collection but also to examine most of the comparable material from northern England together with a high proportion of the sculpture in other areas of the British Isles.

Clearly such a collection, and the discussion based upon it, is indebted to the work of earlier scholars. In Cumbria the chief debt is owed to the Reverend W.S. Calverley.2 Others in the latter half of the nineteenth century such as Dr. C.A.Parker and Canon W. Knowles were, perhaps, more acute in their chronological judgements but it was Calverley who, fired by discoveries made at his own church at Dearham, first attempted a complete record by drawings, rubbings and casts of the finds which were being made during the extensive church restorations of his period. It was Calverley who first recognised the mythological element on the Gosforth cross,3 it was Calverley

2. See the memoirs in Anon 1899, 388-91 and W.S.Calverley 1899, v-x.
3. W.S. Calverley 1883a and W.S. Calverley 1883b.
who cajoled his fellow clerics into reporting and preserving the material and it was his collected papers, published posthumously in 1899, which provided the first corpus of the area’s pre-Norman sculpture.¹

Calverley's collected papers were prepared for publication by W.G. Collingwood and he also contributed a summary survey to the volume. Two years later, more independently, Collingwood produced a study of the Cumberland material for the Victoria County History.² Neither of these works pretended to be a complete corpus or illustrated record and both were written under the great handicap of the inadequate publication of comparable material. Romilly Allen's great collection of the Scottish stones, though preceded by numerous papers, did not appear until 1903.³ Similarly, preliminary publications from P.M.C. Kermode of the Manx series were available in 1901 but his fully illustrated corpus was not to appear until 1907.⁴ For Wales and for Ireland the published material before the collections of Françoise Henry ⁵ and V.E. Nash-Williams ⁶ was strikingly limited. Other English sculpture outside Cumbria, despite some pioneer work by Romilly Allen, was equally poorly published. In view of this lack of comparative material it is perhaps surprising that so many of the judgements of both Collingwood and Calverley have stood the test of time.

For some thirty years after Calverley's death Collingwood assiduously drew, published and commented on northern sculpture, his attention most rewardingly focussed upon the material from Yorkshire for which he produced a complete corpus in the pages of the Yorkshire Archaeological Journal.⁷ He occasionally

---

1. W.S. Calverley 1899.
2. VCH 1901, 255-93.
4. P.M.C. Kermode 1907.
5. F. Henry 1933.
published material from Cumbria in those years, accompanied by
discussions which were now enriched by his close familiarity
with other Northumbrian work. Material from the area figured
prominantly in his final considered statement of 1927 but he
never attempted any re-writing of Calverley's corpus.

The discussion which follows owes much to the pioneer
work of Calverley and Collingwood but mention must also be
made of three other seminal publications from amongst the
plethora of books on early medieval English and Scandinavian
art. The first is Brøndsted's book, published in 1924, which
first set out a lengthy statement in English of the relationship
between Scandinavian and English art and drew heavily on material
from northern England. The second is Kendrick's work, published
in 1949, which stressed an element of Anglian continuity in the
sculpture which this present thesis also demonstrates. Finally
there is the joint publication of Klindt-Jensen and Wilson which most accessibly refines the classifications of scholars
like Brøndsted, Shetelig, Lindqvist and Holmqvist and puts them
onto a firmer chronological footing. To all these writers the
following work is heavily indebted.

The presentation of the discussion of this thesis involved
certain problems of arrangement. The second part consists of a
complete catalogue of the post-Roman, pre-Norman sculpture from
Cumbria together with full descriptions and bibliographical lists.
This is accompanied by a full photographic record and reproductions
of earlier drawings. It is, however, the first part whose
organisation represents a compromise rather than an ideal. Ideally
each fragment should have been discussed separately and only at
a later stage placed into a particular classification. This was
in fact the method adopted in the work which lies behind this
thesis. To present the material in this way would, however, be

2. J. Brøndsted 1924. Most of the Cumbrian material was only known
to Brøndsted through the publications of Calverley and
Collingwood.
3. T.D. Kendrick 1949. The thesis of this book had been worked out
   in a series of articles over the preceding decade.
needlessly repetitious, not only for the obvious reason that similar comments would be repeated for each stone but, more importantly, because the potential groupings for each carving are so numerous: groupings from a single site, groupings as products of a single sculptor or school of sculptors, groupings according to particular head or shaft shapes, groupings according to type of monument (cross/cross-slab/hogback), groupings on the basis of ornament or iconography. This list is not exhaustive but is indicative of a very real problem of organisation.

The plan adopted represents a compromise, dealing with the sculptures in a variety of groupings, though each stone only appears in one set. Particular sculptures are thus placed within a class which, for the writer, seems to bring out the most important relationships of the carving. There is surprisingly little overlap between the various discussions and full cross-referencing is given. After chapters surveying the historical background and the Anglian material there follow studies of the work of two schools of sculptors working in the Viking period. These schools, one of which has not been recognised before, provide the majority of the surviving sculpture and represent the norm against which work like that at Gosforth can be set. The following chapter deals with a group to which the term "school" is less applicable - the circle-heads - and this is followed by a further class which are separable on the basis of their round-shafts or of decoration appropriate to that type of shaft. The following chapters bring together material which is less obviously coherent with sections on stones whose main interest lies in their animal ornament or Christian iconography: it is here that the major overlaps with other chapters occur because carvings dealt with elsewhere are clearly relevant under these headings. The next two chapters are loosely-connected sections devoted to a miscellaneous group of shaft and head fragments. More coherently there is then a chapter devoted to the hogbacks and finally one dealing with the sculpture from Gosforth. It is this latter group which require most justification since the material from this site could have been discussed in the chapters on hogbacks, animal ornament and round-shafts. Equally it might be argued that other sites, like Penrith, Lowther and Brigham,
merit similar treatment. Gosforth has been singled out, however, precisely because it is different, its sculpture quite distinct from the rest of the area in quality and uniformity. One of the great failures of work on the stones from this site has been to isolate them from each other and it is hoped that their joint discussion (after that of all the other Cumbrian material) will allow a better understanding of their unique status. At very least, like the groupings of the other chapters, this chapter demonstrates another fruitful type of classification.

The final chapter attempts some deductions, relating the sculptural evidence to that provided by onomastic sources.

One final introductory comment is required: this concerns the basis on which work of the Viking period can be distinguished from earlier sculpture. Through the early years of this century Collingwood worked out criteria which enabled him to separate the work of the tenth and eleventh centuries from material belonging to the Anglian period. Later writers have often succeeded in casting doubt on the dates which he assigned to individual sculptures within these two sets. This thesis contains similar criticisms of Collingwood. Yet it remains true that no-one has succeeded in undermining his basic division between work of the Anglian and Viking periods. There are persistent associations on hundreds of sculptures in Northumbria between (a) animal ornament and other motifs which derive from Scandinavia and (b) those monument shapes and patterns which Collingwood classified as belonging to the Viking period such as ring-heads, ring-knots, T patterns, step patterns, the presence of loose rings within knotwork. Conversely, these are not motifs which are associated with naturalistic figure sculpture, complex knot-work and organic vine-scroll whose sources and analogues are found in Mediterranean and British art of the seventh to ninth centuries. Particular problems will be analysed later but it is important to record at the outset this basic agreement with Collingwood.

3. For explanation of these terms see p.3 below, Volume 2.
CHAPTER ONE

The Documentary Evidence

The documentary evidence for the Cumbrian area between the late ninth century and the middle years of the eleventh is meagre and often, apparently, self-contradictory. This seeming lack of consistency is almost certainly the result of two factors: firstly that the documents refer to different areas within the region and, secondly, that they record only certain stages in a constant ebb and flow of political boundaries across the entire peninsula.

There is little evidence for Viking activity in the north-west of England before the early years of the tenth century. Certainly Florence of Worcester recorded that Carlisle was sacked in the ravaging which preceded the 876 settlement of York. There are doubts about the value of Florence's account but even if such a sacking actually occurred this is no evidence for settlement in the area. The earliest trace of such settlement along the north-western coast is that of Ingimund in the Wirral and this can be placed no earlier than the first decade of the tenth century. It is only in the tenth century that the pattern of English defences shows that a political force in the north-west was causing concern whilst the coin hoards from the area might be interpreted as reflecting disturbance (though not necessarily settlement) during the period c.900-920.

4. See R.H.W. Dolley 1966, 49-50 for a list of these hoards and his discussion on 22-3 and 27-8. It is relevant to note that there are contemporary hoards to the east of the Pennines. D.M. Metcalf 1960, 94 has suggested that an earlier cluster of hoards from the north-west, dated c.870-c875, reflect the problems of fugitives from eastern England encountering Scandinavian attacks on the area. This early cluster need not reflect Scandinavian settlement. The settlement of Galloway is not directly dated in any documentary source and has been placed in the later ninth century by K.H. Jackson 1955, 85 and in the tenth by C.A.R. Radford 1950, 97.
What little documentary evidence there is for Cumbria shows that at least some part of the peninsula was still ruled by men with English names in the period immediately before 915 but that, at about that date, disruptive activity was forcing them to leave. The Historia de Sancto Cuthberto records that a princeps called Elfred, fugiens piratas, fled eastwards over the Pennines in the middle of the second decade. Stenton linked this with the events described in the immediately preceding paragraph in the Historia which describes the arrangements made by Tilred, the Abbot of Heversham, for his reception as Abbot of Norham and interpreted both journeys as signs of the disturbing effects of Viking settlement in Cumbria at that date. What is equally important however is the implication, in both narratives, of a continuity of Anglian power on the western side of the Pennines into the tenth century. All indications are, then, that the Viking settlement of Cumbria did not begin until the second decade of the tenth century.

The next firm point in the documentary history of Cumbria is provided by the Gospatrick Writ which shows that, during the

1. T. Arnold 1882, 208. For a study of this document see E. Craster 1954.
2. T. Arnold 1882, 208. RCHM 1936, xlix.
3. The case of Edred and Eardulf, recorded in chapter 24 of the Historia, similarly points to the continued existence of an English aristocracy in the area - whatever view is taken of the event itself. Contrast RCHM 1936, xlix, note 4 and E. Craster 1954, 190.
4. As a further indication of the relatively late date of this settlement note the absence of the form Stadir in Cumbria's toponomy. Though found in the western colonies, Man and Iceland, the form appears to have dropped from use in the early Viking period: see O.J.S. Marstrander 1932, 326ff; W F.H. Nicolaisen 1969, 9-11; M. Gelling 1970, 131. The archaeological material gives no clear indication of pre-tenth century settlement now that the early dating of the burial from Ormside given in J.D. Gowen 1954, 173 has been rectified by H. Shetelig 1954, 105. A complete listing of references to this material will be found on pp. 345-353 below (Map 11) relevant also here is F. 1. Dwyer 1952.
reign of Edward the Confessor, an area in Allerdale below Derwent (and thus presumably most of the southern side of the Carlisle plain) was under the control of an Earl of Northumbria but was identifiable as a region which had been combres.¹ This English control was lost, however, to the Scots by 1070, perhaps even earlier,² and later tradition believed that the Scottish boundary had stretched as far south as the river Duddon in southern Cumberland.³ At the time that Domesday Book was compiled the northern English boundary seems to have been on the Derwent.⁴ In 1092 William II took Carlisle and effectively established the present western border between England and Scotland.⁵

The events immediately prior to the Norman Conquest and in the following thirty years do not, therefore, present insuperable problems of interpretation. It is, rather, the period before the compilation of the Gospatrick Writ which presents grave difficulties.

The word combres, in its emended form of cumbrisc, in the Writ would suggest that in the 1050s an area of Allerdale below Derwent was remembered as having been under the control of Strathclyde. Both the date and the extent of this British expansion are matters for conjecture. It would, for example, be difficult to prove that the Carlisle plain was not already

¹ For the text and comments see J. Wilson 1905; F.W. Ragg 1905; RCHM. 1936,1; F.E. Harmer 1952, 419-24 and 531-6; A.M. Armstrong et al. 1952, xxvii-xxx; D.P. Kirby 1962, 93.
³ VCH 1901, 299. On the east the boundary may have included the Barony of Westmorland, centred on the Upper Eden: see A.H. Smith 1967, I,x1 note 2.
⁴ So VCH 1901, 300. The direct evidence only attests English control as far north as the Esk: see A.M. Armstrong et al. 1952, xxxi.
⁵ VCH 1901, 300-1 and A.M. Armstrong et al. 1952, xxxi.
in the hands of Strathclyde by c. 900 since our evidence for an early tenth century English aristocracy in the Historia de Sancto Cuthberto does not come from that area of Cumbria. An expansion at that date, taking advantage of the political chaos to the east of the Pennines, would not be impossible. There is certainly some evidence to suggest that expansion had taken place by 926 for at that date King Æðelstan met the kings of Strathclyde and Scotia on the Eamont, at a place which William of Malmesbury identified as Dacre. Stenton has argued that this river represented the south-eastern limits of Strathclyde at that date since such meetings frequently took place at frontiers. A later stage in this British domination has been noted by Kirby in his interpretation of the ravaging of Cumbraland in 945 and its subsequent donation to the King of the Scots: he reasonably suggests that the area must be that part of Strathclyde south of the Solway. The end of Strathclyde's power in the area may have come only with the extinction of the royal line in 1015. Equally it could have occurred earlier, in 1000, because Henry of Huntingdon's gloss on the Chronicle's account of Æðelræd's successful expedition to Strathclyde might suggest that it was the Scandinavian element in the southern part of the British kingdom that he was anxious to suppress. Conclusive evidence is sadly wanting.

It is equally difficult to assess the extent of this Strathclyde expansion. The boundaries need not, in any case, have remained stable. To Collingwood they extended as far south as the Ribble whilst Kirby has argued in favour of the Duddon.

4. Kirby has argued that the Dumbarton royal line was linked to that of Scotia through most of the period and that a branch of the Strathclyde family ruled the southern part of the British kingdom: see D.P. Kirby 1962 and D.P. Kirby 1971.
Yet both suggestions are suspect: Collingwood's because it involves an equation of political boundaries with some questionable art-historical observations and Kirby's because the Duddon boundary is one which he projects back from the later Scottish expansion in or after the reign of Edward the Confessor. Skene, perhaps misusing the evidence at times, suggested that the Derwent was the southernmost limit\(^1\) and in this he has been followed by Jackson\(^2\) whose onomastic evidence shows that there is little linguistic trace of Strathclyde's influence south of the Derwent, the only boundary (it should be remembered) which can legitimately be inferred from the areas mentioned in the Gospatrick Writ. It is clearly difficult to dogmatise where the evidence does not exist but the one area for which we have both documentary and linguistic evidence of Strathclyde influence, the Carlisle plain, probably marked the limits of effective southern expansion of the British kingdom.

This analysis of the documentary material has, of course, ignored the one group for which the onomastic evidence suggests a major settlement - the Scandinavians. What was their relationship to this expansion of Strathclyde power? The documents give us no direct evidence though they do suggest both that Stainmoor acted as a link between Ireland and the Hiberno-Norse rulers of York\(^3\) and that in 973\(\frac{1}{4}\) an area known as westmoringaland was ruled by a man with a Scandinavian name.\(^4\) But such hints are not sufficient to build up a connected political history, still less to show what was the political allegiance of any Scandinavian settlers in the Carlisle plain or on the Cumbrian coast. This is an issue which will be re-examined in the concluding chapter of this thesis.

1. W.F. Skene 1886, 235, 346, 400 and 456. For his mishandling of the evidence see VCH 1901, 299.

2. K. Jackson 1963, 74 and map facing.

3. This is a possible deduction from the site of Eric Bloodaxe's death on Stainmoor and from coinage distributions: see W.G. Collingwood 1902a and D.M. Wilson 1956, 172.

4. See, for this doubtful evidence and the various interpretations of it, W.H. Stevenson 1898; RCHM 1936, li and lii; A.H. Smith 1967, I, xl.
For the moment we are left with the facts of a Scandinavian invasion and settlement, causing disruption to the upper ranks of Anglian society, in the second decade of the tenth century. To this can be added the fact that, at some date within memory of the 1050s, the Solway basin had been in the control of Strathclyde as the result of a territorial expansion which may have pre-dated 926.

The Scandinavian settlers were Norwegians. This is clear from the evidence of the place-names\(^1\) and it is this same onomastic evidence which shows that these settlers contained groups whose name-forming patterns had been modified by contact with Goidelic speakers, usually assumed to be Irish.\(^2\) Though a full study of the place-names is postponed until they can be related to conclusions drawn from an examination of the sculpture it is relevant to notice here that the onomastic evidence, on an orthodox interpretation such as that favoured by the editors of the English Place-Name Society, would seem to imply a dense settlement allied with the exploitation of upland areas which may have seen little human activity in the pre-Viking period.

This orthodox view of a dense settlement has been subjected to sceptical scrutiny by P.H. Sawyer who has argued that the linguistic evidence of the place-names need not bear this interpretation.\(^3\) His arguments, and those of his opponents,\(^4\) have centred around the Danish settlements in eastern England.

---

2. The fullest treatment of this material is that in E. Ekwall 1918. More recently his Cumbrian material has been amplified in A.M. Armstrong et al. 1952, xxiii-v and A.H. Smith 1967, I, xli-ii. All settlers did not come directly from an Irish-speaking area: see A.H. Smith 1966, 62 where an element from Bergen/Stavanger is recognised.
but, with certain modifications,\(^1\) they are equally relevant to the north-west.

The north-western evidence is salutary in reminding us that the -by suffix was still a living element in place-name formation after the Norman Conquest,\(^2\) that Scandinavian and Irish personal names continued in currency into the Middle English period\(^3\) and that the pattern of inversion compounding lasted well after the Norman Conquest.\(^4\) There is thus some justification for Sawyer's doubts about the universal assignment of such features to the initial phase of the settlement. But, equally, their vigorous continuance implies a large settlement at some stage to explain a lasting linguistic impact. This impact has left traces of Scandinavian inflexions (even attached to non-Scandinavian roots\(^5\)), substitution of Scandinavian sounds in English-derived words\(^6\) and the mass of Scandinavian lexis in the place-names.\(^7\) Only a large settlement will satisfactorily explain both these and the general linguistic influence on the English language, particularly in its dialectal realisations.\(^8\)

The place-name evidence would suggest that it was during the period when a Scandinavian element was present that fresh

\(^{1}\) Modifications to take account of the lack of evidence for the presence of an army in the north-west (such as complicates the picture of Danish settlement) and reservations which flow from the lack of early (Domesday Book) forms of name from much of the Cumbrian area.

\(^{2}\) A.M. Armstrong et al. 1952, xxxi-ii.

\(^{3}\) A.H. Smith 1967, I, xl and xli.


\(^{6}\) A.H. Smith 1967, I, xliv.

\(^{7}\) See form lists in A.M. Armstrong et al. 1952 and A.H. Smith 1967, II.

\(^{8}\) The apparent epigraphic support which was examined in E. Ekwall 1930 requires modification in the light of R.I. Page 1971.
land-taking took place. This land-taking can be divided into two categories. There is first the evidence of Scandinavian habitational elements in areas where pre-Viking, Anglian, names are all of a topographical type which need not denote actual settlement. The classic example of this pattern within the Cumbrian area is in the Appleby district (see Map 9) where the attractive slopes bordering the northern and eastern banks of the Eden carry a string of -tūn names whereas the facing slope, in the shadow of the Lake hills, is filled with Anglian topographical names and Scandinavian habitative -by.¹ This does not necessarily indicate that the Scandinavians did not occupy the -tūn villages² but it must surely indicate the settlement of land which had not proved alluring to the earliest Anglian inhabitants of the area. Whether this land-taking is the result of internal colonisation (Sawyer's explanation) or the initial migration (the more likely explanation) it implies a rapid economic and demographic growth during the period. So also does the second type of land-taking indicated by the almost dominant Scandinavian nomenclature of the Lake hills, lakes and rivers for this must point to the fact that it is only in this period that human activity affected these areas.³

Apart from the place-names it is the crosses and the other sculpture which provide the largest body of evidence for Viking-period Cumbria. Pollen analysis is beginning to discern the evidence for changes in the ecology and economy of the area but, as yet, its dating controls are not entirely satisfactory.⁴

¹ A.H. Smith 1967, I, xxxviii and xliii.
² P.H. Sawyer 1970, 170-1 has a relevant point here.
³ They may not thus have required naming at an earlier date: see R.H.M. Dolley 1970, 182. I reject the possible interpretation of a massive Scandinavian obliteration of earlier Anglian names on the fells since no comparable replacement took place on lower ground where there was also Viking settlement.
⁴ For work in the area see F. Oldfield 1963; F. Oldfield 1969, 298-305; W. Pennington 1969, 81-3 and 93-4; W. Pennington 1970.
The material recovered from graves and as stray finds does not amount to an impressive list though it is useful to remember that these graves form a very high proportion of all those known in England and that their find-spots show traces of a custom of the use of Christian churchyards for equipped burials.¹ Like the onomastic material this type of evidence will be discussed in relation to the sculpture in the final chapter.

CHAPTER TWO

The pre-Viking background

This chapter does not present a detailed analysis of the pre-Viking sculpture of north-west England. It is, rather, a brief survey of this material, pointing to some deductions and possible implications and attempting to isolate certain features which are important for later developments in sculpture during the Viking period.

I

The earliest post-Roman sculpture in the area is a cross-incised slab from Addingham for which I have claimed a Celtic context and a seventh-century date. Despite its simple form the case for such a context seems convincing on distributional grounds alone: the type is familiar (if not well published) in Ireland, Wales, Man and in western and northern Scotland but, outside the Solway basin, does not occur in any area which afterwards became Anglian. The occurrences around the Solway can


2. Representative illustrations of this comparative material will be found in:
   c) for Man: P.M.C. Kermode 1907; P.M.C. Kermode 1912; P.M.C. Kermode 1916; P.M.C. Kermode 1921; P.M.C. Kermode 1929; J.R. Bruce and W. Cubbon 1930.
be explained by the late date of Bernician expansion to the west which allowed the development of a seventh-century type of memorial. In areas which were not subsequently dominated by the Angles there are examples of continued usage into the Viking period but there seems little reason to assume that such work would be produced in Cumbria after the development of the free-standing cross of Anglian type. Indeed the lack of any other example in Anglo-Saxon England south of the Solway argues that it was not just a simple type of memorial persisting throughout the pre-Norman period.

In 1960 I suggested that Addingham IV was unlikely to pre-date the early years of the seventh century. This dating relied heavily upon the evidence afforded by those Welsh slabs on which linear crosses were accompanied by inscriptions. The

Footnotes continued from page 17.

1. The case for a pre-600 settlement of the Solway area, put forward in C.A.R. Radford 1953, 154, is based upon a deduction from a passage in Vita Kentigerni which shows familiarity with (but not necessarily settlement of) Angles in the Solway basin at this date. For a more acceptable date see A.H. Smith 1967, I, xxxvi-viii.

2. e.g., Wales, V.E. Nash-Williams 1950, no.301. See also the non-ecclesiastical material from Scotland discussed in RCHM 1957, 70 and the grave-markers from Viking Greenland, P.M.C. Kermode 1931.

3. The term is that used in V.E. Nash-Williams 1950, 20.
doubts then expressed about the firmness of the Welsh chronology have since been strengthened\(^1\) and a late sixth-century date can no longer be excluded—particularly if recent epigraphic opinion on the Irish material is to be accepted.\(^2\) But such an extension of date does not invalidate the cultural context proposed in 1960.

The Addingham slab is apparently the most southerly of a small group of Celtic monuments from the Solway area.\(^3\) It has been used by Thomas as part of the evidence for a Celtic Christian diocese centred on Carlisle:\(^4\) the argument for this cannot be conclusive but the stone is certainly archaeological evidence for Christian activity in the area before the period of Anglian control.

II

There is evidence for the existence of at least twenty-five separate sculptures from the area which can be assigned to an Anglian date (see Map 1). Unfortunately there is some doubt about the ultimate provenance of three of these but the total number of sites involved does not exceed seventeen and may be as low as fifteen. Only five of these sites have yielded

1. See the comments of L. Alcock 1962, 343. An important re-reading of the Penmachno stone (V.E. Nash-Williams 1950, no. 104) by G. Thomas suggests that this inscription is not so firmly dateable as it appeared to Nash-Williams. I am grateful to Mr. P. Wilson for advance warning of this re-reading. Note, however, that A.C. Thomas' dating of the Addingham slab, relying upon a different argument to that I put forward in 1960, agrees on a seventh-century date.

2. P. Lionard 1961, 108 and the references to work by L. Bieler.

3. A.C. Thomas 1968a, map on 98. See also A.C. Thomas 1968, fig. 37.

more than one piece of sculpture of certain Anglian date. The contrast, both in number of sites and in quantity of sculpture, between the Anglian and Viking periods is very marked: in the tenth and eleventh centuries the number of sites has nearly trebled and the amount of sculpture has increased by a factor of five.

These twenty-five sculptures, together with the place-names, provide most of our information about human activity in the area during the Anglian period. It is thus of some interest to compare distribution maps showing the two forms of evidence (see Maps 1 and 2).

1. The material in this paragraph can be divided as follows:

a) Monuments of certain provenance:
   Addingham II, (?) III; Bewcastle I,II; Brigham I;
   Carlisle II, III,IV; Dacre II; Heversham; Irton I; Kendal;
   Kimby Stephen III,VI; Lowther I,II,III; Penrith IV;
   Urswick in Furness I; Waberthwaite I; Workington I,VI,(?VIII.
   Heversham has been credited with a single monument on the assumption that Collingwood was correct in reconstructing the two fragments as part of a single cross: see J.F. Curwen 1925, 29. Doubts have been expressed about the provenance of the Kendal shaft by W.G. Collingwood 1927, 36(though not by W.G. Collingwood 1904); the unpublished Hodgson papers in the Society of Antiquaries show that it did come from Kendal. Though the RCHM 1936, lxv was uncertain about the provenance of the Anglian sculpture in Lowther Castle, reference to J. Simpson 1874, 11 shows that these stones were from Lowther Churchyard.

b) Monuments of uncertain provenance:
   iii. Sculptured trough in Tullie House. This clearly belongs with (ii) above though its immediate origin was Dalston; see W.G. Collingwood 1905, 207.

b) Monuments of uncertain provenance:
   iii. Sculptured trough in Tullie House. This clearly belongs with (ii) above though its immediate origin was Dalston; see W.G. Collingwood 1905, 207.

c) Beckermet St. Bridget I is probably of Anglian date: see below pp. 69, 149-50. It has not been included in the statistics above.
The map of place-names draws upon the English Place-Name Society (EPNS) volumes for both Cumberland and Westmorland but, for Furness, has relied upon the much earlier work of Ekwall. Though these two sources differ in the comprehensiveness of their collections it is doubtful if there are serious disadvantages for the immediate investigation. This was aimed at isolating the main foci of settlement during the Anglian pre-Viking period, the plot showing the distribution within the area of a selection of Anglian habitative elements. Though many non-habitational names were undoubtedly formed within this period, and many had early changed their function and were attached to settlements, there are no controls which enable us to date such a change for any particular name. The names containing topographical final elements have therefore been excluded and it is presumably for this reason that the map given here differs from that produced for Cumberland by Jackson in 1963.

2. E. Ekwall 1918.
3. Some were probably among the earliest Anglian names and may have been formed even before there was a need to distinguish one settlement from another: see A.H. Smith 1956a, 86 and J.M. Dodgson 1967, 5.
4. As some are in Bede and the early charters: see A.H. Smith 1956a, 86.
5. The need for this caveat is all the more necessary in this north-western area where most names are first recorded in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.
6. K.H. Jackson 1963, fig. 2. Note that the caption claims that the plot shows villages in existence by 1066 whereas the evidence comes mainly from sources which post-date the Conquest by at least 150 years.
It is not claimed that the map shows names which were in existence by the beginning of the eighth century. It shows, rather, those names for which there seems a strong likelihood of an existence before the period of Scandinavian linguistic domination. Among this group -hām has long been recognised as an early element and the plot shows a further division of this material to distinguish the combination -ing + hām. The second element, wic, bristles with semantic problems and is not claimed as an early (i.e. pre-eighth century) formation by the editors of EPNS but Nicholaisen's comments on its north British distribution justify its inclusion here. Apart from the one (now lost) example of wor6 the only other element plotted is -tūn. There seems no doubt that, in general, this element post-dates -hām and continued in use into the Viking and Norman periods. Yet, if the blatant examples of these later usages are removed from the map, it is reasonable to claim that the bulk of the remainder supply a general indication of the post-seventh-century spread of Anglian settlement. A further distinction between parish names in tum and those which lack this status has been introduced on

6. W.F.H. Nicholaisen 1964, 165. The only example is Routhworth in Kendal Ward, A.H. Smith 1967, I, 102 (omitted from map 2.)

* "The distribution of place-names containing tum fairly represents the extent to which colonisation had proceeded during the C.E. period": A.H. Smith, The place-names of the east riding of Yorkshire, part VII, Cambridge, 1962, 42.
the doubtful grounds that the former were sites whose economic potential was such that they would attract early settlement. No other elements have been plotted, despite the claims for a habitative function which could be attached to them: thus the Westmorland compounding of ceaster does not seem to imply human habitation¹ and bóð has been excluded because, though dialectally interesting, it cannot be controlled chronologically.²

The map shows marked concentrations of settlement³ and some interesting correlations between these concentrations and the occurrence of sculpture. The existence of sculpture at Kendal and Heversham agrees with the tendency of the Westmorland names to group on the Kent rather than further east on the Lune whilst Urswick in Furness is on the well-settled eastern side of the peninsula. On the Cumberland coastal strip the fine cross at Irton stands at the centre of a marked group of -tūn names and both Workington and Brigham are in a river valley with several onomastic indications of early settlement. The sculpture at Carlisle is not supported by Anglian place-name evidence⁴ but fortunately we know of its existence as an urban community at a seventh-century date from documentary sources.⁵ Addingham, though not in an area where there is abundant evidence for Anglian settlement, is on the site of a -hām name and we have already seen the sculptural evidence for its pre-Anglian ecclesiastical existence. Of the sites in the upper Eden and its tributaries only Lowther is a site providing both sculpture and onomastic traces of settlement concentration in the immediate area. Both Dacre⁶ and Penrith are on the fringes of such settlement and Kirby Stephen is less clearly supported.

1. They are mapped with hām and tūn in A.H. Smith 1967 but the 'hen' and the hermit in the compounds of Hincaster and Papcastle sufficiently indicate the distinction.
2. See A.H. Smith 1956, 43-5 (and accompanying map) and also W.F.H. Nicholaisen 1964, 165.
3. This statement also applies to the element -tūn which A.M. Armstrong et al. 1952, 503 claimed as evenly spread across the county.
4. The concentration of Anglian names is on the rising ground to the east.
5. B. Golgrave 1940, 122.
This brief survey demonstrates that the vast majority of the Anglian sculpture comes from areas for which there is evidence of early and, to some extent, concentrated settlement.\(^1\) These carvings must then reflect a degree of economic wealth and they are certainly not the products of eremetic communities.

Two crosses stand apart from this statement. The one at Waberthwaite does not perhaps pose a serious problem since the importance of this site during the Roman period may well have persisted without leaving onomastic trace and, in any case, the Irton concentration of -tun names is not far distant. But Bewcastle, though a Roman site, cannot be classed with Waberthwaite for no other example of Anglian sculpture in Cumbria is so far distanced from onomastic evidence of Anglian settlement. Its uniqueness in this respect is an indication of its general cultural isolation from the rest of the north-western material.

It seems likely that the background for much, if not most, of this Anglian sculpture is monastic. The evidence is admittedly exiguous but is certainly suggestive. We know of fifteen-seventeen sites which produced Anglian sculpture. Three of these are also the sites of the only Cumbrian monasteries whose existence is attested in the literary documents.\(^2\) A further five, perhaps seven, sites display that rare achievement of literacy which in early medieval England was the achievement of monasticism.\(^3\)

1. A similar conclusion, though based on evidence which I cannot wholly accept, is reached in R. Hill 1966, 136.

2. There is documentary evidence of varying reliability for Heversham, Carlisle and Dacre: see B. Colgrave 1940, 248; B. Colgrave and R.A.B. Mynors 1969, 446; T. Arnold 1882, 56, 199 and 208.

3. The clear examples are Bewcastle, Beckermet St. Bridget, Irton, Knells and Urswick. A case could be made for Workington on the grounds of an inscribed stone, no. VIII, (if this were certainly Anglian) and the fact that the Cuthbert community chose this as the site for embarkation to Ireland since much of their travels seem to have involved moving from one monastery to another. Note also the name Runcrobsbanc in Lowther parish which presumably indicates the existence of an inscribed stone: see A.H. Smith 1967, II, 187 and R.I. Page 1969, 51. Since there are no certain indications of Viking inscriptions in the area before the mid-eleventh century the Lowther runes may have been Anglian.
Addingham might also be added to this list of probable monastic sites in view of the evidence for pre-Anglian sculpture. Whilst the argument is largely an inferential one it does imply that lay patronage and lay execution of sculpture did not play as important a role as has often been assumed.

The small number of Anglian monuments requires comment for, by comparison with the quantity of sculpture which survives from the Viking period, it would suggest that the graveyards of the north-west in the late ninth and early tenth centuries were far from being "filled with rather smart crosses or memorial slabs".\(^1\) Sculpture may well have been relatively rare.\(^2\) One of the implications stemming from this interpretation of the surviving number of monuments is that the sculpture which the settlers would encounter would be individually more impressive, and potentially influential, than would have been the case if the area's Anglian carvings could be numbered in hundreds.

III

What the sculpture lacked in quantity, however, it made up in variety. It is not always realised that there is a range of types of sculpture embracing crosses, slabs, grave-markers, shrines and various forms of architectural carving. The surviving evidence shows that most of these existed in the Anglian north-west.

There were, firstly, the crosses.\(^3\) As in other parts of Northumbria there is epigraphic evidence\(^4\) that at least some of

2. Compare the situation in Pictish Scotland as outlined in A.C. Thomas 1964, 65-6 and, for the early Christian Irish Sea area, A.C. Thomas 1971, 92. The latter paper argues that only one tenth of burials had a grave-marker. It is also relevant to note the trace of multiple commissioning on the inscription at Bewcastle for this may be an indication of the expense involved; see R.I. Page 1960, 58.
3. Excavations at the Minster at York have produced pillars with incised carvings which should give cause to reflect before identifying a rectangular shaft as part of a cross.
4. The non-runic material is collected in E. Okasha 1971. Most of the runic material will be found in W.G. Collingwood 1915, 289-91 and W.G. Collingwood 1927, 56-68 though both transcriptions and translations are not always accurate.
these were memorial crosses though not all necessarily marked the actual grave of the person commemorated. But even these commemoratory crosses, like Bewcastle, could have functioned as preaching crosses or (as is well attested in Ireland) served as objects of contemplation either within a monastic enclosure or

1. The clearest evidence for a grave-marker function is that provided by the restored inscription on one of the plain crosses from Whitby reading HIC RESQUIESCIT: see C.R. Peers and C.A.R. Radford 1943, 44 and E. Okasha 1971, 121-2 though note her rejection of the continuation ..IN HOC SEPULCHRO which Peers and Radford proposed and which has been accepted in A.C. Thomas 1971, 126. Another cross carries an inscription read and restored by Peers and Radford as HIC REQUIESCENT CORPORA but this also is rejected in E. Okasha 1971, 122.

The inscriptive evidence from Bewcastle, Urswick and Carlisle merely shows that these crosses were commemorative. There is no archaeological evidence from Northumbria of the association of a cross and a grave and, in particular, there are serious doubts about the frequently quoted case of the so-called Acca's cross: see M. Swanton 1970 and P. Hunter-Blair 1964, 89. The literary evidence provides evidence of Cuthbert's wish to be buried at the foot of an already standing (? wooden) cross: see B. Colgrave 1940, 272. Ælwald's cross was commemorative: see T. Arnold 1882, 39.

2. The iconography is not particularly funereal. For preaching crosses, many no doubt in wood, see J-P. Migne 1850, 752; O. Holder-Egger 1887, 88; A. Oswald 1955, 15-19 and 26-7; G. Baldwin Brown 1921, 161.

3. See F. Henry 1965, fig. 17 for schematic plan from the Book of Mulling and 134-6 for comments on Irish usage. This could also have been the function of the crosses which once filled the sockets (not directly associated with burials) at Whitby and Hexham; see C.R. Peers and C.A.R. Radford 1943, plate XXXI and H.M. and J. Taylor 1961, fig.I. See also Winchester, M. Biddle 1968, 276.
within the church itself.¹

The crosses can be classified into three types. Least impressive is the type which often carries an inscription on the head but otherwise has no decoration apart from an incised outline and a rosette at the centre of the arms. Carlisle IV provides an example of the type from Cumbria and there are others at Whitby, Dewsbury, Hexham, York and Hoddom.² As will be seen this is a type which persisted into the Viking period.

The more common form of cross was elaborately decorated on all four faces but, like the plain type, had a rectangular-sectioned shaft. There is, however, evidence which shows that Cumbria had at least one example of another form of cross in which the lower part of the shaft had a cylindrical section. Dacre II only survives fragmentarily but there is sufficient to show that the lower part of the arris split to form the scallop at the junction of rectangular and round sections.³ The split was filled by pellets. The whole relationship between the Dacre and other Anglian round-shafts and their Viking-period equivalents will be discussed in a later chapter. It will suffice here to note the evidence.

¹ See H.M. Taylor 1969, 294. The literary evidence does not point to such a use before the ninth century but the differential weathering of the sides of the Ruthwell cross due to a short exposure to the elements in the early modern period might imply that the cross was protected (? within the church) for most of its early life.


³ In his first publication of the stone, W.G. Collingwood 1912, 158 noted the Collingham analogy but did not identify the piece as a round shaft. Note that work of the Saxo-Norman overlap used pellets on the arris: see G. Baldwin Brown 1937, 143.
The slab is another class of monument which must have been seen by the Viking settlers. Both of the Cumbrian examples of this type appear to have been erect, rather than recumbant, monuments. Bewcastle II presumably functioned as a grave-marker and finds its closest analogies for the carefully rounded top in the name-stones of Lindisfarne. But it is clear from the stone at Adel that this type continued very late and the general primitiveness of the Bewcastle stone does not help greatly in its dating. It might however be noted that the cross is formed by what Thomas has described as "broad pocking technique" which appears across the Solway on monuments which have been assigned to dates between the ninth and eleventh centuries. Yet the pocked technique is also found earlier and there is no real reason why this should not be of the same period as the Lindisfarne stones.

Fortunately the other slab has more decoration and is more convincingly dated to the Anglian period. The now-lost Knells stone was almost certainly an erect monument (perhaps set against a wall) since the animals which crawl around the upper corners would make little visual impact or sense on a recumbant slab. Such large cross-inscribed slabs are found all over

2. W.G. Collingwood 1915, 132. This Yorkshire example is larger than the Lindisfarne type of stone.
5. The technique is used, for example, on the early incised crosses north of the Solway: see C.A.R. Radford 1951; C.A.R. Radford 1956a; A.E. Truckell 1955. A pre-Anglian date for this Bewcastle stone seems unlikely in view of its careful shaping. For the dating of the Lindisfarne stones see A.S.C. Ross 1936; F.S. Scott 1956; E. Okasha 1971, 94-7.
7. There are parallels for this detail in Scotland: see J.R. Allen 1903, III, figs. 227 B, 309 A and 495. There is a fuller discussion of this material on p154-5 below.
Christian Britain and are no rarities in an Anglo-Saxon context — witness the fine eighth-century examples from Monkwearmouth and Jarrow. The pre-Viking date of Knells is indicated by the inscription, the close parallels offered by the Wensley slabs and by the fact that certain details of the treatment of the birds (notably the everted wing) find analogies in eighth-century art.

Apart from the very curious inscribed stone, Workington VIII, which may have been a memorial set in a wall, the one other type of Anglian carving for which we have surviving evidence is that of architectural decoration. This aspect of Anglo-Saxon sculpture has been much underestimated but several recent studies have stressed both its significance to the development of Anglo-Saxon carving and the volume of material surviving.

Both of the architectural pieces from Cumbria are now in Tullie House Museum, Carlisle. Though the stones came from two different sites, Bow and Dalston, there can be no doubt that they belong together since the height of the decorated faces is

3. W.G. Collingwood 1907, 409, figs. a and b. A better illustration of the more decorated example is in E. Bakka 1963, fig. 35 where its eighth-century date is established.
4. D.M. Wilson 1964, 12 discusses this material. The bird on the dexter side also appears to have an ear lappet with curled terminal similar to that on the Cropthorne bird: see G. Baldwin Brown 1937, plate CVI (I). This would again support an eighth-century date.
5. J.R. Mason and H. Valentine 1928, plates facing 60 and 62. For possible analogies see C.R. Peers and C.A.R. Radford 1943, 42-4. The pre-Viking date cannot be certainly established though both the type of name and the literacy of the stone make this likely.
8. W.G. Collingwood 1905. Possibly both derive from Kirksteads though the evidence is not, as Collingwood demonstrates, very clear.
identical, the one has a mirror-image of the vine-scroll decoration of the other and they are worked in the same calciferous limestone. They have been assigned to dates which vary between Roman¹ and Norman² but it seems likely that Brøndsted³ was correct in referring them to the Anglian period. Neither was a cross-shaft since there is no tapering and only one face of each was carved.⁴ Their horizontal positioning seems assured by the direction in which the grapes hang⁵ and by the wide moulding on one border. Collingwood suggested that they had acted as lintels⁶ and this is, at least theoretically, possible but the way in which one pattern offers a mirror-image of the other suggests that they were designed to be seen together, perhaps on either side of the chancel arch and, most certainly, as sections of frieze.⁷ As such they would be taller than other known friezes but this does not seem to present insuperable difficulties to the identification.

1. So R.S. Ferguson 1879 and G. Baldwin Brown 1921, 275. Those Roman art-historians consulted are unwilling to accept these as Romano-British work.
2. W.G. Collingwood 1905, 207 tended to this view though admitting the possibility of an eighth-century date.
4. The sword on the side of the Bow stone presumably represents medieval re-use but the incised cross on the face opposite the scroll may be contemporary with it: see L.E. Hope 1906, 335 for the incised cross.
5. Even in the most degenerate work grapes do not hang sideways in relation to the vertical positioning of the stone.
Sculpture seems to have been produced in Cumbria through most of the Anglian period. Ninth-century work is particularly well represented – this must, for example, be the date of the winged beasts of Lowther III and Dacre II – but the much discussed shaft, Bewcastle I, is most convincingly placed within the eighth century.¹

The full range of stylisation in treatment of the vine-scroll from that seen at Bewcastle to the stringy plant of Waberthwaite I (whose closest parallel is found across the Solway at Glencairn in association with a Jellinge animal,²) lead to the same conclusion – however tenuous is the link between stylistic evolution and a chronological scale.

IV

There are serious difficulties in assessing the cultural contacts revealed by this sculpture. Little carving, for example, has survived from potentially influential monastic sites like York,³ Whitby,⁴ Ripon⁵ and Jarrow/Monkwearmouth.⁶ Equally it is only chance that has preserved a single fragment of vine scroll from Lastingham of a type unknown elsewhere in Northumbria.⁷ At other sites, like Otley and Dewsbury, a great deal of sculpture has survived from what were clearly monastic foundations yet the documentary evidence for both the foundations and their ecclesiastical links has disappeared.⁸ Since such links often

---

¹ For the date see R.J. Cramp 1961, 12-3 and R.J. Cramp 1965, 8-9.
² W.G. Collingwood 1926b, plate facing 57.
⁴ C.R. Peers and C.A.R. Radford 1943 illustrate the sculpture but, apart from the (?) shrine fragment shown in plate XXb, there is little relief sculpture.
⁵ W.G. Collingwood 1915, 234.
⁷ W.G. Collingwood 1907, 358, fig. p.
⁸ The tonsured monk shown on the sculpture from both sites would suggest that they were monastic foundations: see W.G. Collingwood 1915, 166, fig. h and 225, fig. h. For Otley see also R.J. Cramp 1971a.
stretched over a great distance,\(^1\) by-passing houses which lay close at hand, the loss of these documentary sources is particularly serious: the exclusive use of identical motifs in two widely separated areas might well be explicable if such evidence had survived.

Some of the Anglian sculpture from Cumbria would not seem out of context anywhere in Northumbria. Thus, although Addingham II is worked in a local red sandstone, its motifs would occasion no surprise if they were to be found to the east of the Pennines. We have already seen that the inscribed transverse, Carlisle IV, is a type with parallels at Hexham, York, Whitby and Hoddon.\(^2\) So too, many of the details of Cumbrian vine-scrolls are part of a common Northumbrian repertoire: characteristic examples are provided by the pointed binding-sheath of Dacre II\(^3\) or the fruit and leaf combination of Brigham I.\(^4\)

When it is possible to distinguish influences from certain areas or centres there is one foundation which seems to have had surprisingly little impact. Carlisle, and probably the north of Cumbria, fell within the orbit of the see of Lindisfarne\(^5\) yet it is very difficult to identify any certain evidence of impact from the sculptural tradition of that island. Its tradition, in as far as it can be seen both on Lindisfarne\(^6\) and in the archaic products of the community when it settled at Chester-le-Street and Durham,\(^7\) shows a strong tendency to use of such manuscript-derived motifs as fine-line interlace, ribbon beasts and fret patterns. The fine interlace of Bewcastle I shows something of

---

1. See, for example, H.E. Craster 1954, especially 182ff.
2. See above p. 27.
5. H.E. Craster 1954, 181. Craster suggests that the southern area "formed from the first a part of York diocese".
7. R.J. Cramp 1966 discusses this material.
this tradition and it could be argued that fret patterns are sufficiently rare in Anglian sculpture, outside the Lindisfarne/Norham¹ school, for the occurrences on Dacre II, Penrith IV and Workington I to be interpreted as influenced from Lindisfarne. Lowther III, now in Glasgow, certainly has ribbon beasts which are in marked contrast to the relatively naturalistic animals of most Northumbrian sculpture. Yet - and this could apply to fret and interlace as well - motifs which belong most happily on the page of a manuscript need not show any direct Lindisfarne influence when they occur in the north-west: one would expect a monastery to have some holding of illuminated books which could have inspired the sculptor and those manuscripts need not have been the products of the Lindisfarne scriptorium.²

But there are other signs of contact with the Northumbrian area north of the Tees, to centres which exercise no influence at all in the following Viking period. Miss Cramp has convincingly demonstrated that Jarrow provides the most plausible background for the detailed handling of the inhabited scroll at Ruthwell and Bewcastle ³ whilst W.G. Collingwood⁴ long ago showed that Hexham was the centre for the dispersion of the system of shaft decoration in which there are panels of full-length double and single scroll. The chequers on the Bewcastle cross seem to derive from the Italianate-looking usage on imposts at Hexham⁵

1. For Norham see J. Stuart 1867, plates 27 and 28.
2. It is apposite to draw attention to a ribbon beast like Lowther on a ninth-century shaft from York: see W.G. Collingwood 1909, 173 fig. a.
4. W.G. Collingwood 1925d. See now R.J. Cramp 1971a, 57 where a distinction is drawn between the type of scroll known from Otley and the wiry Hexham plant.
5. F.J. Haverfield and W. Greenwell 1899, no.x and W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig. 34c.

For the Italianate background see R.J. Cramp 1967a, 23.
whilst the rosette flowers of Kirkby Stephen III and the magnificent flower on Dacre II may ultimately stem from the Hexham exploitation of this motif.\textsuperscript{1} It should, however, be emphasised that no sculpture is without its eclectic elements.\textsuperscript{2}

Whilst it is clearly important to stress the links to eastern Bernicia two other factors seem to be equally important. There are, firstly, signs of regional development within the Anglian period which mark off north-western products from work on the other side of the Pennines. Secondly, much of the sculpture shows links to Yorkshire and to the art of Mercia.

The local groupings show themselves in several ways. Whatever the relative chronology of the Bewcastle/Ruthwell pair of monuments there has never been any dispute that they stand together in motifs, iconography and ambition and are, to some extent, isolated from the rest of Northumbrian sculpture.\textsuperscript{3} At a less impressive level there seems to be some localised link between Irton I and Workington VI for both mark off the upper part of a scroll-decorated head by a moulding which does not seem to occur elsewhere.\textsuperscript{4}

More important, and more widely evidenced, is the north-western treatment of the vine-scroll. That there was a localised development has been recognised\textsuperscript{5} but its chief identifying

\addcontentsline{toc}{section}{Notes}

\begin{enumerate}
\item See R.J. Cramp 1961, 14 and note 13. There are close parallels for the Kirkby Stephen fragment at Hoddom and Wycliffe, C.A.R. Radford 1953, plate IIIb and W.G. Collingwood 1907, 412, fig. d.- the latter is particularly close and may reflect a link across Stainmoor which was to play an important role in the subsequent period.
\item See comment on Bewcastle in R.J. Cramp 1965, 8-9.
\item The Irton detail is not shown in W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig.100 but was drawn by W.S. Calverley 1899, facing 206 and can be seen in T.D. Kendrick 1938, plate XCII (2). The Workington example is based upon the most plausible reconstruction.
\end{enumerate}
characteristic has not been noticed before. The use in the north-west of double and single scrolls in full-length panels is clearly derived from Hexham and the most convenient example with which to begin the identification of the north-western treatment is Lowther II. This is the only carving which approaches Acca's cross "in quality of execution" and in "true understanding of the double strand medallion". On its narrow edge the single stem of the scroll produces offshoots from a point near the base and not, as is normal, the top of each curve. The offshoot then runs alongside the main stem before curling away to terminate in a leaf or fruit. The result is that the main stem and the offshoot terminal are always separated by the stem of the offshoot (see fig. 1). This scheme, which is quite distinct from the usual type, can be seen on two of the shafts from Lancaster, the other two fragments from Lowther (I and III) and on the crosses from Heversham, Heysham and Hoddom. To this list can be added the shaft from Kendal which differs from the rest in the way in which the offshoot turns backwards immediately after the break from the main stem but where the essential separation

2. Lancaster A, W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig. 46; Lancaster C, B.J.N. Edwards 1967, plate IX.
3. W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig. 89.
of terminal and main stem by the subsidiary branch is still preserved. This type of stem break and termination only occurs once outside the north-west, at Jarrow, and there the leaf arrangement is quite distinct. Other shafts at Waberthwaite and Lancaster can be associated with the group.

Once this set is distinguished other linking features can be traced. There is, for example, the arrangement of the leaves/grapes within the double-scroll medallion. At Hexham and on other shafts these are arranged so that there is lateral symmetry but on Lowther II and III, Heversham and Lancaster A they are set either below each other or within a whorl. It is, of course, possible to make further groupings within this north-western set — one such would be the link between Heversham and Lowther II in the pelta arrangement of the offshoot termination, but it is sufficient here to register the existence of regionalising tendencies before the end of the Anglian period. What evidence survives suggests that this style covered an area from Lancaster to Hoddom but, interestingly, does not seem to affect the Cumbrian coastal plain. On the surviving material it would be difficult to claim a Lancaster origin for this regional characteristic.

1. F.J. Haverfield and W. Greenwell 1899, no. XIII.
2. Waberthwaite I on the basis of the fact that its offshoots spring away from the main stem at a point near the base of the curve though the rest of its decoration, in its panelling, is not linked. Lancaster B has associations with the other Lancaster pieces: see Cramp's remarks in B.J.N Edwards 1967 and W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig. 74.
3. For the Hexham arrangement see W.G. Collingwood 1927, figs. 37, 39, 40 and 41. For the whorl effect compare Northallerton (W.G. Collingwood 1907, 373, fig. d) to which there may be a link.
5. As have W.G. Collingwood 1927, 36 and R.J. Cramp 1967a, 28. Stylistically Lowther II is much earlier than the Lancaster shafts.
This north-western type of vine-scroll can be seen as a development of a motif whose origins lie in eastern Northumbria. Much of Cumbria's sculpture, however, has links with Deira rather than Bernicia. This is particularly true of the work which can be assigned to the later eighth and ninth centuries when southern Northumbria (and Mercia beyond) was more artistically inventive and lively than were the northern centres of Hexham, Lindisfarne and Jarrow/Monkwearmouth. A similar alignment of the sculpture in Dumfriesshire has been noticed.¹

Contacts with the art of Yorkshire and areas to the south can be traced in various ways. It would perhaps be best to examine first a rather debatable example provided by sculptures at Workington and Penrith. A cross head (no. I) from Workington's Curwen Vault was clearly decorated with a double scroll springing from a broad stem in the lower arm.² This broad stem can be paralleled elsewhere in Northumbria³ but what can only be matched elsewhere in sculpture on Penrith IV is the presence of a bud separating the two shoots which form the stems of the double scroll. This bud is, however, found on the Ormside bowl and on the Mercian metalwork which Bakka has claimed as stylistically derived from that bowl.⁴ If the Ormside bowl is Mercian then the Workington/Penrith bud may reflect influence from that area.⁵ If, as may now seem more likely, it is a Northumbrian product,⁶ then these two presumably reflect a local north-western style.

The material from Carlisle seems to be particularly linked to the Yorkshire area. The inscribed transverse (no.IV) has already been noted as an example of a widespread type but it is important to notice that the only parallel for the incised rectangles

---

2. The scroll on the reconstructed head would presumably be like that suggested for Carlisle II: see W.G.Collingwood 1927, fig. 105.
3. e.g. Nunnykirk, W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig. 45.
5. Note that the bud beneath the double scroll on the south side of Bewcastle is of a completely different type.
beneath its arms comes from Northallerton. The same Northallerton cross provides one of the parallels for the combination of lorgnette and chevrons which is found on Carlisle III, now kept in the Fratry. The combination also occurs at Ripon and at Heysham. Whether or not the decorative scheme is Ripon-derived the links of this Carlisle piece are to the south and not eastwards across the Pennines. It is in the same direction that analogues for the "cat's cradle" decoration of the arm-end must be sought.

Carlisle II is linked to the plain inscribed form of cross and in its combination of inscription and scroll is paralleled at Dewsbury. The very thin delicate scroll on the face and that on the surviving edge of the fragment is also found in Yorkshire at Croft, Cundall and Masham on work which has long been recognised as reflecting Mercian and southern art. Again these links exclude Bernicia.

The zoomorphic art reveals the same tendencies for, though Bewcastle's menagerie may be linked to Jarrow and areas to the east, most of Cumbria's birds and beasts seem related to work from Yorkshire and Mercia. The birds on the now-lost Knells slab, for example, have a sharply everted wing-tip which has been discussed recently by Wilson who shows it as a familiar feature in later eighth-century art from Mercia. The animals provide yet

1. W.G. Collingwood 1907, 373, figs. a-c.
2. W.G. Collingwood 1915, 234, figs. a-c.
3. W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig. 28.
4. As W.G. Collingwood 1927, 87 and 94-5
6. W.G. Collingwood 1915, 166, figs. i-k.
9. D.M. Wilson 1964, 12. The Knells birds may have a head lappet ending in a curl like that at Cropthorne: see G. Baldwin Brown 1937, plate CVI.
more convincing evidence. The clearest example is the 'lion' of Dacre II. Together with the beasts of Lowther II and those at Croft, the Dacre 'lion' belongs to a rare class of winged scroll-beasts. The alert stance, the puffed-out chest and the strongly curved neck are found again in Northumbria, this time without accompanying scrolls, at Melsonby and Masham. There can be no doubt that all of these northern animals reflect an animal drawing whose roots are in eighth-century Mercia. The Mercian winged biped of the eighth century was adopted complete at Ilkley and it is therefore likely that the Dacre group show an adoption of the Mercian wings and stance onto a quadruped. Alternatively the links may be with the slightly later art of Southumbria where a similar stance is found on quadrupeds. Most of these latter animals are wingless but the Breedon material shows that a winged quadruped was known in southern art at the period. Whether interpreted as an adoption of biped characteristics onto a Northumbrian quadruped or a direct borrowing of a southern winged quadruped, the southern derivation of the type is still clear.

1. L. Stone 1955, plate 10b. It is possible that the beasts from Hoddom were also winged: see C.A.R. Radford 1953, plates 1b and 2b.
5. W.G. Collingwood 1915, 186 fig. a.
6. D.M. Wilson 1964, plate XIX (no. 25) illustrates a wingless beast from Ixworth which has a similar stance and at least one back leg: it is thus theoretically possible that Mercia could have provided stance, wings and both front and rear legs.
7. e.g. a) B.M. Royal I.E.VI or Æthelswith's ring, D.M. Wilson 1964 plates V and XI (no. 1).
   b) Sculpture at Wroxeter and Cropthorne, G. Baldwin Brown 1937, plates LXXIII and CVI.
8. A.W. Clapham 1927, plate XXXIII, fig. 2.
9. As recognised by T.D. Kendrick 1938, 200 though for his "Frankish" substitute "Mercian/southern English". The acceptance of a winged beast into a Northumbrian scroll may have been aided by the existence of winged animals as evangelist symbols in non-sculptural Northumbrian art: see E. Kitzinger 1956, 230-41.
likely for the Dacre animal seems to be indicated by the human face given to the beast for, though it is possible to quote another example from east Lothian, and the Dacre moustache is very like those sported at Rothbury, the human mask on an animal is a distinctly southern mannerism.

The upper animal of Lowther III, which is also winged, must derive from the same art world: there is a fine parallel both for the general shape of the beast and for his awkward placing among the branches on the shaft from Croft whose southern affiliations have often been noted. Together with Easby, Otley and Cundall/Aldborough this stone from Croft also offers the best Northumbrian parallels for the other scroll beasts of Lowther III and Heversham. None of these stylistic links run to Bernicia but, interestingly, they are shared with Dumfriesshire where parallels with the Easby/Otley/Croft material have been noted. There is, however, no link in animal ornament between Yorkshire/Cumbria and Galloway. This negative point is worth making at this stage since contacts across the Solway seem to change between the Anglian and Viking periods: in the tenth and eleventh centuries it is Galloway and Cumbria which are linked to the exclusion of Dumfriesshire.

1. J.G. Callander 1933, fig.10.
2. T.D. Kendrick 1938, plate LXII.
3. e.g. (a) B.M. Cotton Tib. Cii: see M. Rickert 1954, plate 15.
   (b) Book of Cerne: see D.W. Wilson 1964, plate IIIb.
   (c) Breedon sculpture: see A.W. Clapham 1927, plate XXI, fig. 2. C.L. Curle 1940, 87 looked to "southern influence" to explain a similar feature in Scottish sculpture.
5. For Easby see W.H. Longhurst 1931. For Otley and Cundall see W.G. Collingwood 1915, 225 and W.G. Collingwood 1907, 310. For reconstruction of Cundall/Aldborough see W.G.Collingwood 1927, fig. 32. The relative size of animals in relation to a scroll at Lowther and Heversham is best paralleled at Cundall/Aldborough.
There are few Anglian sculptures from the area which attract iconographical study. As on all Northumbrian sculpture there is a lack of Old Testament biblical scenes but to this is added an almost complete absence of figure sculpture. The surviving evidence would suggest that there were few local Anglian models for any Viking-age carver who wished to embark on figure sculpture. Some of the abstract ornament, like the vine-scroll with its potent symbolism, has its interpretative interest but it is only at Knells, Bewcastle and Urswick that there is anything to repay detailed investigation.

The Knells slab has no figure sculpture but is interesting because of the positioning of the two birds above the arms of the cross. This motif has a very long history in Christian art: there are fine examples in early Christian art and from Merovingian France. In Britain it is known in Ireland and Scotland and seems to have persisted into the Viking period at least in Scotland and certainly on the Isle of Man. In Anglo-Saxon England there is a very close parallel at Wensley and another at Lancaster; both of these date to the pre-Viking period but the Newent funerary tablet shows an allied motif continuing into the eleventh century. The precise interpretation of the birds

1. A lack which has been noted by R.J. Cramp 1965, 9.
2. Drawing upon John XV, 1-7 and (perhaps for the inhabited type) Psalms CIV.
3. e.g. F. van der Meer and C. Mohrmann 1959, plate 466; M. Gough 1961, plate 46.
4. e.g. L. Coutil 1930, fig. facing 40; E. Salin 1952, figs. 44 and 9 (recte 99); D. Talbot Rice 1965, 204-5.
5. F. Henry 1965, figs. 15b and c.
6. J.R. Allen 1903, III, fig. 264A.
7. J.R. Allen 1903, III, fig. 281a
8. P.M.C. Kermode 1907, nos.97 and 103 (and ? 93).
9. W.G. Collingwood 1907, 409, figs a and b.
10. W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig. 128.
11. G. Zarnecki 1953, plate 3 where the birds are enclosed with the hand of God in the upper arm of the cross. On p. 50 Zarnecki suggests that these represent the Holy Ghost.
(which vary in their type) is probably that of the soul\(^1\) though
it should not be forgotten that they could be substitutes for
angels\(^2\) and might have other connotations.\(^3\)

The iconography of the Bewcastle monument has often been
treated and requires little further examination in this immediate
context.\(^4\) The central panel, by reference to the inscription-
identified central panel at Ruthwell is a representation of
Christ in Majesty but seen in the particular context of Psalm
XC.13 which exegesis saw as prophetic of Christ's rejection of
temptation in the wilderness: in the desert the beasts acknowledge
Christ's divinity. The panel above is identical to one at
Ruthwell, which occupies the same position, and shows John the
Baptist holding the paschal lamb: this scene also has in it the
theme of the desert in the prototype of Christian asceticism who
was also the herald of the Lamb which would take away the sin of
the world.\(^5\) The lower panel at Bewcastle differs from the more
ambitious Ruthwell shaft and contains a figure who cannot be
closely paralleled: the most likely explanation is that this is
an eccentric representation of St. John the evangelist with his
eagle symbol.\(^6\) The two Johns, above and below the figure of Christ,
give an iconographical balance and though the scheme is less
complex than Ruthwell it is complete and satisfactory.

comments on this identification of bird and soul. It is, of
course, one well known in Anglo-Saxon literature: see
P.D. Henry 1966, 137-49; V. Salmon 1960. F. Clemoes 1969,
68ff. and A. Campbell 1967.

2. See P.M.C. Kermode 1907, no. 101 with the bird partnered by a
? angel or V.E. Nash-Williams 1950, no 377 where a seraphim
is invoked.

3. For interpretations drawing upon Scandinavian religion see
P.M.C. Kermode 1907, 144.

4. See, in particular, F. Saxl 1943 and M. Schapiro 1944 who both
concentrate on Ruthwell but whose material is relevant to
Bewcastle. Some additional material is discussed in

5. See references in note 1 above and see Bede, J.P.Migne 1862,121.

The other example of Anglian figural sculpture from the area, Usworth I, is also associated with a runic inscription and is presumably also the product of a literate, and thus monastic, milieu. The inscription indicates that Collingwood's dating (which got progressively later in his successive writings1) cannot be upheld. On purely linguistic grounds it must be ascribed to the period between the middle of the eighth and ninth centuries.2 The knotwork above the inscription is not listed in Romilly Allen's great corpus but belongs with a type which is found elsewhere in the area in the Anglian period3 and which also continued in use in the tenth and eleventh centuries.4 The simple plait on the narrow edge, using parallel strands of differing thicknesses, does not run counter to this Anglian date.5

The figure sculpture poses problems of interpretation. Below the inscription is a panel with two figures in profile, with high collars like those at York,6 the one gesturing across a cross to the other. It would be possible to interpret them as Mary and John flanking the cross and thus to see the scene as one repeated later on Burton in Kendal I. But the lack of female characteristics, the profile view and the size of the figures in relation to the cross all make this unlikely.

Other possibilities can therefore be entertained. One, which would be entirely appropriate for such a monument, is that this scene shows Christ, with cross, making a welcoming gesture to the

---

2. R.I. Page: 750-850 (in lit.) See in particular the extraordinary archaism bæurnæ to which A. Campbell 1959, 117 draws attention.
3. e.g., Addingham II.
4. See discussion of Bromfield on p. 199 below.
5. See Leeds, W.G. Collingwood 1915, 210, fig. b; Lindisfarne, C.R. Peers 1925, plate IV (I); Gandersheim casket, D.M. Wilson 1964, plate Ia. Note that the knotwork at Irton is of this parallel type though of the same thickness.
dead man. An example of this scene from the fifth century has often been illustrated and it is perhaps relevant to compare scenes showing the Harrowing of Hell in which Christ, armed with a cross, reaches out to help the souls. It is, however, equally possible that these Urswick figures are simply saints: this was ultimately Collingwood's conclusion and it is supported by the closely similar dispositions of the apostles facing across a small crucifix on such work as a fifth-century sarcophagus from Constantinople or, later, on Merovingian buckles. Such a type does not appear to be common in insular art.

The scroll face is even more intriguing. The scroll itself is clearly based upon Anglian types, the pediment base being paralleled in the stem thickenings of such work as Dewsbury and Nunnykirk and the single/double scroll change finding its analogy at Ilkley or Sheffield. The birds, animals and human beings are not really susceptible to art-historical analysis but the total composition is extremely interesting since it contains human beings within the scroll. This is not a common phenomenon. There are figures who shoot up into the scroll and others, armed and unarmed, who actually move within the branches. But the paired figures seem to be limited to the western side of Britain with the other examples on Dacre II, at Hoddom and

1. F. van der Meer and C. Mohrmann 1959, plate 337.
2. e.g. Bristol, D. Talbot Rice 1952, plate 12. In this scene Christ is usually portrayed as larger than the saved soul.
4. D. Talbot Rice 1957, fig. 5.
6. Dewsbury, W.G. Collingwood 1915, 170, fig. 6; Nunnykirk, W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig. 45.
7. W.G. Collingwood 1927, figs. 63 and 63.
9. Hexham, W.G. Collingwood 1925d, fig. 2; Jarrow, W.G.Collingwood 1927, fig. 96.; Tynemouth, J. Stuart 1867; Sandbach, C.A.R. Radford 1957, fig. 4; Breedon, A.W. Clapham 1928, plate XXXIII, fig.1 and plate XXXIV, fig.3.
9a. Only the feet are visible and the dexter pair may be those of a bird.
10. C.A.R. Radford 1953, plate IV.
Diddlebury. In rightly rejecting the possibility of an identification of these paired figures with Adam and Eve Cramp suggested that they are the end-product of a purely stylistic evolution in which artists were attempting to achieve a balanced composition around a central-stemmed vine-scroll. But another interpretation could be proposed, at least for the Urswick carving.

The two human figures appear to be male and female. Above them are birds and below are animals. It is possible that we have represented here the great cosmic tree which is both cross and ladder to heaven. One of the most influential statements of this concept was that of the Latin poem De Pascha which, until the ninth century, was attributed to St. Cyprian and associated with his writings. In it is described the great cosmic tree set in the centre of the earth, evolved by Christian exegesis out of its Jewish antecedents, a tree which is at once the cross, Christ and the ladder to heaven as well as the source of creation's shelter and sustenance. This poem merely gives an enlarged statement of a concept which is familiar in the works of the early fathers and, through them, in later writers, including Anglo-Saxons.

In the work of St. Gregory we find the tree associated with the idea of the soul as a bird. One wonders if this Urswick cross does not show the ascent of the archetypal male and female, the pure souls above them and the bestial below. It is not, admittedly, before the fourteenth century that there is literary evidence for such a distinction in interpretation between the beasts at the foot of the cosmic tree and the bird souls above. Yet the early fathers had viewed the ascent of the tree as one

1. Anon. 1899a.
   R.J. Cramp 1961, 15 noted that it would be difficult to parallel the active enmeshment in the foliage of an Adam and Eve depiction.
3. R.J. Cramp 1961, 16. See now R.J. Cramp 1971a, 58 where it is suggested that the Dacre/Hoddom/Breedon types are derived from vintage scenes.
4. The following paragraph draws heavily upon the material discussed in E.S.Greenhill 1954; R.E.Kaske 1967; F.L.Utley 1957.
involving grades of virtue and Urswick merits consideration in the light of their writings. This summary chapter is clearly not the context in which to argue the identification in detail but it does suggest that the possible iconographic interest of the Anglian material in the area is not yet exhausted.

VI

This survey of the early sculpture has focused on those issues which are pertinent to the study of carving in the Viking period. The settlers in the tenth century came to an area with a long-established tradition of sculpture, where a succession of ornamental styles would be available for imitation. The Anglian carvings exhibited a surprising variety of form and decoration and were to be found in areas which were centres of Anglian settlement. Some of the sculpture was commemorative though the crosses also had other functions. It is doubtful if there was a great deal of it and it is likely that a high proportion was associated with monasteries.
CHAPTER THREE
The Spiral-Scroll School

There are fragments of at least twenty-two crosses in the area whose decorative motifs are sufficiently distinctive to merit their grouping into a school of sculpture. Links between some, though not all, of these crosses have long been recognised and it is to Collingwood that we owe the name of "the spiral school". The title at the head of this chapter is a slight modification of that name but, for reasons which will appear below, is more appropriate.

These crosses come from fourteen sites which, with the exception of Addingham, are all on the coastal plain south of the River Ellen (see Map 4). Apart from the shafts at Addingham and Beckermet St. Bridget all are carved in white sandstone. In addition to this core of recognised work there is a (now lost) fragment from Arlecdon which might belong to the group and there are other sculptures on the peninsular which can be related to those produced by the school.

There are three distinctive motifs used by this school. First, there is the vegetable ornament which gives its name to the group, secondly there is the type of interlace which Collingwood aptly called "stopped-plait" and, lastly, there is the persistent use of a cross-head decoration made up of

1. Addingham I; Aspatria II, IV, V; Beckermet St. Bridget I; Beckermet St. John I, II; Bridekirk I; Cross Canonby II; Dearham II, III; Distington I, III, IV; Haile I; Harrington; Isel I; Plumbland I; St. Bees I, II, III, IV, V; Workington II.

The doubt about the actual number of monuments is caused by the fact that the two Dearham carvings and some of the lost fragments from St. Bees may have been parts of the same crosses.

2. E.g., E.H. Knowles 1880, 144.
4. J.H. Martindale 1905. Martindale describes this as a red sandstone fragment.
5. Carlisle I; Distington II; Kirkby Stephen VII; Isel II; Burton in Kendal I.
6. W.G. Collingwood 1927, 64.
spines, bosses and circles. A less widespread, but still notable, feature of the work of the school is the use of symbols such as the triskele, swastika and ∞-form.

The three main motifs frequently occur together on the same cross: seven of the surviving nine cross-heads which are decorated with spiral-scroll also carry the spine-and-boss pattern whilst thirteen of the fourteen stopped-plait occurrences are associated with spiral-scroll work (see fig. 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Spiral-Scroll</th>
<th>Stopped-Plait</th>
<th>Lorgnette</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Addingham I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspatria II</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspatria IV</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspatria V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beckermet St. Bridget I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beckermet St. John I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beckermet St. John II</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridekirk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Canonby II</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dearham II</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dearham III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distington I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distington III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distington IV</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haile I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrington</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isel I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumbland I</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Bees I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Bees II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Bees III</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Bees IV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Bees V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workington II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 2: Spiral-scroll school motifs

Though the whole group can be assigned to the Viking period it will be argued below that the origins of all three major decorative motifs lie in Anglian art. Sculptors in other areas, and artists in other media, occasionally pursued the same lines of treatment of scroll and plait but only in the stone sculpture of Cumberland (and in the occasional piece related to the school)

1. First treated in W.G. Collingwood 1913.
2. See p. 46 below.
were all three types of decoration used simultaneously. The following section examines each of these motifs in turn.

II

Spiral-scroll, as it is fully developed in the school, consists of thin branches wandering over the surface of the panel. Frequently the branches assume key-pattern shapes or are grouped so as to suggest the forms of swastikas and triskeles. Leaves can be attached to the branches but may float free among the loose symbols (swastikas, triskeles and \(\langle\cdots\rangle\) forms) which are scattered among the branches.

The origins of this motif in the Anglian vine-scroll can be clearly seen in some of the scroll-work which is more organic than the majority of the school's products. Haile I provides the best example, though it should be stressed that its relative naturalism does not imply any chronological precedence within the group. It is obvious that the design is based upon the type of Anglian scroll in which branches spring to right and left of a central stem.\(^1\) Most of the details can also be paralleled among the known pre-Viking scrolls: the stripped and spiralling branches,\(^2\) the trefoil leaf,\(^3\) the pelta-like shaping of the branches\(^4\) and the deliberate juxtaposing of the shoots to form a triskele shape.\(^5\) Even the loose branch on the lower right side of the central stem at Haile can be found in Anglian art.\(^6\)

---

1. e.g., Northallerton, Simonburn, Falstone and Halton: see W.G. Collingwood 1907, 373 fig.c and W.G. Collingwood 1927, figs. 43, 44 and 92. The type is also known in "inhabited" form: see W.G. Collingwood 1927, figs. 57 and 59.
2. e.g., Ilkley: see W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig. 63. In Cumbria it can be seen on Heversham and Dacre II. For a fine parallel outside Northumbria in Rutland see V.B. Crowther-Beynon 1909.
3. e.g., Melsonby, Cudall/Aldborough: see W.G. Collingwood 1927, figs. 20 and 32.
4. Lowther and Heversham II are examples from Cumbria.
5. e.g., Croft: see W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig. 59. Kendal provides a local example.
6. Dewsbury: see W.G. Collingwood 1915, 170 fig.u.
The Haile sculptor has transformed an organic vine-scroll into an all-covering pattern in which the convolutions of the branches are more important than the representation of the scroll. A somewhat similar treatment can be seen outside Cumbria at Falstone in Northumberland. This approach is taken a stage further on Beckermet St. John I where again the basic lay-out is of a central-stemmed vine-scroll. The upper section is still fairly coherent and, in such details as the star-shaped leaf, has analogues in Anglian-period work. The lower part of the shaft, however, shows branches which take on key-pattern shapes such as the swastika and battlement-pattern as well as branches which are cut free from the main stem. All of these features are developments of Anglian scroll tendencies, and all were found on the Haile sculpture just examined. The new factor seen at Beckermet is the linking-up of the ends of separate branches, for this has the effect of breaking up the dominance of the central stem and removing any sense of an organic vine-scroll. This linking-up occasionally happened on some of the more complicated Anglian scrolls but its wholesale adoption by the Cumbrian school is the main cause of the characteristic appearance of its spiral-scroll.

Other sculptures from the school show treatments of the scroll which are similar to Haile and Beckermet in that the motif is used to cover a fairly large area. There is, however, one small sub-group in which the scroll is used in a slightly differing way. There are five examples, three from St. Bees and one from Plumbland and Distington, in which a thin single branch is used. On Plumbland I and on St. Bees IV and V this branch threads its way through two lines of stopped-plait; the same type of scroll appears on all the surviving narrow faces of the shafts in the sub-group. Despite the apparent difference

1. W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig. 44.
2. See the rosette-leaves listed on p.33 above.
3. For swastika see Acca’s cross at Hexham and a shaft from St. Peter's, York: W.G. Collingwood 1927, figs.39 and 146.
4. e.g., Acca’s cross: see W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig.39(lower left).
5. Distington I; Plumbland I; St. Bees II,IV,V.
between the all-covering and single-branch types the two can be treated together for the sub-group shows the same associations of stopped-plait, loose-leaf shapes, swastika, triskele and $\infty$ symbols as the work of the rest of the school. The single branches also tend to assume key-pattern shapes for which there are exact parallels in the main group.\(^1\)

The spiral-scroll of this school is, then, based upon Anglian scrolls and many of its characteristics can be traced back to tendencies already apparent in the earlier period. In view of this Anglian origin it is not surprising to find somewhat similar treatments elsewhere in areas as widely separated as Yorkshire and Wales.\(^2\) But such isolated occurrences must not be interpreted as necessarily having any connection with the Cumbrian school: they are better seen as parallel and, usually, isolated developments. Only when associated with other motifs from the school, like stopped-plait or the spine-and-boss head pattern, is there a need to search for a direct link: there appear to be only four sculptures, outside the Cumbrian peninsula, which fall into this category.\(^3\) This point about parallel but unconnected development can perhaps best be made by reference to a series of Viking-age stirrups from Eastern Danelaw which have spiral-scroll of a type which is very close to that used on sculpture in Cumbria but for which any direct link is geographically and culturally unlikely.\(^4\)

---

1. Compare, for example, the narrow edge of St. Bees IV and the upper sinister of Dearham II.

2. York and Cheadle: see W.G. Collingwood 1927, figs. 145 and 221.

   Barwick in Elmet: see W.G. Collingwood 1915, 138, fig. g.

   Whitford, Flint: see V.E. Nash-Williams 1950, no. 190.

3.a) Maughold, Isle of Man: see P.M.C. Kermode 1907, no. 72 and G. Baldwin Brown 1937, plate LXXXV.

   b) Netherurd Mains, Kirkurd, Peebles: see R.B.K.Stevenson 1961, plate XI, no.3.

   c) Fardenreoch, Colmonell, Ayrshire: see R.S.G. Anderson 1927, fig. 3.

   d) Prestbury, Cheshire: see J.Croston 1884.

4. W.A. Seaby 1957 and D.W. Wilson 1964, 39 and 62. See also R.A. Smith 1925, 91 who quotes parallels on Yorkshire carvings but does not argue for a direct connection.
In one of his early writings Collingwood\(^1\) drew attention to an analogous type of scroll on the trefoil brooch from Kirkoswald. It was not a parallel which he invoked in any of his later works and he was almost certainly correct in thus rejecting the possibility that it had any relevance to the particular development of the scroll in the Cumbrian sculptural school. In view of the controversy over the origin of the Kirkoswald brooch\(^2\) this may be considered fortunate and there seems no reason to re-examine the issue again even though we now have filigree work of the tenth and eleventh centuries which seems to be of English manufacture.\(^3\) Not only can a coherent line of development in scroll treatment be traced within the sculptural medium itself but there is also the important distinction that Scandinavian, English, Carolingian and Ottonian metalwork scrolls \(^4\) place little emphasis upon the leaf form and certainly show none of the variety of leaf types which can be seen on these crosses.

Stopped-plait can be described as a type of interlace in which the strands do not pass over and under each other but are stopped short of the crossing-point. The result is a completely two-dimensional patterning of short lengths of strand. Almost all of the surviving fragments are further distinguished by the fact that each length of strand has rounded ends and is marked by a central groove – a groove which does not run out at the

\(^1\) In W.S. Calverley 1899, 298. It is intriguing to note that an anonymous reviewer (? J.R. Allen) in The Reliquary, 1900, 131 favoured a development from the Northumbrian sculptural vine-scrolls.


\(^4\) For references see footnotes and bibliographies \(^3\) above.
end of the strand (see fig. 3).

Fig. 3
Stopped plait

Fourteen of the sculptures in the school have this type of strand.¹ It occurs in almost identical form on them all, though its use on the narrow edge of Dearham II results in the strand-lengths being smaller and more closely juxtaposed than on the other examples. There is no central groove on Harrington or Distington I.

Other examples of this type of strand are very limited in their distribution. The shaft from Burton in Kendal has two lengths treated in this way and there are others on the cross-slab from Maughold and the cross from Netherurd Mains which have already been noted as also carrying spiral-scroll.² The biggest group of parallels is in two areas of south-west Scotland, around Glasgow³ and in what Radford⁴ has called the Whithorn School.

1. Addingham I; Aspatria IV; Beckermet St. John I, II; Dearham II; Distington I; Harrington; Ise I; Plumbland I; St. Bees I, III, IV, V; Workington II. W.S. Calverley 1899, plate facing 35 shows Beckermet St. John II as lacking a median groove: it is clearly indicated both on modern photographs and in the drawing in E.H. Knowles 1880, plate II.
2. see note 3 on p.51 above.
4. C.A.R. Radford and G. Donaldson 1953, 12-4. Fullest discussion is W.G. Collingwood 1925a, 217-8 and ff. A full list of this Scottish group will be found in Appendix 2 on which is based MapII.
Almost all of these Scottish pieces have a line-incised strand similar to the Cumbrian type and will be considered in more detail below.

The development of this type of interlace-strand has been attributed to imitation of metalwork, and particularly filigree techniques. It has even been suggested that the fashion began as a bungling and indiscriminate reproduction of a metalwork exemplar. Yet, whilst it is certainly true that there are parallels in filigree work, it is possible to point to analogous treatments executed in other metalwork techniques and in other media. Whilst not ruling out the possibility that some or all of these types of interlace may have exercised an effect, there seems to be a much stronger case for seeing stopped-plait (like the spiral-scroll) as an extreme development of tendencies already existing within insular sculpture.

The three-dimensional rendering of interlace, as seen at Bewcastle, does continue right through the pre-Norman period but, even within Anglian Northumbrian sculpture, other types of interlace can be observed. The type which is relevant for the genesis of stopped-plait is that in which the interlace-strands

1. Collingwood in W.S. Calverley 1899, 296; W.G. Collingwood 1925a, 218; W.G. Collingwood 1927, 64.
4. e.g., metalwork from Whitby: see C.R. Peers and C.A.R. Radford 1943, plate XXVII nos. 20, 24 and 80; Beeston Tor brooch and Hammersmith plaque: see D.M. Wilson 1964, plate XI (no. 2) and XXIII (no. 42); brooch from Austris, Tingstäde, Gotland and the "Cathach": see D.M. Wilson and O. Klindt-Jensen 1966, plates LVI (a) and LVI (b); the Soiscel Molaise: see F. Henry 1967, plate 58; Hoddom crosier-drop: see M. MacDermott 1957, plate LXIII.
5. e.g., Hexham sheath: see R.A. Smith 1923, fig. 129; Book of Kells, fol. 130: see J.E. Forssander 1943, fig. 15.
merely abut, all being worked in the same plane. At the point of intersection there is usually a marked groove. Though primarily a type which occurs in the Viking period, the example brought to light during the excavations at Whitby Abbey show that it was also in use in Northumbria in the earlier period. All that is required to produce "stopped-plait" from this Whitby stage is to widen the groove at the point of crossing. As for the incised medial line, this could well have been suggested by those Anglian double-strand interlace types in which the division lines between the two strands are carelessly not carried to the crossing. This last point may not be wholly convincing but the general argument that this type of interlace is based upon tendencies present in other (and often earlier) sculpture seems more plausible than invoking influence from other media. The Cumbrian sculptors created an interlace-pattern in which the idea of disintegration is as strongly present as it was in their handling of the spiral-scroll.

Since there is a background for this motif in earlier insular knotwork it is not surprising to find other examples of stopped-plait in widely separated areas. Apart from the Manx and Scottish examples quoted earlier, however, none of these occurrences could be mistaken for Cumbrian work or are associated with other of the school's motifs.

This idiosyncratic development of motifs used elsewhere can also be seen in the spine-and-boss pattern which is so frequently used on the cross-heads in this school. In this case there is not

1. Middleton, A.L. Binns 1956, figs. 2, 3 and 4; Ellerburn, T.D. Kendrick 1949, plate IXIV; Dearham I and Muncaster I. See also p. 133 below.
3. The fragment from Whitby, listed in note 2 above, provides a classic example.
4. Bexhill, Sussex: see T.D. Kendrick 1949, plate LVI; Merthyr Mawr, Glamorgan: see V.E. Nash-Williams 1950, no. 239; Lancaster: W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig. 137; Yarm: see F.J. Haverfield and W. Greenwell 1899, no. L (though the detail is not well produced); Whiteness, Shetland: see E.S.R. Tait 1937, 370.
perhaps quite such a radical departure from normal Northumbrian usage.

An unusually large number of cross-heads from this school have survived. Seven of the nine\(^1\) remaining carry a cruciform decoration which Collingwood\(^2\) christened the "lorgnette". Basically this consists of an upraised spine leading out into each arm from a central boss or circle and terminating in a boss and/or circle. There are a large number of these lorgnettes in Northumbrian sculpture\(^3\) but the distinctive element in the spiral-school's treatment of the motif is that, whatever variety of central pattern is employed, there is always only a single spine leading out to a ring-encircled boss in the cross-arm. Only once does this combination occur outside the school and this example, from Carlisle, could well be linked to the school.\(^4\)

The lorgnette pattern was used in the Anglian period. Both incised and relief versions occur on the Lindisfarne and Hartlepool slabs\(^5\) which can be epigraphically and philologically assigned to this period; similar evidence points to the same date for an incised example on a head from Ripon\(^6\) and there is a group of four closely related crosses from Ripon, Northallerton, Heysham and Carlisle which have relief versions associated with chevron ornament and very naturalistic vine-scroll.\(^7\) In the

1. Beckermet St. John I; Bridekirk I; Cross-Canonby II; Dearham III; Distington III; Harrington; St. Bees III; Addingham I certainly did not use it and St. Bees I probably did not.
3. It also occurs outside the area and in other media: see C.R. Peers 1928, fig. 9; V. E. Nash-Williams 1950, nos. 156 and 405; P. Lionard 1961, figs. 21 and 23; G. E. Blunt 1961, plate IV no. I; W. Kitson-Clark 1941, plate facing p. 333.
4. Carlisle I.
6. W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig. 117.
ensuing Viking period the pattern was very popular both in north Yorkshire\(^1\) and around the Solway\(^2\) though it is noticeable that the two areas show a preference for differing combinations of spines and bosses.

There is thus nothing markedly eccentric in the use of lorgnette decoration by this school: the individuality lies in the consistent use of only one combination of spine and boss out of the many possible.

III

The principal decorative motifs employed by the school seem, therefore, to be derived from those used during the Anglian period. This need not necessarily imply a post-Anglian date for the group\(^3\) and, indeed, Collingwood\(^4\) initially seemed to think that some at least belonged to the Anglian period though he never followed Knowles and Calverley in attributing them to post-Roman Britons.\(^5\) Only later did Collingwood place them in to a Viking context\(^6\) - a dating which emerges from the evidence discussed in this and the following section.

The first group of dating evidence comes from the knotwork types for, though most of the interlace is merely two- or three-strand twist, there are some patterns which are chronologically significant.

---

1. a) Associated with patterns of Viking-period date are examples at Forcett, Aberford, Gainford and Gilling: see W.G. Collingwood 1907, 320 fig.b; W.G. Collingwood 1915, 130 figs. c and e; W.G. Collingwood 1927, figs. 13 no.7 and 116 no.20.

b) Possibly of this date are examples from Great Ayton, Upleatham, Gilling and Stainton in Cleveland: see W.G. Collingwood 1907, 323, 325, 390 and W.G. Collingwood 1911, 301.

2. Carlisle I; Penrith I,II; Kirby Stephen VII. For Craignarget and Sinniness see W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig. 18.

3. Compare the dating of minimi as contemporary with their prototypes in J.P.Kent 1961, 7.

4. In W.S. Calverley 1899, 298.

5. W.S. Calverley 1899, 18.

On St. Bees III, and possibly on Beckermet St. John I, the knot pattern appears to be a stopped-plait version of the ring-chain. Inevitably there must remain an element of doubt in this identification since the individual units of this type of plait do not always link up coherently when extended.¹ The St. Bees decoration, nevertheless, does seem to be based upon the usual Northumbrian rendering of the ring-chain. The exclusively Viking-period use of this knot-pattern, long accepted, is treated below.²

If, on the other hand, the patterns on St. Bees III and Beckermet St. John I are not ring-chains then they can most reasonably be interpreted as two parallel rows of three-strand plait. The taste for parallel rows of plait, often with some form of scroll between, is very strong in the school:³ in this feature the group seems to share a taste which is virtually limited to north-west England and south-west Scotland.⁴ It is also a type of lay-out which, where it is associated with dateable patterns, seems to belong to the Viking period.

However interpreted therefore, the patterns on St. Bees III and Beckermet St. John I point to a date in the Viking period for these two sculptures and for the others in the school which use strips of parallel vertical ornament.

The shape of cross-heads provides a second type of evidence for date. Eight of the nine are free-armed, a feature which is indicative of the strength of the Anglian tradition in the school,

---

¹. In W.S. Calverley 1899, 260 Collingwood shows himself convinced of this identification.
². See below p. 122.
³. Aspatria II, IV; Dearham II; Plumblond I; St. Bees V; Workington II.
⁴. Other Cumbrian examples are Beckermet St. Bridget II, Waberthwaite II, Gosforth I and Great Clifton. From Lancashire and Cheshire there are examples at Halton, Barton and Bromborough: see W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig. 191 and J.R. Allen 1895, 137 and 164. There are Scottish examples from Jordanhill and Fardenreoch, Colmonell: see J.R. Allen 1902, III, fig. 479 and R.S.G. Anderson 1927, fig. 3. The latter example is discussed further below p. 74.
but the one exception (Addingham I) has several traits which tie it to the Viking period. Its encircling ring is, of course, of this period\(^1\) and the parallels for the "hammerhead" shape, to borrow Collingwood's convenient term,\(^2\) are indicative of the same chronological horizon and, further, seem to be limited to the area of Norwegian settlement in England. The closest parallel is on the shaft from Gargrave in Yorkshire where the lower member of the head has an Addingham type of expansion.\(^3\) This would give a dating indication for the type since the loose tendrils of its ornament are clearly of the Viking period. A similar dating can be given to other examples which have the flat top but lack the Gargrave/Addingham expansion of the lower member.\(^4\) If those hammerheads with a fan-shaped top are added to the list\(^5\) this dating and the Norwegian settlement distribution is even further reinforced.

The rest of the cross-heads belonging to the school are free-armed but all have shapes which seem to belong to the Viking period. Dearham III is a rather crude attempt at a hammerhead whilst St. Bees III has transverse arms which emerge direct from the shaft, without any representation or shaping of a lower arm. The armpits are square; this is a late feature; the closest parallels for this very peculiar shape in Northumbrian sculpture are provided by the crosses at Hauxwell and Lastingham in

\[\text{1. See W.G. Collingwood 1926 and below p. 380.}\]
\[\text{2. W.G. Collingwood 1927, 90.}\]
\[\text{3. W.G. Collingwood 1915, 175.}\]
\[\text{4. This is a type which is particularly prevalent in Cumbria: see Carlisle I, Brigham VII, Bromfield II, Dearham III and Walton. For examples outside this area see W.G.Collingwood 1927, figs. 112 and 113 illustrating Middlesmoor and Kilmore.}\]
\[\text{5. Characteristic examples are two from Wales and those at Spennithorne, Yorks. and Boghouse, Mochrum, Wigtownshire: see V.E. Nash-Williams 1950, nos. 65 and III; W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig. 110; R.S.G. Anderson 1927a, fig. 3.}\]
Yorkshire and the Netherton cross in Lanarkshire. The ornament of all three of these crosses is of late date in the pre-Norman sequence and the St. Bees cross must presumably be placed within the same context.

The short lateral arms of St. Bees III are found on some of the other heads in the school: this too is a late feature for measurements seem to indicate that it is only on Northumbrian crosses carrying ornament of the Viking period that the width of the shaft is more than half that of the head. Short arms are particularly noticeable on Beckermet St. John I where they do not extend beyond the width of the shaft: this extreme treatment can only be matched by the hammerhead from Middlesmoor in Yorkshire whose ornament and inscription alike point to a Viking-period date.

The one head which has not so far been discussed is that from Harrington which Collingwood restored as a free-armed head but with a projection at the junction of the block and the curve of the spatulation (see fig. 4). The possibility that this projection is the broken remains of a ring is denied by the

![Fig. 4: Harrington cross-head](image)

1. For Hauxwell and Lastingham see W.G. Collingwood 1907, 331 and 358 though neither restoration is certain. For Netherton see R.B.K. Stevenson 1961, plate X. See also the small headstone from Greens in R.B.K. Stevenson 1961, fig. 6.
2. Beckermet St. John I and (probably) both Bridekirk I and Cross Canonby II.
3. W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig. 112.
presence of a worn panel of key-pattern on the end. This projection can only be paralleled in insular sculpture on the slab from Drummore, Wigtownshire, whose Viking-period dating now seems certain. What might be an analogous type of projection is found on several ring-heads in Wales and Cornwall and on slabs in Ireland where the spandrel has a trefoil cusp. Projecting lugs also appear at the junction of the head and shaft on a number of cross-heads on the east coast of the Irish Sea between Chester and Cornwall as well as on slabs in Ireland. There is probably no direct link between these two types of projections and those on Harrington and Drummore; at most they probably reflect a contemporary taste for projecting excrescences.

The small amount of evidence afforded by the cross-heads thus points to their being of the Viking period.

The key patterns tell the same story. Two of these, the T-pattern and the step-pattern, were long ago claimed by Collingwood as characteristic of Viking-period sculpture. The remaining one is the so-called battlement pattern, no. 886 in Romilly Allen's classification, which is much less frequently used on sculpture than the others. Indeed the examples from Addingham I, Arlecdon, Plumbland I, St. Bees III and Workington III account for over half of the Northumbrian occurrences. In


2. a) Diserth, Wales: see V.E. Nash-Williams 1950, no. 185.
   b) St. Breward; St. Columb Major; Padstow no. 3; Gwethiwick: see A.G. Langdon 1896, 395, 396, 397 and 399.

3. Cheshire: see J.D. Bu'lock 1959, 6. Diserth, Wales: see V.E. Nash-Williams 1950, no. 185. 28 examples from Cornwall are listed in A.G. Langdon 1896, 155-6. Bilton, Yorks: see W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig. 149b. Irish slabs: see P. Lionard 1961, 125 and fig. 20. See S.P. O'Riordan 1947, 108 for suggestion that these are skeuomorphs of wooden nails. See also projecting lugs on ring and armpit of Irish crosses noted below p. 196-9.

4. T-pattern on Dearham III (and probably Distington I) and step-pattern on Beckermet St. John I. See W.G. Collingwood 1915, 272 and W.G. Collingwood 1927, 63. See also p. 196 below.

other media it occurs at all periods but its sculptural use seems to be confined to the work of Viking date.

Though it does not occur on the Isle of Man there are sporadic occurrences in other parts of the British Isles. None of the four Welsh examples need be dated before the tenth century whilst in Scotland Stevenson has dated one of the three occurrences to the end of the ninth century. In Northumbria the four (non-spiral-school) sculptures with this motif are all to be placed in the Viking period. This comparative material would thus suggest that the battlement pattern should indicate a tenth- or eleventh-century date for the spiral-scroll sculptures.

IV

Further evidence for the dating of the school is provided by the symbols. To both Collingwood and Stevenson these were

1. In a pre-Viking context it can be seen on metalwork from Whitby, on the Lullingstone hanging bowl and on a bowl from the St. Ninian's Isle treasure: see C.R. Peers and C.A.R. Radford 1943, 51, no. 18; F. Henry 1965, plates 26 and 27; A.C. O'Dell 1959, plate XXVIIb. For an example in a Viking context see the comb from York illustrated in D.M. Waterman 1959, plate XVIII, no. II.

2. V. E. Nash-Williams 1950, nos. 3, 80, 208 and 234. There is no associated ornament to give a firm date to no. 80 though Nash-Williams assigned it to the tenth or eleventh century.


5. For examples from Kirby Hill and Lastingham in Yorkshire see W.G. Collingwood 1907, 339 fig. b and 358 figs. 1 and o. For Bolton, Lancs., see J.R. Allen 1895, 142. For Cheadle, Cheshire, see W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig. 221. See also T.D. Kendrick 1949, plate LVI for Bexhill.


indicative of Scandinavian date. A full survey of the comparative material confirms this dating but records an open verdict on Collingwood's further claim that the swastika is a Norwegian importation into northern England.

One of the main difficulties in dealing with the swastika in this context is to evaluate the relevance of the highly elaborated versions of the symbol which occur so frequently in Hiberno-Saxon art. Some sort of distinction between elaborated and simple swastikas, and between the angular and curvilinear types, has therefore been preserved in the following discussion.

The distribution of the simple, usually angular, swastika in non-Irish insular sculpture is limited to a very narrow area in Cumberland and south-west Scotland. All six examples in this area (the total number other than material from the spiral-scroll school) can be attributed to the Viking period. In view of the very limited distribution of the motif in sculpture there is no reason to assume any other date for the examples in this spiral-scroll school.

The date and the localised distribution of the swastika symbol seem to make plausible the idea that it was a Norwegian introduction into the north-west. A full survey of the use of the swastika in western Europe between the fourth and eleventh centuries, whilst not conclusive, suggests that this is likely; it also suggests, however, that there may have been a continual use of the motif in the British Isles from the period of the

1. (a) Craignarget slab: see W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig. 18 and p. 14.
(b) Whithorn: see R.S.G. Anderson 1930, 295.
(c) Greens, Lanarks: see R.B.K. Stevenson 1961, fig. 6 and p. 52.
(d) Netherurd Mains, Kirkurd, Peebles: see R.B.K. Stevenson 1961, plate XI no. 3 and p. 52-3.
(e) Cambusnethan, Lanarks: see J.R. Allen 1905, III fig. 482 is less relevant as is semi-key pattern.
(f) Aspatria VI: see discussion below pp. 254 ff.

Isel II has been omitted from this list as it seems to be closely related to the spiral-scroll school. Govan no. 4 is marginally apposite: see J.R. Allen 1905, III fig. 486. The slab from Wamphray is not listed here since its swastika is highly foliate: see W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig. 69 and (for dating) V.I. Evison 1961, 155; W.G. Collingwood 1927, 55; R.J. Cramp 1961, 19-20.
Anglo-Saxon settlement.

Between the fourth and the seventh centuries the swastika was in widespread use in western Europe. In England at this period it is found on metalwork and pottery and there is also good evidence for its contemporary use in Scandinavia. From a Christian context Ireland provides several examples on gravestones which Henry attributed to the sixth and seventh centuries both on epigraphic grounds and because of their associations with primitive monastic sites.

It is in the post-seventh century period that it is more difficult to trace a continued use of the symbol though the difficulty may only reflect the differential survival of pagan and Christian material. Elaborate spiral versions can be found in Hiberno-Saxon and southern English manuscripts and on Irish sculpture though there is occasionally an angular and simple version present. In other media there are a few examples of simple, usually curvilinear, versions in both England and Ireland

1. For use on pottery see J.N.L. Myres 1969, 138 and the accompanying drawings. For square-headed brooches see E.T. Leeds 1949, passim. For swastica brooches see E.T. Leeds 1945, 52 and E.T. Leeds and J.L. Barber 1950, 189. For other early examples in metalwork see R.A. Smith 1923, fig.18; V.I. Evison 1967, figs. 6m and 7b; V.I. Evison 1968, plate LIII.

2. For use on bracteates see M.B. Mackeprang 1952, passim. For examples on brooches see J. Brøndsted 1931, fig. 16 and B. Salin 1935, fig. 534. Note also the fifth-century combs discussed in A. Roes 1963, 9 and the Valstena pillar illustrated in F. Henry 1933, plate 4.


4. For characteristic examples from the Rome Gospels, the Armagh Gospels, B.M. Royal I E VI and Vatican Barberini Lat. 570 see M. Rickert 1954, plate 12; F. Henry 1967, plates 29 and 34; D.M. Wilson 1964, plate V.

5. e.g., Kilkieran: see H.M. Roe 1962, plate XVII no.4.

6. e.g., B.M. Royal I E VI: see D.M. Wilson 1964, plate V.
but many are difficult to date with any precision. In Scandinavia the swastika was certainly in use in the early Viking period but again there is difficulty in tracing a firm continuity from the seventh century. The evidence, in fact, does not allow any definite conclusion as to whether the Norwegians re-introduced the symbol into the British Isles.

The survey does, however, show that the north-west Northumbrian usage of the swastika can be seen as a regional reflection (in one medium) of a symbol whose use is widespread in the Viking homeland and colonies.

The triskele, as a free form, is not found anywhere in insular sculpture outside the spiral-scroll school. As with the swastika there is plenty of evidence for its use between the fourth and seventh centuries in England and Scandinavia. In elaborate, spiralling, form it occurs from the seventh century

1. (a) sceat of pre-750 and styca of ninth century: see J.J. North 1963, plate I (no. 47) and plate II (no. II).
   (b) whetstone attributed to Wales or Ireland: see T.D. Kendrick 1941, plate XVII.
   (c) Irish grave-slab: see P. Lionard 1961, fig. 19 (no. 10).
   (d) slab from Conchan, Isle of Man: see P.M.C. Kermode 1907, no. 62.


3. Though note the pot from Dorma bei Ribe, Denmark: see H. Arbman 1937, plate 25 (no. 2).

4. e.g., (a) trefoil brooch from hoard in Schonen, Sweden: see M. Stenberger 1958, plate 2 (no. 8).
   (b) brooch from Oronsay: see S. Grieg 1940, fig. 23.
   (c) slab from Ireland: see P. Lionard 1961, fig. 25 and discussion on 134 and 141.
   (d) British coinage: see M. Dolley 1954, plate XXXI (no. 7) and J.J. North 1963, plate VI (nos. 19 and 20).
   (e) Stillingfleet ironwork: see D. Talbot Rice 1952, plate 91a.

5. For examples in metalwork and on pottery see R.A. Smith 1923, fig. 106 and R.R. Clarke 1939, 209.

onwards in Hiberno-Saxon and southern English manuscripts, and in insular metalwork. Somewhat simpler versions can also be found on Irish sculpture of the pre-Viking period. In the Viking period it is again found in Ireland, both on slabs and on some of the high crosses and it occurs in other media both in Scandinavia and in the colonies. In view of this lengthy usage it is only possible to assert that the motif would not be out of place in a Viking-period context.

The third symbol, $\bowtie$, would not be out of place in any context in north-west Europe in the period between the fourth and the twelfth centuries. Examples can be quoted in some medium

1. See, for example, the Lichfield Gospels, the Book of Kells, the Durham Cassiodorus and the Rome Gospels: F. Henry 1965, plates 102 and 107; F. Henry 1967, plates 25 and 29; M. Rickert 1954, plates 10 and 12.
2. A sufficient range of date and area is represented by the following:
   (a) eighth-century sceat: see J.J. North 1963, plate I (no.41).
   (b) the Moylough belt reliquary: see F. Henry 1965, plate 35.
   (c) a pin-head from Talnotrie: see H.E. Maxwell 1915, fig. 2.
4. For a slab see P. Lionard 1961, fig. 25 and p. 141. For the scripture cross at Clonmacnois see F. Henry 1967, plate 90.
5. See, for example, the Jellinge brooch from Sperrestrup illustrated in R. Skovmand 1942, fig. 25 or the Ixworth brooch shown in V.I. Evison 1957, plate XXVI (f).
from practically every century in England, Ireland and Scandinavia. In insular sculpture, where a dating is possible from the associated ornament, the occurrences seem to be of the tenth or eleventh centuries.

1. a) pre-Viking. R.L.S. Bruce-Mitford 1956, 16 refers to it as being "common in Anglo-Saxon jewellery of the late sixth and seventh centuries" whilst G. Haseloff 1950, 172 refers to its occurrence on both Anglo-Saxon and Irish filigree. For pottery see J.N.L. Myres 1969, 138. For square-headed brooches see E.T. Leeds 1949, passim. There are examples on the Franks Casket and on a pin-head from Cambridge: see R.A. Smith 1925, fig. 17.

b) Viking period. D.M. Waterman 1959, 87 refers to this as a characteristic arrangement of ring and dot decoration. For examples on a sword, a spear and a copper brooch of this period see H. Maryon 1950, plate XXIb; G.F. Lawrence 1930, plate XII; D.M. Wilson 1964, plate XXV (no. 47).

2. a) pre-Viking. Garryduff bird, Tara brooch and Ardagh chalice: see F. Henry 1965, fig. 6b and plates 40 and D.

b) Viking period. For the crosier of St. Aedh Mac Eri and Hiberno-Norse coinage, all carrying this symbol, see J. Reftery 1941, plate 95 and R.H.M. Dolley 1966, plate IV (108-9), plate V (139), plate VI (193) and plate VII (passim).

3. For examples on bracteates see M.B. Mäckeprang 1952, passim. For brooches of pre-Viking period from Schonen, Gotland and Alstad see B. Salin 1935, fig. 530; J. Brundsted 1931, fig. 19e; H. Shetelig 1927, plate X fig. 7; H. Shetelig 1920, fig. 291. For Viking period metalwork from Eketorp and Terslev, Sjælland see H. Arbman 1961, plate 52 and S. Lindqvist 1931, fig. 11.

4. For examples at Kirkheaton, Gargrave, Gilling and Kirkby Wharfe (all Yorkshire) and Cheadle, Cheshire see W.G. Collingwood 1927, figs. 67, 111, 143, 189, 221. For Wales see V.E. Nash-Williams 1950, nos. 18, 28, 29, 211, 261, 303, 360. For the Isle of Man see P.M.C. Kermode 1907, nos. 66, 72, 97. For Scottish examples at Bressay, Kilbar, Dunblane (no. 1) and Inchinnan (no. 3) see J.R. Allen 1903, 111, figs. 4, 118, 330B, 478E. The example from Birsay seems earlier than the rest of the insular sculptural examples: see C.L. Curle 1940, plate XXIb and R.B.K. Stevenson 1956, 115 where it is referred to the late eighth century.
All three symbols were originally sun symbols\(^1\) and the swastika, at least, probably kept this significance into the pagan period of Anglo-Saxon England,\(^2\) though Baldwin Brown\(^3\) was always sceptical of its having anything more than a decorative function by that date. There is unequivocal evidence to show that all were early adopted into Christian art where they are clearly given a Christian significance.\(^4\) Though many occurrences seem to indicate that they are being used purely as decorative motifs, the combination of all three in the work of the spiral-scroll school would seem to suggest that they still had a residue of meaning and that Christian rather than pagan.

The evidence considered so far in this and the preceding section points to the Viking period as the time when the spiral-scroll-school flourished. Other odd decorative motifs fit this date. The double rope-moulding of Addingham I appears only occasionally elsewhere in Northumbrian sculpture and all of the examples are of a demonstrably late date.\(^5\) The "reversed spectacles" pattern on the end of the arm of St. Bees III (perhaps derived from the stripped scroll of the type seen on the edge of Carlisle II) has analogies with work of the later period,\(^6\) the rider motif belongs to the Viking period in Northumbrian sculpture,\(^7\) and the incised crosslet at Addingham, with its deeply sunk arm ends, is similar to the ones on the Viking-age slabs from Drummore and Graignarget.\(^8\) Most of the other features, like the facing animal heads of St. Bees I and the animal-headed interlace on the same cross can be paralleled at practically any period.

---

1. See the survey in E. Salin 1959, 121 ff, and P. Gelling and H.R. Ellis Davidson 1962, 140ff.
4. See E. Salin 1959, 121ff.
5. Burton in Kendal II; Whithorn no. 4: see W.G. Collingwood 1925a, plate IV, no. 14; Sherburn: see W.G. Collingwood 1911, 274.
7. See discussion of Gosforth below p. 77.
8. W.G. Collingwood 1925a, plate XIV nos. 45 and 47. See also p. 208 below.
Although the majority of these spiral-scroll sculptures are apparently of the Viking period, there is one shaft for which an Anglian date can plausibly be advanced. This is the inscribed shaft from Beckermet St. Bridget (no.1). The script, language and meaning of the inscription are now, and long have been, irrecoverable. However, since all surviving non-runic inscriptions from the area are of pre-Viking date and no runic inscriptions (other than those of Norman and later date) can be assigned later than the Anglian period, it could be argued that the Beckermet shaft is pre-tenth century. It certainly stands apart from the rest of the spiral-scroll group in having a round-shaft and in not using the white sandstone employed by the rest of the school's sculptors who worked in the coastal strip. There is some reason therefore for the hypothesis that this ambitious monument was the first in the area to develop spiral-scroll but whether this was a development of the Anglian or Viking periods cannot be finally decided.

The cumulative evidence points to a date in the Viking period for the majority of the products of the spiral-scroll school, even though the artist(s) may have been inspired by a shaft at Beckermet which was produced by an Anglian sculptor. Attempts to impose a narrower dating within the broad brackets of the tenth and eleventh centuries are much more hazardous. In particular it should be noted that the positing of an Anglian inspiration does not necessarily imply that the imitative successors worked in the immediately following period: the inscribed Beckermet shaft, like Bewcastle I and Irton I, still stands in its original socket and position available at any period as a source for inspiration and copying.

1. E. Okasha 1971, 52. A similar conclusion was reached by R.I. Page (in private communication dated 13.X.64): "Neither from a runic nor a non-runic point of view can anything be deduced from the present state of the inscription".


One point is certain; all twenty-two fragments are not the work of the same hand. There are differences in cutting which preclude this and it is also possible to distinguish the work of different individuals on more than one cross. There is, for instance, the sculptor of Aspatria II and Dearham II who used an identical pattern on both faces of those shafts and who was the only artist in the school to mix anthropomorphic elements with scroll-work. Or, again, it is difficult to believe that the same artist could be responsible on the one hand for the precise lay-out and the use of space to separate differing motifs on St. Bees II, IV, V and, on the other, for the incoherent mixture of elements on Addingham I. Nor is it likely that the sculptor of the relatively elegant and ambitious Beckermet St. Bridget I would have produced the highly inelegant Addingham I.

These differences between sculptures are not only between one workshop and another. The work at St. Bees nicely demonstrates this point for there, on the same site, there is a three-way contrast in monument types and aesthetic approach between St. Bees II, IV, V, St. Bees I and St. Bees III. The same point could be made from the monuments at Aspatria.

The period of activity of the school does not therefore have to be limited to the working lifetime of one man. It is, however, difficult to prove that the varieties of monument and ornament are not the result of differing, yet contemporary, sculptors' and patrons' tastes. But the case for a long-lived school does have its attractions for this would best explain the contrast with the group discussed in the next chapter - the Beckermet school. This latter school was not admittedly as productive as the spiral-scroll but lacks the internal variety of ornament which was indicated in the last paragraph.

1. W.S. Calverley 1899, 18 describes the now-hidden reverse of Aspatria as carrying spirals.

2. It is worth noting that W.G. Collingwood 1925a, 218 hazarded the view that one sculptor was responsible for Beckermet St. John I, St. Bees I (and another at St. Bees), Aspatria, Workington II and Humoland I.

3. Note the lack of lorgnette head, lack of spirals and careful spatulation of St. Bees III.
There is a further contrast with the Beckermet school, which could be explained in terms of differing lengths of activity, in the influence the spiral-scroll group had on the other sculptors. The Beckermet school did have some influence locally but it is not so marked as is that of the spiral-scroll group. It could be that the ideas of stopped-plait and spiral-scroll proved more attractive to other sculptors than did the motifs of the Beckermet school but equally the degree of local influence may be related to the respective length of time that the two schools were active.

Reluctantly, it must be concluded that we can only be sure that more than one sculptor was involved in the production of spiral-scroll and that it is not safe to assume that the various artists were necessarily working over a lengthy period of time. Despite this, it seems worth recording that there is a perfectly plausible stylistic evolution in the school. This would begin with Beckermet St. Bridget I, a monument which, to judge from its shape and inscription, was an ambitious and potentially influential piece of work. Other workshops seized upon its concept of the spiral-scroll, most of them marrying it in differing ways with stopped-plait. The white sandstone used by these workshops may well indicate that there was an economic as well as aesthetic unity between the different artists of the school. At the end of the evolution stands Addingham I, the only shaft incoherently to mix scroll with stopped-plait and the only shaft to use a ring-head, geographically distanced from the rest of the school and eschewing the type of stone used on the coastal plain.1 But this is to speculate.

A closer dating for the school might have been easier if the sculptors had not worked so aggressively in a sub-Anglian tradition. Clearly this is culturally an interesting feature of the group but the lack of the well-known and well-dated Viking art-styles is frustrating when attempting to establish a chronology.

Some help in narrowing the date comes from one of the

1. And possibly linked in turn to Middlesmoor in western Yorkshire: compare the ornament on the sides of the Addingham shaft with that on the face of Middlesmoor as illustrated in W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig.112.
sculptures at Whithorn\textsuperscript{1} which carries stopped-plait, some spiral-scroll of the single-branch (St. Bees/Plumblad/Distington) type, a T-pattern and the remains of an inscription in Anglian runes. Collingwood\textsuperscript{2} argued that the T-pattern indicated a tenth-century date and that the Anglian runes would be unlikely in this Viking-settled area after the early part of that century. If this argument could be accepted then it would follow that, whatever the exact nature of the relationship between the Whithorn school and Cumbrian stopped-plait, it is inherently unlikely that they would be far separated in date.

Since Collingwood wrote, however, Radford and Donaldson\textsuperscript{3} have attributed the cross-slab to the late tenth or eleventh century and Page\textsuperscript{4}, from a purely linguistic viewpoint, is unwilling to commit himself beyond a dating of post-800. Yet Collingwood’s argument still stands, for, even allowing for the traditional archaic element in the script and language of funereal inscriptions, Anglian runes are less likely in an eleventh-century context in that area than they are in the tenth century\textsuperscript{5} and are more likely to belong before, rather than after, 950.

If the Whithorn slab, which has so much in common with the Cumbrian school, can be placed in the early part of the tenth century then this would indicate that the spiral-scroll school was active at about the same period. It does not, for the reasons noted above, prove that the school did not continue into the second half of the century and, indeed, into the period after c. 1000.

\begin{enumerate}
\item W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig. 80.
\item W.G. Collingwood 1925, 217 and W.G. Collingwood 1927, 63 both assign c. 950.
\item C.A.R. Radford and G. Donaldson 1953, 40.
\item R.I. Page 1964, 68.
\item See Page’s dictum: “If there were other grounds for holding an object to be pre-eleventh-century the fact that it held a runic inscription might be held to support them”, R.I. Page 1964, 69.
\end{enumerate}
VI

The close links with one of the Whithorn slabs leads to a discussion of the influence and wider relationships of the spiral-scroll school.

The most obvious of these links is with the stopped-plait sculptures of Whithorn together with those in the Clyde valley which are in turn dependant upon the Galloway group. Yet, whilst both Galloway and Cumbria use stopped-plait, there are easily recognisable differences between the two areas. Nowhere in Cumbria is the Whithorn type of disc-head used, nowhere in Galloway is there a free-armed head with this type of interlace. Only once in Cumbria is there a ring-twist of the type which is nearly universal in the Whithorn school and similarly the Carrick bend never occurs in Cumbria. Simple plaits and the ring-chain\(^1\) are not found in the group north of the Solway. Most importantly, all of the Cumbrian stopped-plait is accompanied by spiral-scroll; only once is this association found at Whithorn.

Though a link undoubtedly exists between the two areas, therefore, it is clear that each developed with almost complete independance. On the available evidence it is impossible to decide whether the idea of stopped-plait was originally developed north or south of the Solway estuary. It is more competently handled to the north but there is some support for Collingwood's contention\(^2\) that the ideas flowed from south to north in this instance.

The support comes from the only Whithorn slab which uses spiral-scroll.\(^3\) In many ways this slab (no.14) is unlike the rest of the Whithorn group\(^4\): it uses four-strand plait and not the expected ring-twist, there is a marked lack of coherence about the design and there is the spiral-scroll element of the

1. I can find no evidence for ring-chain in Whithorn school as claimed by C.A.R. Radford 1968a, 124.
3. W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig. 112.
4. Though Collingwood was right to link with this Whithorn piece a fragment from Old Kilkonnel which tends to similar incoherence; see his comments quoted in C.F. Charleson 1929, 132-3 and plate facing 129, no. I.
single-branch type seen at St. Bees, Plumbland and Distington. All of these are features linking this Whithorn slab to the Cumbrian stopped-plait school. Whilst not denying the local Whithorn elements on the slab (the shape of the monument and its cross-head, its use of simple twist with interweaving strands) it has in it important features which belong to the school south of the Solway. At very least, therefore, this slab shows that some ideas flowed from south to north between the two groups. More speculatively it could be argued that, since this slab stands typologically at the head of the Whithorn sculptures, the whole idea of stopped-plait is one which came from Cumberland to pupils who ultimately performed more competently than their teachers. But this last point is incapable of proof.

Apart from Whithorn slab 14 there are other sculptures outside the Cumbrian peninsular which seem to have been influenced by this school. It is clear, given the Anglian basis of both stopped-plait and spiral-scroll, that varieties of both could occur elsewhere independently of any Cumberland influence but, where there is a combination of these two motifs, the possibility of influence becomes much stronger.

The sculpture from Netherurd Mains, Kirkurd, Peebles falls into this category. Amongst the incoherent stopped-plait (with medial incised line) are fragments of spiral-scroll and a swastica. The combination of these three motifs is not one found elsewhere in its locality but we have already seen it as typical of the Cumbrian school.

Further west is a fragment from Fardenreoch, Colmonell, Ayrshire which is decorated with three vertical strips of pattern in which two, pelleted, three-strand plaits flank a central strip.

of what Anderson described as "twist" but which is clearly derived-scroll-work. This scheme of decoration has no parallels within the immediate area but exactly matches that of the Dearham II/Aspatria II sculptor and can be plausibly related to his ideas.

A third sculpture, where a Cumbrian link has long been postulated, is a slab at Maughold, Isle of Man. This uses spiral-scroll, swastika and triskele forms together with stopped-plait, a combination of elements which is typical of the spiral-scroll school. The slab cannot be closely dated but its parallels in Cumberland would seem to bring its date forward to at least the tenth century.

One final example in which Cumbrian influence seems likely is a fragment of shaft, now joined to the upper half of another cross and placed in a glass case in the churchyard at Prestbury, Cheshire. The shaft is covered in an inorganic scroll, which takes on key-pattern shapes more noticeably than any other sculpture outside the Cumbrian group. The interlace-strands are of a conventional, nonstopped, type and there is a headless quadruped involved in the decoration for which there is no parallel in the Cumbrian spiral-scroll group. It could be a separate manifestation of those Anglian tendencies which gave birth to the Cumbrian school or the link may be more direct. It is certainly stylistically an isolate in the Cheshire-Lancashire region.

1. E.H. Knowles 1880, 144; W.S. Calverley 1899, 34; P.M.C. Kermode 1907, 30 and 146.
2. P.M.C. Kermode 1907, no.73. See photograph in G. Baldwin Brown 1937, plate Ixxxv. W.G. Collingwood 1906-7a, 408.
3. D.M. Wilson suggested a late-ninth century date at Isle of Man conference of S.M.A. 1961 on basis of trumpet pelta but admitted that a later date was possible. It is unlikely that this slab could have inspired the Cumbrian school in view of the origin of spiral-scroll in Anglian vine-scrolls.
Alongside these non-Cumbrian pieces there are other sculptures within the immediate area of the spiral-scroll school which demonstrate how influential were its ideas. Among these the most noticeable is Burton in Kendal I which uses stopped-plait and, apparently, some type of fleshy spiral-scroll: only its iconographic ambition and its geographical isolation prevent it from being discussed as a part of the school.¹

The upper part of a composite cross, Isel II, is also closely related to the spiral-scroll school. The artist's approach differs from that of the school in placing the symbols in their own panel but this is the only Northumbrian sculpture outside the spiral-scroll group which combines all three symbols on the one monument. It also employs another motif (see fig. 5). This may be either an eccentric form of swastika or a development of a scroll. It may, however, have a symbolic function like the triskele and swastika since there are analagous motifs on sculptures in both Aberdeenshire and Lancashire.²

The only record to survive of a shaft fragment from Arlecdon is a poor photograph³ and this is far from satisfactory as a basis on which to claim another example of spiral-scroll influence. Yet it does carry a scroll-like battlement pattern and possibly some stopped plait. Martindale's identification of the stone as a red sandstone would, in any case, set this stone apart from the main spiral-scroll material.

1. It is discussed fully below p.208. Note that the interlace-strands are of the three-cord type favoured by the Beckermet school.
2. Dyce, Aberdeenshire: see J. Ritchie 1911, fig. 2; Bolton, Lancs.: see J.R. Allen 1895, 142.
Five cross-heads may be related, with appropriate reservations, to the school. All show traces of a decorative scheme which is virtually omnipresent among the recognised works of the group - the use of a lorgnette motif on one side of the head in combination with a ringed boss on the reverse. The cross-head, Carlisle I, is the clearest example since it uses the lorgnette with single spine leading to a ringed boss in the arm, the type which is otherwise confined to the spiral-scroll school. Kirkby Stephen VII has a similar type of combination though here the spine is open. On Bromfield II, Distington II and Workington V a ringed boss survives but the reverse face has, in each case, been lost. The use of white sandstone on the latter three examples makes the case for their relevance slightly more convincing than would otherwise appear.

VII

The link between Dearham II and Aspatria II has already been noticed. The anthropomorphic elements on those shafts now require some additional discussion.

Calverley\(^1\) identified the bird and the man on the Dearham shaft as an illustration of the story of St. Kenneth. Whilst it would be difficult to disprove this suggestion it is perhaps better to approach the problem of interpretation in the light of the Anglian tradition of inhabited scrolls. Though most of these only contain birds and animals there are others which also have humans clambering within the branches.\(^2\) Granted this background of human and animals in scrolls, the bird and man at Dearham are not altogether unexpected in a school which is drawing so heavily upon earlier motifs.

The horseman with his sad nag is probably not to be derived from any Anglian Northumbrian source since no sculptures of that date in that area have horsemen, though they do occur further south during the pre-Viking period at Breedon, Ely and in Derbyshire.\(^3\) The study of this motif \(^4\) shows that all of

1. W.S. Calverley 1884, 291-3.
2. See the material listed above p.44.
3. For Breedon, Ely and Bakewell see A.W. Clapham 1928, plate XXXI, figs.1 and 3; L.Cobbett 1934, 62; R.E. Routh 1938, plate 2A.
4. See p.327 below for Gosforth I. Other Northumbrian horsemen seem to centre on the Ices valley. There are unpublished examples at Scalby and others at Chester le Street, Stockburn and Rainford: see J.H. Knowles 1907, nos. 3 a 21; J. Macquoid and J. Greenwell 1950, no xxx.


the horsemen in Northumbrian sculpture are associated with Viking-period patterns though in both Irish and Pictish art they were familiar elements in the pre-tenth-century period. It is probably to one of the latter sources that we must look for the ultimate source of this element in Northumbria.

This particular horse differs from the other Northumbrian types in his lack of alertness, the slack reins and the abysmal drawing. All of these features could be paralleled in the Celtic/Pictish world but it is doubtful if such parallels have any significance other than a shared incompetence. To Calverley the uphill progression indicated the journey to heaven. One Pictish sculptor did show a mounted warrior climbing up a slope but the apparent upward progression of the Dearhara steed is as likely to be due to bad drawing or inaccurate imitation of Celtic/Pictish horses which, in their high stepping pose, often seem to be climbing.

The biggest problem in interpretation affects the mutilated figure on Aspatria II. Calverley saw the anthropomorphic element as the body and legs of a man but carefully avoided representing the object between his legs. Collingwood drew attention to this and interpreted it as a tail or sword. Since a sword in such a position is extremely unlikely it seems probable that this is a tail—if we assume that Calverley has reconstructed the fragment the right way up.

On this assumption two possibilities exist for the

1. e.g., at Maughold, Isle of Man or Bullion, Dundee: see P.M.C. Kermode 1907, no. 72 and R.B.K. Stevenson 1961, plate VII. The sword which W.S. Calverley 1899, 130 claimed was carried by the Dearham horseman is probably the back of the saddle: compare the better drawn Meigle no. 5 in J.R. Allen 1903, III, fig. 314B.
2. W.S. Calverley 1899, 130.
4. e.g., R.B.K. Stevenson 1956, plates 8, 10 and 11.
5. W.S. Calverley 1899, 18.
interpretation of the figure. It could be a phallic figure and Viking-period parallels could be quoted on sculpture from Wales and on a strap-end from York. Whilst such an interpretation would present difficulties it would not therefore be totally out of place in an Anglo-Viking context.

Another alternative is that the "legs" are the flexed back or front legs of an animal whose short tail or head is set between them. On most of the examples of this type of beast the front legs do not normally protrude beyond the head as they would need to do on this reconstruction and I can find no satisfactory parallel for a short-tailed beast with flexed back legs.

Neither of these alternatives is very satisfactory. A third solution is much more so. If the fragment is reversed in relation to its position in Calverley's reconstruction then the figure of an orans beneath a cross can be discerned. There is no objection to such a reversal since the fragment is not large enough to indicate which was originally the upper part of the design. Such a composition would have a close parallel on a Welsh sculpture which Nash-Williams interpreted as a crucifixion.

1. Llanmamllach, Breckonshire and Whitford, Flintshire: see V.E. Nash-Williams 1950, nos. 61 and 190. See also E. Ettlinger 1961.


3. Nor in a specifically Christian context: see the Welsh sculptures listed in note 1 or the Merovingian material from Paris Risle (Meuse) and Grésin illustrated in L. Coutil 1930, figs. facing 26 and 42 and E. Salin 1959, plate XI.

4. e.g., Gandersheim Casket: see D.M. Wilson 1964, plate la; the Codex Aureus: see A.W. Clapham 1928, plate XXXVIII, fig. 2.

5. though see gripping beasts in H. Arbman 1937, passim.
scene. No final conclusion can be reached but this seems the most convincing of those put forward.

VIII

No claim of great aesthetic merit can be made for the work of the spiral-scroll school. Its interest lies in the large number of sites and fragments involved and in the index it provides of a local style and a Cumbrian taste for sub-Anglian ornament at a period which probably included the early part of the tenth century.

1. V.E. Nash-Williams 1950, no. 56. See also Merovingian plaque in E. Salin 1959, fig. 112. See also H.M. Roe 1970, esp. 214ff where, inter alia, there is discussion of Daniel as a type of Christ, the typology being indicated by placing a cross above the orans figure. The late persistence of the orans depiction in English sculpture is clear from examples at Norbury, Whalley, Heysham and Prestbury; R.E. Routh 1938, 34; W.G. Collingwood 1927, figs. 132 and 207; J. Croston 1884, fig.
CHAPTER FOUR
The Beckermet School

I

Whilst the existence of the spiral-scroll school has long been recognised there is another school, also working within the Viking period, which has not previously been noticed. Its work survives amongst material from four sites: Beckermet St. John, Brigham, Haile and Workington. Of these only Brigham does not also produce spiral-scroll work (see p. 5).

The group consists of at least nine separate monuments though some calculations would raise this total to fourteen. To this list can be added the fragmentary Urswick in Furness II which is geographically and, to some extent artistically, peripheral to the main group. Even with this addition the total number of carvings from the school is smaller than that produced by the spiral-scroll group.

The factor which distinguishes this sculpture is the use of certain knotwork patterns whose combination is exclusive to the school and whose individual use is virtually confined to the work of the group. Since Beckermet St. John shows the greatest range of these characteristic motifs the school has been named after the site.

1. Beckermet St. John III, IV, V, VI, VII; Brigham II, IV; Haile II, III, IV, V; Workington IV.

2. The calculation is uncertain because of two problems. Beckermet St. John IV, VI and VII may all be parts of the same monument, as Collingwood once suggested: see W.S. Calverley 1899, 35. I am convinced of the fact that IV and VI belong together but less so of VII. The second problem concerns the number of stones from Haile. E.H. Knowles 1878 illustrated four but implied (p. 96) that there were six which shared the same ornamental repertoire. All of these pieces were lost by 1899 (see W.S. Calverley 1899, 181); four have since reappeared but their identification with those illustrated by Knowles is not entirely certain. Another fragment from Brigham, no. XI, is mentioned here for the sake of completeness since it seems to carry a Stafford knot, but its worn condition excludes it from further discussion.
The most important of these patterns is the run of linked "Stafford knots", no. 597 in Romilly Allen's classification,\(^1\) (see fig. 6). This is obviously a very simple knot and is found in various media in most areas of western Europe from, at latest, the seventh century.\(^2\) Its occurrence on ten of the pieces from the school\(^3\) is therefore not, of itself, indicative of a particular cultural background or period. Its usefulness lies in isolating the group for, when the distribution of the pattern on insular sculpture is plotted (see Map 12) it is remarkable how infrequently the knot is found outside the south

---

2. e.g., (a) Continental Merovingian metalwork: W. Holmqvist 1939, frontispiece, plate II no. 4, plate III no. I; N. Åberg 1947, fig. 61 no. 3b and 4. (b) buckle from Crundale, Kent: G. Haseloff 1959, plate VIII, d. (c) Irish metalwork of both pre-Viking and Viking periods: A. Mahr 1932 plates 18 no. 3, 31 no. 8, 34, 35 no. 13; J. Raftery 1941, plates 88 and 91 no. 3; M. MacDermott 1957, plate LIX (c). (d) Pre-Viking metalwork from Scandinavia: B. Salin 1935, figs. 144 and 574; C.A. Nordman 1931, fig. 10; N. Åberg 1941, fig. 1 (and see p. 7 claiming insular influence here); G. Arwidsson 1942, fig. 18. (e) Viking period material from Scandinavia: D.M. Wilson and O. Klindt-Jensen 1966, plate XXIII (b); J. Petersen 1928, fig. 218. (f) Italian architectural decoration of eighth and ninth centuries: A. Haseloff 1930, plate 60; N. Åberg 1945, 33, fig. 28 no. 5; G. Coffey 1910, 12. J.R. Allen 1903, II, 232 lists others.
3. Beckermet St. John IV, VI, VII; Brigham II, IV; Haile II, III, IV, V; Workington IV; Urswick II.
Cumbrian area and the work of this school. It is used in the Anglian period on Irton I and, to the east of the Pennines, on three sculptures of the Viking period; from the Isle of Man there is one example at Braddan and there are a further two in south-west Scotland. It is suggested below that the Manx and Scottish examples were probably influenced in their choice of motif by the Beckermet School and that the use of the pattern on the Irton cross was the original impulse for its localised popularity in southern Cumbria. The Yorkshire and Nottinghamshire occurrences of the knot are not necessarily so linked.

The Stafford knot is the most commonly used, and the most distinctive, of the school's patterns but there are others, not recurring so frequently, which further link the various pieces together and help to isolate them from the rest of Northumbrian sculpture. Thus on Beckermet St. John IV, V, VI is a run of knotwork, not listed by Romilly Allen, which is found again, reversed and badly laid out, on Workington IV: it does not seem to occur elsewhere in insular sculpture (see fig. 7). These Beckermet and Workington carvings are also linked by cross-binding

1. Sherburn, Yorks.: see W.G. Collingwood 1911, 272, fig. h; Kippax, Yorks.: see W.G. Collingwood 1915, 201 fig. c; Shelton, Notts.: see A. de Boulay Hill 1916, plate IV.
2. F.M.C. Kermode 1921, fig. 3.
3. Boghouse, Mochrum, Wigtown: see R.S.G. Anderson 1927, 118 and fig. 3; Old Kirkconnel, Dumfriesshire: see C.F. Charleson 1929, plate facing 129. The knot is, of course, frequently found on cross-heads where a Stafford knot fills each arm. These can be ignored in the present context as can the example from Greens, Lanarkshire, which seems to derive from this usage: see R.B.K. Stevenson 1961, fig. 6. Similarly the occasional single or dual occurrence of the knot, muddled with other types, need not be considered: for an example see Winwick, W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig. 155 (which more accurately shows the run than J.R. Allen 1895, fig. facing 157).
4. It is basically his no. 665 with an extra strand.
of the knot-work - a feature which, whilst frequently found on scrolls,\(^1\) does not appear elsewhere in knotwork (see fig. 8).

![Fig. 7: Beckermet/Workington knot](image1)

![Fig. 8: Cross-binding](image2)

The close ties between the two sites are also emphasised by the fact that Beckermet St. John VI uses Romilly Allen's knot 574a\(^2\) which is only found elsewhere in Northumbrian sculpture on Workington IV.\(^3\)

Another linking element, though not found at Beckermet, is the use of triple-cord interlace.\(^4\) This will require an extended discussion below since it carries chronological implications but its function in further identifying the work of this school can be deduced from Talbot Rice's comment that this is "unusual in pre-Conquest work".\(^5\) Less universally employed within the school is the totally unparalleled terminal which completes the

---

1. Combined with zoomorphic work it can be seen at Oseberg: see H. Shetelig 1920, fig. 63 (a-c).
3. Allen lists Workington as the only example. Another occurrence is at Astonfield, Staffs.: see T. Fape 1947, 22.
4. Brigham IV (traces on upper dexter corner of face); Haile II, III, IV, V; Workington IV. For explanation of this and other terms see p. 3 of Vol. II.
5. D. Talbot Rice 1952, 123.
run of Stafford knots on shafts at Haile and Beckermet\(^1\) and which seems to involve a series of concentric rings\(^2\) (see fig. 9).

![Fig. 9: Haile/Beckermet terminal](image)

The use of a drill to emphasise the intersecting points of knotwork on Beckermet St. John III and Brigham IV is found outside the school in work of the Viking period\(^3\) but again serves to bind this group closely together.

This brief review has demonstrated how closely interlinked are the sculptures which can be assigned to this school in the fact that they employ motifs which are either exclusive to the school or whose combination is unknown elsewhere. Fig. 10 summarises this point and shows the distribution within the

---

1. Beckermet St. John IV, VI; Haile IV.
2. The fact that this only occurs on three fragments could be due to the fact that only four terminations of this Stafford knot survive: it could be that the pattern regularly had a concentric ring terminal at one end as on Beckermet IV, VI and Haile IV and, at the other, some type of (?) semi-plant motif as on Beckermet VI and (perhaps) Urswick II.
3. In Cumbria it is known on the north face of Gosforth I, at Hutton-in-the-Forest and on Penrith III. Other occurrences noted are on a shaft from Ieven, Yorks, and on cross-heads from Great Farne and Wooler in Northumberland: see W. G. Collingwood 1911, 260 and F. Haverfield and W. Greenwell 1899, nos. I and II. P. M. C. Kermode 1907, 199 claims another example at Kirk Michael.
Having established the existence of the school it is now appropriate to justify the placing of this chapter within a section dealing with the Viking period. There are several indications that this is the period of the school; cumulatively they seem to invalidate any earlier dating but it would perhaps be best to examine each point individually (sub-section A-I below).

### Table: Beckermet School Motifs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>R.A. triple cord</th>
<th>R.A. binding</th>
<th>R.A. 574a (kstark)</th>
<th>R.A. 771 (kstark)</th>
<th>drill terminal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beckermet St. J. III</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beckermet St. J. IV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beckermet St. J. V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beckermet St. J. VI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beckermet St. J. VII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigham II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigham IV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haile II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haile III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haile IV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haile V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workington IV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fig. 10:** Beckermet School Motifs
A. Three-cord interlace on Brigham IV, Haile II, III, IV and Workington IV.

Although Coffey urged the necessity of distinguishing between genuine three-cord interlace and what Bruce-Mitford has happily called "contoured interlace" the distinction in practice is not always clear and it has seemed advisable to include both types in the discussion which follows.

1) Contoured interlace has been the subject of recent discussion but the argument has often been confused, as Bruce-Mitford hinted in a review of the manuscript occurrences, by the fact that it is not possible to divorce contoured interlace from contoured zoomorphic ornament since the one often turns into the other, especially in art of the Viking period. Contoured interlace in which a zoomorphic element is present has thus to be discussed along with the non-zoomorphic type.

The position with regard to manuscript occurrences of this type of interlace is clear. Early Hiberno-Saxon manuscripts such as Durham A.II.10, The Book of Durrow, the Lindisfarne Gospels, the Echternach Gospels, and Durham A.II.16, all contain examples, though there is variation in the method of marking the central section. Later Irish manuscripts and work from insular...

6. Representative examples, ranging in date from the late ninth to the late tenth century can be found in the Book of MacDurnan, the Southampton Psalter and Cotton Vit.F XI: see F. Henry 1967, plates L, O and 41. For a manuscript of the late eleventh/early twelfth century see F. Henry and G.L. Marsh-Micheli 1962, plates XIIIc and XIVb.
influenced continental scriptoria\textsuperscript{1} show the persistence of the type through to the eleventh century. Stevenson's\textsuperscript{2} argument that contoured interlace is not limited to an early phase of insular manuscript illumination is completely convincing.

In other media the same lengthy usage can be observed. In Ireland it is found on metalwork of both the pre-Viking and Viking periods\textsuperscript{3} whilst on this side of the Irish Sea examples can be quoted on Viking-period material like the bone caskets from Scotland.\textsuperscript{4} Metalwork and woodwork in Scandinavia, where zoomorphic and interlace elements are frequently inextricable mixed, show this type of interlace-strand from as early as the eighth century through to Urnes-style work of the eleventh.\textsuperscript{5}

\textit{A priori}, in view of the evidence assembled from other media, it would not be surprising if contoured interlace showed the same lengthy period of usage on insular sculpture. When the relatively few examples from the British Isles are gathered together, however, it appears that almost all can be referred to the Viking period.

This is certainly the case with the five Manx examples\textsuperscript{6} and

3. As pre-Viking examples, the Domnach Airgid and a shrine mounting from Norway: see F. Henry 1965, plate 55 and A. Mahr 1932, plate 24, no. 1. For the Viking period see St. Dimma's Book-shrine illustrated in J. Raftery 1941, plate 102.
4. J. Anderson 1886; J.G. Callander 1927, 105-17; R.B.K. Stevenson 1956a. Stevenson's dating is preferable to the late medieval date given in the earlier articles.
5. (a) brooches from Amrum and Ostnes, Bjørkøy: see N. Åberg 1941, fig. 5; J.E. Forssandor 1943, fig. 36. (b) Shetelig's sledge from Oseberg and metalwork from Gokstad: see H. Shetelig 1920, figs. 161 and 218. (c) ornament on the stave church from Hemse, Gotland and on a font at Gällstad: see S. Lindqvist 1931, fig. 28; G. Baldwin Brown 1937, plate LXXXII.
6. F.M.C. Kermode 1907, nos. 52, 59, 82, 91 and 99. It is relevant to add the example where pellets occupy the position of the central strand: nos. 77, 98, 99, 100, 101, 105, 107, 109, 110.
the three from Scotland. In Northumbria three of the four occurrences (outside this Beckermet school) are of the tenth/eleventh-century period whilst the other cannot be readily dated.

In Ireland also there is evidence of use at a similar date in association with work in the local Urnes style.

But Ireland also provides exceptions to this general Viking-period dating because a group of sculptures from the north-west of the country (the cross at Carndonagh and other carvings at Fahan Mura and Clogher), which all make great use of contoured interlace, have been consistently assigned to the seventh century by Irish art-historians. If their view is accepted then it opens the possibility that contoured interlace could appear elsewhere on insular sculpture in a pre-Viking context. The dating of the Irish group has, however, been questioned by Stevenson who argued that they can more plausibly be placed in the tenth century. There does not seem to be a convincing case against a late dating: the Fahan Mura inscription only establishes a terminus post quem, some of the parallels drawn between the Carndonagh carvings and admittedly early sculpture are not very strong.


2. For Plumbland II and Lowther IX, X see below p.258. Folkton is associated with Jellinge animals: see W.G. Collingwood 1909, 197. Thorp Arch has no dateable associated ornament though the hacked cutting may indicate a late date: see W.G. Collingwood 1915, 248.


7. It seems reasonable to group all of the Carndonagh carvings together since they show the same type of treatment of figures.
and the primitive crucifixion iconography of the Clogher cross can be shown to have had a long life around the Irish Sea. In favour of a tenth-century date are the parallels with the Ardchattan slab and the (apparent) Viking sword carried by one of the figures on a pillar at Carronagh.

Yet, though a late dating for this north-west Irish group of sculptures would best fit the period for contoured interlace elsewhere in insular sculpture, the case for a tenth-century horizon cannot be made with absolute conviction. We are then forced to conclude that contoured interlace from a Northumbrian area is likely to belong to the Viking period but an earlier dating cannot be excluded. Similar conclusions emerge from the study of three-cord interlace which now follows.

ii) Three-cord interlace is found on metalwork in most of the Germanic areas of western Europe, including Britain, by the seventh century. Many of the examples have a strong zoomorphic element. Though there are numerous occurrences of this type of interlace in Italian and other continental architectural

1. e.g., between Carndonagh and Duvillaun or Fahan Mura and Gallen in F. Henry 1965, 125.
3. R.B.K. Stevenson 1956a, 94. See F. Henry 1965, plate 59. Stevenson's argument depends upon the assumption that all of the Carndonagh group are of the same date and that we know the full range of Irish sword types.
4. British examples:– Caenby disc: see G. Haseloff 1959, plate VIIIc; pendant from Kent: see E.T. Leeds 1936, plate XVIIIc; belt-mount from North Elmshall, Yorks: see D.M. Wilson and D.G. Hurst 1965, plate XIX E; Lullingstone bowl: see F. Henry 1965, plate 26; disc from Standal, Møre og Romsdal: see E. Bakka 1963, fig.59. For material in Italy and France see N. Åberg 1945, passim and N. Åberg 1947, passim.
5. See A. Haseloff 1930, passim; G.T. Rivoira 1910, passim; N. Åberg 1945, passim.
6. See G.T. Rivoira 1910, II, fig.741; N. Åberg 1947, fig.26; W. Holmquist 1939, plate 125; J.B. Ward-Perkins 1938, plate XXXVI no.3. For non-sculptural usage see ivory tablet from Notre Dame d'Angers in L. Coutil 1930, facing p.66.
contexts both before and after the seventh century there is little trace of it in either Britain or Scandinavia between c700 and the Viking period. It then becomes quite popular on metalwork in Scandinavia though it still seems to be rare in Britain.

Insular sculpture shows no lengthy usage comparable with the continent. Of the seven examples from Wales, only one is dated by Nash-Williams before the tenth century. This latter piece, on the basis of its borrowing of Northumbrian motifs, must be assigned to the later ninth century and its animal ornament might be thought to place it even later. The two examples from Cornwall certainly belong to the Viking period with their ring-heads, knotwork which includes loose rings and their very degenerate scroll. In the rest of England, outside the Beckermet school, there appear to be only seven fragments decorated with this type of interlace and all carry characteristic Viking-period ornament. The sole examples from Scotland and the

---

1. Perhaps a mount from York, though the dating is not securely pre-Viking: see D.M. Waterman 1959, fig.10 no.II. See also H. Arbman 1937, plate 50 (no.3).
2. a) Britain: Saffron Walden pendant: see V.I. Evison 1969, plate LXXI.
   b) Scandinavia: see J. Petersen 1923, figs. 112,113; H. Arbman 1937, fig.22; M. Stenberger 1947, plate 174.
5. A.G. Langdon 1896, figs. facing 358 and 397.
7. Meigle no. 4: see J.R. Allen 1903, III, fig. 313A and (for dating) B.B.K. Stevenson 1961, 55 and B.B.K. Stevenson 1956, 122. Note also a strongly zoomorphic example from Canna: see J.R. Allen 1903, fig. 112A.
Isle of Man are unlikely to pre-date the end of the ninth century.

On balance the evidence from these surveys of both three-cord and contoured interlace would therefore suggest that a school which used these forms was active during the Viking period.

B. Romilly Allen's knot no. 771 on Beckermet St. John III, IV and Urswick II.

The importance of the so-called "woven circle" or "ring-knot" as a marker of Viking-period workmanship when it occurs on Northumbrian sculpture has frequently been noticed. A complete review of the relevant material emphasises its reliability as a tenth-or eleventh-century indicator, though only within the Northumbrian sculptural series.

Both Henry and Holmqvist have pointed to the frequency of this knot on Frankish Merovingian work and the latter has laboriously demonstrated its Coptic ancestry. It is possible to trace continental usage of the pattern, in a variety of media, from the sixth century until, at least, the later tenth century.

1. P.M.C. Kermode 1907, no. 61.
2. It is relevant to note the high frequency of this type of interlace in Norman work: see G. Zarnecki 1951, passim.
5. W. Holmqvist 1939, 56 ff.
6. The chronological range is illustrated by the following examples:
   a) sculpture from Narbonne and Arles: see J.B. Ward-Perkins 1938, plate XXXV no. 1 and plate XXXVI nos. 3 and 6; L. Coutil 1920, figs. facing 64 and 112.
   b) metalwork of Merovingian period from France and Germany: see W. Holmqvist 1939, 56 ff.; N. Åberg 1947, fig. 12; E. Salin 1949, fig. 79.
   c) reliquary box from Coïme Cathedral: see P. Baum 1937, plate 36.
   d) ivory diptych from Rambona of c900: A. Haseloff 1930, plate 78.
   e) manuscripts dating from early ninth to late tenth century: see J. Brøndsted 1924, fig. 177; G.L. Micheli 1939, plate 189; E.K. Rand 1929, plate 74, no. 1; M. Stenberger 1961, fig. 12, no. 1.
On the Scandinavian peninsula\(^1\) the motif first appears on metalwork and woodwork of the early Viking period, in particular as one of the ring-chain varieties in Borre-style material. It does not, apparently, occur in this area on work of earlier date.\(^2\)

The insular, non-sculptural, examples seem (with one possible exception) to be similarly limited to the Viking period. From Canterbury there is a fine example on a disc-brooch alongside Jellinge-influenced animals.\(^3\) A trial piece from London\(^4\) has a ring-knot in association with acanthus ornament which is unlikely to pre-date the tenth century and the same date is likely for another example on a spoon from York.\(^5\) In Scotland there is a probable occurrence on a Ringerike strap-end from Jarlshof and on the ivory chess-men from Lewis\(^7\) which are of Scandinavian type and have acanthus decoration associated with the knot. From Ireland three\(^8\) of the four examples of this pattern on metalwork are clearly of the Viking period and only one,\(^9\) found in Norway,

\(^1\) For metalwork from the Borre find and from Gokstad see D.M. Wilson and O. Klindt-Jensen 1966, plate XXVII f and H. Shetelig 1920, fig. 224. For brooches from Norway, Sweden, Iceland and Denmark see H. Arbman 1961, plate 56; J. Petersen 1928, figs. 158 and 227; R. Skovmand 1942, fig. 9. See also H. Arbman 1937, plate 47, no. 13b which Arbman claimed was English-influenced.


\(^4\) F. Cottrill 1935.

\(^5\) D.M. Waterman 1959, fig. 15, no. 2. See also the tag in fig. 10, no. 10.

\(^6\) J.R.C. Hamilton 1956, plate XXIX no.1.

\(^7\) O.M. Dalton 1909, plates XXXVIII-XLVIII.

\(^8\) a) Lagore bronze pin: see H. Hencken 1950, 73 (no. 716) and 74. b) Lismore crozier and Cross of Cong: see J. Raftery 1941, plates 93 (no. 2) and 98. c) gilt-bronze ornament from Furnes, Norway: see J. Petersen 1940, fig. 5.

\(^9\) An eighth-century date for the Furnes piece has been claimed by E. Bakka 1963, 56. It is probably more accurate to refer this to the Hiberno-Saxon, rather than Irish, art-world.
is likely to be earlier. Closely related knots appear, in both English and Irish manuscript illumination, to be limited to the tenth and eleventh centuries.¹

In view of this insular material, affording evidence of the knot's popularity in the Viking period, it is not surprising that the sculptural examples are almost all of the same tenth-or eleventh-century date. There is, indeed, only one potential exception² and that is provided by the same Irish site of Carndonagh which produced a possible early example of contoured interlace. If we accept Henry's dating of this stone to the seventh century³ then the presence of the knot on sculpture at this date must be seen as a rare reflex of the popularity of the knot in Merovingian art.⁴ If Stevenson's dating is correct,⁵ then this occurrence belongs to the same chronological horizon as all other sculptural examples. Nash-Williams has assigned the two Welsh occurrences to the Viking period⁶ and the two from Man⁷ belong to the same phase. The only example in Scotland⁸ has no associated ornament by which it can be dated.

On Northumbrian sculpture not only does the associated ornament of almost every example betray Viking taste but the

---

1. Three examples are provided by the Bosworth Psalter, the Psalter of Ricemarcus and B.M. Cotton Vit.F XI: see T.D. Kendrick 1949, plate XXX (I); F. Henry 1960, plate XIVb; F. Henry 1967, plate II.
3. See references in note on p. 89 above.
4. See F. Henry 1965, 130. Its absence from other early insular sculpture would presumably be explained by the fact that sculpture in other areas of Britain only began after a date when Merovingian influence was in decline.
distribution of the surviving pieces is markedly that of the Norse, as opposed to the Danish, settlers.\(^1\) Outside the Beckermet school there are some fifteen examples. Of those on the western side of the Pennines there are two from St. John's Chester with circle-heads to which Bu'lock assigns a late-tenth-century date,\(^2\) two in Lancashire\(^3\) at Lancaster and Melling, the former with a ring-head and both carrying Viking ring-chain and knotwork with lobate offshoots of Viking type. Further north in Cumberland the associated ornament of Aspatria I, Bromfield I and Gilcrux is of the same tenth or eleventh century date.\(^4\) In Yorkshire there are seven examples, one from the York Minster excavations, and the associated ornament points to a Viking-period dating in each case.\(^5\) The remaining occurrence is at Chester-le-Street, in Co. Durham.\(^6\)

This somewhat laborious survey seems to show that it is virtually certain that the ring-knot is characteristically a motif of the Viking period when it occurs on English sculpture even though it has a very long history in the western European

---


2. J.D. Bu'lock 1959, 10, nos. 3 and 5. There are no satisfactory illustrations of these shafts though see J.R. Allen 1895, fig. facing 156. There seems no reason to limit their date to pre-1000 A.D.


4. See below, Chapter Five.


The lozenge-shaped tie on knot no. 771 on Beckermet St. John III and IV.

Shetelig has argued that the occurrence of this lozenge indicates a direct contact between the Beckermet shaft and the Viking-period sculpture on the Isle of Man. This is doubtful.

In association with Romilly Allen's knot no. 771 the lozenge occurs on Merovingian metalwork and in the pre-Viking period it is also found in Britain as a simple binding on other forms of knotwork. There is, however, no doubt that it became very popular in the Viking period in Scandinavia where it occurs frequently.

1. This discussion has ignored the connected runs of this pattern which were very popular in the tenth and eleventh centuries in Staffordshire and the neighbouring counties: see T. Pape 1947, passim and R.E. Routh 1938, 5. These connected runs do appear in pre-Viking contexts in both England and Ireland: see T.D. Kendrick 1938, 212 note 2 and F. Henry 1933, plate 26, no. 3 (assigned on p. 97 to the eighth century). There are several Northumbrian crosses of the pre-Viking period on which this running pattern is nearly achieved: see Acca's cross in W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig. 39. In another form the connected type is known in Ireland on the leather budget of the Breac Moedóc and the St. Dimma's Book Shrine: see J.W. Waterer 1969, plate IV and J. Raftery 1941, plate 102. The date of the book-satchel is not certain.

2. H. Shetelig 1948, 85. This statement is not in the revised form of this paper (H. Shetelig 1954).

3. W. Holmqvist 1939, figs. 66-70 and plate V no.3; N. Åberg 1947, fig. 12; E. Salin 1949, fig. 79.

4. e.g., Book of Kells, fol. I r.
particularly as an element in the Oseberg and Borre styles. It is legitimate to infer that the numerous occurrences in the art of the Viking colonies reflect its use in the homeland. This evidence of widespread popularity inevitably undermines Shetelig's argument for some kind of special link in this respect between Man and Beckermet: none of the Manx occurrences are with knot no. 771, the lozenge occurs elsewhere in English Viking sculpture (at York and Chester also with knot 771) and there are closer parallels for Beckermet's knot in Irish metalwork than on any sculpture on Man. The relationship is to be explained in terms of influences operating upon both Irish Sea colonies rather than of one upon the other.

Nevertheless the chronological inference is clear: this is an element which is popular in the Viking period and its other occurrences on English sculpture are all of that date.


2. a) With knot 771:—see the York spoon, Lagore pin, Cross of Cong in notes above. For another example see the Icelandic pendant illustrated in J. Petersen 1928, fig. 227. In stone see a cross from Chester illustrated in J.D. Bu'lock 1959, fig. III. There is an unpublished example, associated with bifurcating knotwork of Viking type, from York Minster.

   b) With other types of knot:—York spear-head socket and Thames bone pin: see T.D. Kendrick 1949, plate LXIX (1 and 3); Manx sculpture: see P.M.C. Kermode 1907, passim; Scottish casket: see note above; examples on English sculpture are those on Millom I and on carvings at York and Staveley in Yorks. and Astonfield and Checkley in Staffs.: see W.G. Collingwood 1927, figs. 148 and 190; T. Pape 1947, 24 and 29.
D. The lobate extension on Beckermet St. John IV (see fig. 11)

Fig. 11
Motif from Beckermet St. John IV

This is identical to those found on the turning points of interlace on Manx sculptures of the tenth and eleventh centuries. There is no exact parallel for this feature on any other English sculpture, though there is something analogous on work from Yorkshire. The motif can be traced back to work like the Oseberg sledge in Scandinavian art where similar extensions spring from a lozenge-shaped 'tie'. In its turn the Oseberg treatment can be shown to derive from Style E animal ornament of the later eighth century. These winglike appendages are often found in Viking art of the ninth, tenth and eleventh centuries in Scandinavia but only on the Manx crosses are they frequent in material from the colonies—though Irish Ringerike, Umeå metalwork shows a very distinctive and elegant use of the motif.

4. It will suffice to quote such well-known examples as the disc-on-bow brooch from Othemars, Othem, Gotland (D.M. Wilson and O. Klindt-Jensen 1966, fig. 7) or the sequence of illustrations in B. Salin 1942, figs. 615–638. To G. Ardwesson, 1942, 49 this is "characteristic astragal-artigen motiv."
5. For early Viking examples see: H. Shetelig 1920, 8–238; D.M. Wilson and O. Klindt-Jensen 1966, fig. 42 and plates XXI, XXII, XXIII(a), XXVI, XXVII(i).
   For examples from later Viking art see: D.M. Wilson and O. Klindt-Jensen 1966, plates XXXV and XIX; H.R. Ellis 1942, fig. 5; E. Lindqvist 1931, fig. 26.
in the eleventh and twelfth centuries.\(^1\)

Despite Holmqvist's arguments\(^2\) it seems clear that this type of extension is in direct line of descent from Scandinavian art and has no insular ancestry. The somewhat similar feature which occurs in acanthus foliate interlace in some southern English manuscripts of the later tenth and eleventh centuries\(^3\) may have encouraged its use but could equally have been influenced by Scandinavian models.

The curling protruberances at the turning points of the bands on the knot 771 on both Beckermet St. John III and IV, on the other hand, need not necessarily stem from a Scandinavian source. Brøndsted\(^4\) has rightly stressed the part that lobed interlace plays in Viking art but there are too many examples of this type of curling offshoot in manuscripts of the pre-Viking period in both Britain\(^5\) and on insular-influenced continental manuscripts\(^6\) for this to be certainly derived from Scandinavian art. It is, however, relevant to note that, in sculpture, this type of offshoot is found on the Viking crosses of Man\(^7\) and only once elsewhere in England - on a Viking-period shaft from Welling in Lancashire.\(^8\)

---

1. See the crosiers illustrated in A. Mahr 1932, plate 75 and J. Raftery 1941, plates 88 and 95 (2).
3. F. Wormald 1945, plate VIb; T. D. Kendrick 1949, plate XXX (2); D. Talbot Rice 1952, plates 42d and 44a. Note that H. Shetelig 1920, 432 interpreted lobate elements in Jellinge art as derived from non-Scandinavian foliate ornament but adopted because of its identification with the earlier wing-like lobes of Style E.
4. J. Brøndsted 1924, 278.
6. G.L. Micheli 1939, plates 80, 93, 110, 124, 146, 179, 198, 219, 224.
7. F.M.C. Kermode 1907, nos. 74, 95, 96, 99, 101, 103.
8. W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig. 179. Since this was written a further example has been discovered on a shaft from Newgate, York. (unpublished).
E. The ring-twist

This frequently recurring pattern is often found with Scandinavian-derived ornament, never with good figure-sculpture or organic vine-scroll. No later discoveries have undermined Collingwood's view that, in Northumbrian sculpture, this was a pattern characteristic of work of the Viking period.

F. Romilly Allen's knot no.658 a on Beckermet St. John III.

There are a number of very similar knotwork patterns which certainly occur on pre-Viking period sculpture in Britain, and Romilly Allen noted its presence in the Book of Durrow. As a sculptural pattern it is rare in Britain and only seems to recur once more in Northumbrian sculpture on Kirkby Steven II on a shaft of the Viking period. In Wales it is found on three stones, one of which is well dated to the tenth century, the others being less certainly assigned to the eighth and ninth centuries. There is hardly sufficient evidence to use this pattern in any discussion of date.

G. The step pattern on the Urswick II fragment only occurs on sculpture in the Viking period.

H. The shape of the cross head

No complete cross-head has survived amongst any of the pieces now making up the group but there are sufficient traces of the head on Beckermet St. John VI and Urswick II to justify restorations.

The Urswick head was certainly of the wheel-head type which Collingwood proposed in his original publication of the fragment.

6. W.G. Collingwood 1915, 272 summarises the situation and no later finds invalidate his conclusion.
The Beckermet head poses more problems but is unlikely to have had a free-armed shape: those shafts whose upper panel is topped by the curve of the lower arm of a free-armed head always have the shaft and cross-arm on differing planes.\(^1\) This reduces the range of possible restorations to a ring-head or circle-head and the latter is marginally more likely than the former. In either case the proposed type of head for Beckermet, like that for Urswick, is one which is not used in the pre-Viking period.

I. The animals' heads on Beckermet St. John III, IV, V

The animal with the curved upper lip on the face of IV fits into a well-recognised Viking-period group in the British Isles. M. MacDermott\(^2\) has shown that there are pre-Viking occurrences of beasts with curled lips but it still remains true that the majority are of the later period.\(^3\) Such a dating for this Beckermet head is made more certain by the presence of a marked "bump" over the eye, for Wilson\(^4\) has noticed this as being almost an omnipresent characteristic of the Jellinge beast in England. Northumbrian,\(^5\) Mercian\(^6\) and Manx\(^7\) sculpture of the tenth and eleventh centuries afford examples of a single curled lip and the type can also be seen in other media in Britain in the tenth century on the disc-brooch from Canterbury\(^8\) and the ivory comb now in the British Museum,\(^9\) The head on that comb is, indeed, 

---

1. See W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig. 132 and below p.106.
2. M. MacDermott 1955, 92-3. To her lists add the Anglo-Saxon example in J. Humphreys et al 1925, plate LVII no.2. and contrast her conclusions with those of F. Henry 1933, 76.
3. e.g., T.D. Kendrick 1949, plates LXXXII, LXXXV, LXXXVII, LXXXVIII; D. Talbot Rice 1952, plate 91; R.E. Routh 1938, plate IV b.
7. P.M.C. Kermode 1907, no.62.
the closest parallel available for the Beckermet head.

The head on the reverse of Beckermet St. John V is the same as the one on IV though it lacks the curling of the lip. The twin hanging heads on the other side of V, with their lentoid eyes, sharply falling noses and single upper tooth are paralleled in all of their details on Northumbrian sculpture of the Viking period\(^1\) and the actual composition is very close to those on the large Gosforth cross and one of the shafts from Chester-le-Street.\(^2\)

In all this accumulating evidence for a Viking-period date there is one anomaly, the animal's head on the face of Beckermet St. John III, whose jaws sweep round behind the single eye to form the back of the head in a way which was popular in work of Salin's style 2. Parallels can be cited from the seventh and eighth centuries in Britain,\(^3\) Scandinavia,\(^4\) Denmark\(^5\) and Germany\(^6\) but in none of these areas has it been possible to bridge the gap to the tenth-or eleventh-century date of the Beckermet sculpture which is indicated by the rest of the evidence. It must be viewed as an apparent archaic element.

Apart from this one zoomorphic element all of the evidence reviewed in sub-sections A-I points to the school having been active in the Viking period. Individually some of these indications may be open to doubt but collectively they are conclusive. Much of the evidence for date has come from the Beckermet stones: this is inevitable since they exhibit the

---

1. See below p. 128
4. B. Salin 1934, fig. 568; G. Arwidsson 1942, plate 76; H. Arbman et al. 1938; fig. 12.
5. M.B. Mackeprang 1952; H. Shetelig 1920, fig. 258.
6. B. Salin 1935, fig. 199; W. Holmqvist 1955, plate 72; E.C. Dunning and V.I. Evison 1961, plate XXXIV/a and fig. 3 no.1.
widest range of decoration, but all of the other shafts assigned to the school are closely linked to these Beckermet sculptures (often by pattern links exclusive to the group) and independently a tenth-or eleventh-century date could be convincingly argued for each.

It is difficult to achieve greater precision of dating within the wider limits of the Viking period, particularly because of the lack of animal ornament. The links and analogies which have been noticed seem to be with the Jellinge and Mammen phases of Viking art and with Manx crosses which are conventionally placed in the tenth or early eleventh centuries.\(^1\) Any narrower dating than this cannot be justified.\(^2\)

III

The term "school" has been used deliberately since the different types of cutting and the varying competence with which the designs are executed would seem to preclude the possibility that they are all the work of the same hand. Whilst allowing for more than one sculptor it is impossible to establish whether we are dealing with the work of artists working contemporaneously at four sites or with the work of several generations. On balance the former seems more likely but the reasoning is not very convincing: one would, for example, have expected a long-lived school to have achieved greater spread of activity. What is certain is that this school did not achieve the influence, the scale of activity or the apparent economic unity of the spiral-scroll school with which it may have been contemporary.\(^3\)

In only two respects, lobate extensions and lozenge-shaped

---


2. It will be seen below (pp136-) that the circle-head group (to which Beckermet St. John VI seems to belong) was active in the tenth century.

3. This chronological overlap is implied by the fact that both schools were active in the tenth century. It is also hinted by the ornament of Burton in Kendal I which uses the stopped-plait of the spiral-scroll school but in the three-cord form of the Beckermet school.
ties, does this school reveal any reliance upon decorative motifs whose ultimate source lies in Scandinavian art. Ornament like ring-twist and contoured/three-cord interlace are not particularly Scandinavian: they are popular elements in the art of the colonies. Like the circle-head shape examined in the next chapter they reflect a taste which is better labelled "insula Viking" rather than "Scandinavian".

There are traces of contact between this group and Manx sculpture. Though it could be argued that the lobate extension of Beckermet St. John IV was independently derived from Scandinavian art, its unique occurrence in England suggests that there is some direct link between this feature and its frequent use on the Isle of Man. But not all contacts between Man and this Cumbrian school flowed from west to east. One of the sculptures discovered at Braddan after publication of Kermode's great corpus uses a series of Stafford knots. Like the other non-Cumbrian examples of this knot in Nottinghamshire and Yorkshire this could be a chance repetition were it not for the associated ornament. On the narrow face, as on so many shafts of the Beckermet school, is a ring-twist whilst the main face carries a form of Romilly Allen's knot no. 587 which is extremely close to the knot used on the broad faces of Workington IV and Beckermet St. John IV, V, VI. Neither the Stafford knot or 587 are found elsewhere on the island: it is difficult to believe that there is not some link with Cumbria.

If a link is admitted then the line of influence is more likely to run from Cumbria to Man than vice-versa. Not only is the Manx slab isolated in the island's sculpture but there was a

1. As seems to be the case with the lozenge-shaped tie.
2. The curling extensions of Beckermet III and IV are probably also directly derived from Man.
3. P.M.C. Kermode 1921, fig. 3.
4. J.R. Allen, 1903, II, 226. The knot is a half-version of Allen's type.
5. This is stressed in P.M.C. Kermode 1921, 260.
good reason for the widespread adoption of the Stafford knot by artists working in the Viking period in southern Cumbria. Within a few miles of Beckermet and Haile in the tenth and eleventh centuries was the Irton cross. Even today, still in its original socket and position, it is an impressive monument and it must always have been a well-known and potentially influential carving. It is the only sculpture from the Anglian period in the British Isles which uses the Stafford knot as a shaft ornament and it is difficult to evade the conclusion that here was the source of inspiration for the use of this knot in the later sculpture in the locality.*

Two sculptures from across the Solway can also claim links with this Cumbrian group. The associated knots on the fragment from Old Kirkconnel are not used in the Beckermet school (nor indeed are they common in Viking-period work) but the carving comes from a site where there are other signs of Cumbrian influence. The confused run of Stafford knots on the slab from Boghouse, Mochrum, Wigtown has, perhaps, a less obvious Cumbrian ancestry though the carver was apparently attempting to render a vaguely memorised version of the basic knot-motif of the school across the Solway, a school whose very existence has hitherto been unsuspected.

1. C.F. Charleson 1929, plate facing 129.
2. See above p. 73.

*Since the above was written a further examination of Irton I, under extremely favourable lighting conditions, shows that the run of knotwork which forms the dexter border of the shaft-panels on the west side is not made up solely of Stafford knots. The claim made above for influence from Irton accordingly requires modification.
CHAPTER FIVE

The Circle-heads

A third group of sculptures can be isolated on the basis of their use of a particular shaping of the cross-head. This set is not so coherently unified as the two schools treated in the preceding chapters but the crosses are sufficiently interlinked to justify treatment as a separate group (see map 3*). The group consists of eight (possibly eleven) crosses from seven or eight sites on the coastal plain of Cumberland. At least three of these sites have produced no sculpture of spiral-scroll or Beckermet type. These carvings are linked by the fact that, where it survives, the cross-head has a distinctive form in which the circle appears to overlie the arms of the cross. The ends of the arms thus project as "ears" beyond the circle (see fig. 12). Six of the group still preserve all, or a substantial

Fig. 12
A circle-head

1. There is some overlap with the Beckermet school because Beckermet St. John VI reconstructs best as a circle-head.
2. The certain examples are: Aspatria I; Bromfield I, III; Dearham I; Gilcrux; Irton II; Muncaster I; Rockcliffe. Workington III and Beckermet St. John VI are less certain members of the group where only the curved junction of shaft and head is preserved: a search through the rest of Northumbrian sculpture seems to show that, where there are similar curved junctions on either free-armed or ring-headed crosses, the head and shaft are set in differing planes and are thus distinct from the Workington and Beckermet examples. A final, but unlikely, circle-head is the (now lost) Workington VII. Aspatria III might also be added to the list.
3. Irton, Gilcrux and Rockcliffe. Bromfield may provide a fourth site though see p. 77 above.

* and J. D. Bulechek 1959, P. 1
part, of this head\textsuperscript{1} and there are traces of it on a further three or four.\textsuperscript{2} Bromfield I, though lacking a head, is decorated with ornamental motifs which are so closely linked to those of known circle-heads that it can be included as a certain member of the group.\textsuperscript{3}

Though all the surviving heads share the feature of a continuous circle over-lying the cross-arms there is no complete uniformity within the group: Gilcrux only has one face so treated and the reverse has a normal ring-head form; Irton II has a circle surrounded by an outer ring (see fig.\textsuperscript{13}); Rockcliffe has unpierced spandrils; Bromfield I and Rockcliffe have a form of shaft which is not shared by the others. Yet despite these internal variations the group is distinguishable from the associated types elsewhere in its consistent use of two or three cords of plait to decorate the circle, in the piercing of the spandrils\textsuperscript{4}, the consistent distinction of circle and cross-arm and, finally, the lack of bossing.

1. Aspatria I; Bromfield III; Dearham I; Gilcrux; Irton II; Rockcliffe.
2. Beckermet St. John VI; Muncaster I; Workington III. Workington VII is another possibility.
3. The association is one already made in W.G. Collingwood 1927, 143–4.
4. Rockcliffe is clearly an exception here but the treatment of the non-pierced spandril is quite distinct from that in the other areas and seems to be influenced by the Whithorn school: see below p.127.
The associated groups have long been recognised. With the exception of a head from Gargrave in west Yorkshire\(^1\) they are spread down the east coast of the Irish Sea with examples in Cheshire,\(^2\) North Wales\(^3\) and Cornwall.\(^4\) Like the Cumberland group they all use the continuous circle but they share little else. Eight of the nine examples from Cheshire have non-pierced spandrels with bosses in the arm-pits and further bosses at the junction of head and shaft; whilst the decoration on the circle consists, not of plait, but of pellets or key-pattern. The one exception, from Bromborough,\(^5\) is nearer to the Cumbrian type in its lack of bosses but still has a non-Cumbrian line of pellets around the circle. Similar pellets decorate the Gargrave head which also has non-pierced spandrels. In Wales the two shafts from Penmon have no decoration on the circle and neither has pierced spandrels. The other Welsh cross is from Diserth, Flintshire; it has interlace running round the circle and the spandrels are pierced but again it differs from the Cumberland treatment since the spandrels are bossed to produce a trefoil cusp, the circle is not separated from the arms and there are bosses at the junction of shaft and head. In Cornwall the spandrels are never pierced, the circle and arm are not usually distinguished, the circle never carries plait and at least one example has bossing at the junction of shaft and head.\(^6\)

Whilst the material assembled in the last paragraph has brought together crosses which share the common feature of the continuous circle it has emphasised the separate nature of the Cumberland group both positively and negatively in the use and avoidance of certain decorative elements. It is now time to consider the relationship between the Cumbrian and other groups.

1. W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig. 156 b
2. J.D. Bu'lock 1959, 10 lists these. See also W.G. Collingwood 1928, 14-17.
3. V.E. Nash-Williams 1950, nos. 37, 38, 185 (and 190, though this lacks projecting ears).
5. J.R. Allen 1895, 164.
6. The four relevant pieces are illustrated in A.G. Langdon 1896, 172 (Blisland) and 173-4 (Cardynham).
Collingwood\(^1\) believed that the idea of the circle-head developed in Cumberland and then spread, perhaps through the wanderings of one sculptor, to Yorkshire and to Anglesey.\(^2\) There are certainly signs of an interpenetration of ideas from group to group: Gargrave has the pelleted circle of the Cheshire area but in its additional ring is best paralleled at Irton II, Bromborough has a Cumbrian shape but with Cheshire pelleting whilst Diserth has the Cumbrian plait on its circle but uses bosses like the Cheshire sculptures. Yet, in the face of such distinctive regional forms, it is impossible to be certain where the type first began. The simplicity of the Cumberland type would argue in favour of its precedence but this is not an argument which carries great conviction.

It is, at least theoretically, possible that the original inspiration for this type of head came from the western side of the Irish Sea for the so-called Cross of the Scriptures at Clonmacnois\(^3\) has a cross-head which is very close to the type under discussion. Its date, conventionally placed in the earliest decades of the tenth century, would not invalidate this suggestion since none of the circle-heads need be assigned to an earlier period. A case for Irish influence on some of the groups of circle-heads on the eastern side of the Irish Sea is certainly a strong one because the spandril bossing of the Cheshire sculptures (and others in Wales and Cornwall) is closely paralleled in Ireland before, during and after the period when it is a feature of this

---

1. W.G. Collingwood 1927, 144. See also J.D. Bu'lock 1959, 5.
2. Bu'lock's criticism is apt: "if so, he was more versatile than some of his successors". (p.5).
The problem of the origins of the circle-head is further complicated by versions which appear on slabs in Ireland and the Isle of Man for it is impossible to establish if these are precursors or reflexes of free-standing cross-types or, indeed, if they represent a completely separate development.

The problem of precedence must thus be left open but it is clear that this is a development which belongs to the western

1. Well known examples are:-
   a) Cross of the Tower at Kells: see F. Henry 1967, plate 74. It is assigned to the first decade of the ninth century by Henry and to the late eighth century by H.M. Roe 1966, 8.
   b) Market cross at Kells: see F. Henry 1967, plate 104. Henry (pp. 155-6) assigns this to the tenth century.
   e) Drumcliff: see F. Henry 1964, plate 60. For early eleventh-century date see M. and L. de Paor 1960, 149. See also F. Henry 1970, 126.

See also the later cross at Dysert O'Dea, F. Henry 1970, plate 60.

It is also relevant to note the bossing on the inside of the ring on crosses at Armagh, Clonmacnois, Durrow and Arboe: see F. Henry 1964, plate 36; F. Henry 1967, plate 109, 110 and I.

2. P. Lionard 1961, fig. 13 no. 8 and p. 18.
3. P.M.C. Kermode 1907, no. 59 or 97A. Both have other links to north-western England.
4. from e.g., ring-encircled crosses like P.M.C. Kermode 1907, nos. 37 and 64 via the stage of no. 33. A further problem is the relationship of the sculptural examples to such circle-crosses as that on the Moylough belt reliquary: see F. Henry 1965, plate 35.
part of Britain south of the Solway, that different areas
developed the type along local lines and that there is probably
influence on some of the groups from Ireland.¹

II

Since there is a good deal of variety in the decoration
of this group it seems best to treat each carving separately
before proceeding to broader statements about the chronology
or relationships of the set as a whole. The shaft from Aspatria
is discussed first, not because it is the most complete, but
because it best combines types of ornament repeated elsewhere
in the group.

Aspatria I

The dating of this shaft to the Viking period is assured
by the presence of the ring-knot on the west face.² The knot
has a peculiar form (better recorded in Calverley's drawing than
in Collingwood's,³) in which there are four concentric rings,
one of which is made up of pellets. Multiple rings with this
type of knot are only found elsewhere on insular sculpture at
Lancaster and Melling⁴ and there is a further close link with
these two Lancashire shafts in that they also use a ring of
pellets in precisely the same position as did the Aspatria
sculptor. These shafts similarly employ the knot in the same
sort of composition as Aspatria, as the lower part of a long
panel which contains other types of decoration. The link of
the Aspatria and Melling shafts is further strengthened by the
similarity of the interlace above the ring-knots which is
markedly irregular and lobate on both carvings. This raggedness
has much in common with the Mammen phase of Viking art as it
can be extrapolated from the classic instances of this style.⁵

¹ Clearly much later are eleventh- and twelfth-century work
like that seen in F. Henry 1970, fig. 13. It is clear from
the ornament of the English group that they cannot be as
late as this.
² See the discussion on p. 92 ff..
³ Compare W.S. Calverley 1899, fig. facing p. 14 with W.G.
Collingwood 1927, fig. 178.
⁴ W.G. Collingwood 1927, figs. 171 and 179. Melling is better
illustrated in W.G. Collingwood 1904a, fig. 5.
Another link with the Lancaster shaft is found in the pattern on the east face of the Aspatria cross. This is no. 657 in Romilly Allen's analysis and only occurs elsewhere in Northumbrian sculpture on the hogback from Aspatria (no. VII), on the circle-head Bromfield I and at Lancaster. The only other occurrence in Britain which has been noted is on the tenth-century shaft from Forres though at Braddan there is a very muddled and irregular piece of knotwork which might be an attempt to render this pattern. Whilst recognising that all of these could be unconnected, chance, recurrences it does seem likely that the repetition of the pattern at Lancaster and Bromfield is more than coincidence in view of their other links to the Aspatria cross.

The animal on the lower part of the west face is now rather worn but seems to have been accurately rendered by Collingwood's drawing. To Collingwood this beast was "quasi-Jellinge" whilst, more recently, Bu'lock has stripped it of even this reservation and described it uncompromisingly as "Jellinge". In fact it is not a Jellinge animal at all but an insular beast with a respectable pre-Viking ancestry.

The crouched, backward-turning, animal has a long history

2. Lancaster: see W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig. 171.
3. J.R. Allen 1903, III, fig. 156. For date see R.B.K. Stevenson 1956, 128.
4. P.M.C. Kermode 1907, no. 56 and ibid. pp. 25-6. His suspicion that this stone is of the Viking period seems justified.
5. Braddan's claim to connection with Northumbria is also strong since the pattern is clearly unfamiliar to the sculptor and is from a site where other links to Cumbrian sculpture can be shown.
8. J.D. Bu'lock 1959, 10.
in insular art and all of the distinctive features of the Aspatria animal can be found in art which is of the pre-tenth-century date. The beast on the strap-end from Talnotrie, deposited c. 875, provides a good parallel with its four legs, the backward-turned head, the cowering position, one ear cocked and the long tongue passing in front of the body. Those few details of the Aspatria animal which are not found on the Talnotrie strap-end can be found on other fragments of metalwork found in northern England: the raised paw can be seen on strap-ends from Whitby, Coldingham and York, on the ring from Malton (and on the horn-mount from Burghead) whilst the knotted tail which developed into encompassing interlace is a constant feature of insular animals in all media.

This crouching animal of eighth- and ninth-century metalwork rarely occurs on Northumbrian sculpture during the pre-Viking period. It is, however, not just at Aspatria that it was adopted into the art of the tenth and eleventh centuries: Hickling in Nottinghamshire, Nunburnholme in Yorkshire, Cross

4. Whitby: see C.R. Peers and C.A.R. Radford 1943, fig. 11 nos. 5 and 6; York: see D.M. Waterman 1959, fig. 10, nos. 3 and 4; Coldingham: see D.M. Wilson 1964, fig. 3; Malton: see D.M. Waterman 1951; Burghead: see D.M. Wilson and C.E. Blunt 1961, plate XXIXb. For the equivalent phase in Irish art see M. MacDermott 1955, 81-5. and for the relevant material from the type-site at Trewhiddle see D.M. Wilson 1964, figs. 38 and 40.
5. G. Haseloff 1951, figs. 11, 13 and 14; E. Bakka 1963, fig. 54 and much of the material listed in note 4 above.
6. The only certain example is on a slab from Wensley (see E. Bakka 1963, fig. 35) though another possibility is provided by the cross-arm from Lasswade (no. 1): see J.R. Allen 1905, III, fig. 442 (wrongly labelled as no. 2.).
7. T.D. Kendrick 1949, plate LIII and (for drawing) A.de.B. Hill 1916, fig. 5.
8. W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig. 152.
Cannonby I and Brigham IX in Cumberland, Monifieth in Scotland¹ and (closest to Aspatria in style) Chester² all afford parallels. Like these beasts the Aspatria animal is firmly in an insular tradition and affords yet another indication of the persistence into the tenth and eleventh centuries of Anglian ornament.

The knot-pattern on the narrow edge of the Aspatria cross is less significant both chronologically and culturally. This is Romilly Allen's knot no. 661³ and, like its single-loop version no. 653,⁴ it was long a popular knot in insular art.⁵ In view of their joint use on several objects⁶ there is probably no chronological distinction to be drawn between the two types. Knot no. 661 occurs in Ireland in the pre-Viking period on metalwork, manuscripts, bone and on stone-carvings⁷ and it can be found at the same period in Pictish contexts on stone and metalwork.⁸ Further south it occurs on Northumbrian manuscripts,⁹ English metalwork (none necessarily Northumbrian¹⁰) and, most

---

2. T.D. Kendrick 1940, plate XI. A similar adaption of Trewhiddle animals in a Viking-period context can be seen in metalwork on the Canterbury disc-brooch and the plate from a late Saxon casket: see D.M. Wilson 1964, fig. 14 and plate 53.
6. e.g., Lagore trial-piece; Ardagh brooch; Tessem mount: see F. Henry 1965, plate 37; M. and L. de Paor 1960, plate 40; E. Bakka 1963, fig. 56.
7. See examples listed in note 6 above and add the Lough Erne shrine, the gilt-bronze object in St.-Germain Museum and (though not certainly Irish) Corpus Christi ms. 197: see F. Henry 1965, plates 20, 66 and 100.
8. Meigle no. 26: see J.R. Allen 1903, III, fig. 318 and (for ninth-century date) R.B.K. Stevenson 1956, 122; pennanular brooch from St. Ninian's Isle: see A.C. O'Dell 1960, 37. See also R.A. Smith 1914, plate XXVI no. 8.
10. Ormside bowl, Bjørke and Tessem mounts: see E. Bakka 1963, figs. 3, 8 and 56.
relevantly of all, on Northumbrian carvings.¹

In the Viking period its use in Ireland and Pictish areas is well attested² but, though Collingwood³ refers to it as being "fairly frequent" on Northumbrian sculpture at this time, the only other examples appear to be on the hogback Aspatria VII (which we have already noticed as using another of the shaft's patterns), Kirkby Stephen IV and a cross at Chester-le-Street.⁴ There is perhaps insufficient evidence for asserting that this is a pattern limited in the Viking period to the western seaboard: it appears to have been one which was long in use in Anglian (and indeed most insular) work though it is perhaps negatively significant that it does not occur in the Isle of Man.

Finally it is worth remarking on the total organisation of the ornament on this shaft since it seems to be one which was standard in the Cumberland group of circle-heads. Though the east side only has one full-length panel of knotwork the western has two panels, the lower one being very narrow. This type of scheme is found again on two other circle-heads whose shafts survive complete: the north side of Dearham I and on all faces of Muncaster I. If one discounts those Northumbrian crosses whose ornamental scheme is clearly derived from that of the round-shafts⁵ it emerges that this scheme is restricted to the

1. Hornby, Lancs.: see W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig. 71; Ripon: see W.G. Collingwood 1915, 234, fig. f; Waberthwaite I; Hoddom: see C.A.R. Radford 1953, plate IIIb (a scrollversion).


4. J. Stuart 1867, plate XCI (though the drawing is inaccurate).

5. e.g., Middleton (A.L. Binns 1966, fig. I) or Collingham (W.G. Collingwood 1915, 160, figs. 0-9). In both cases the derivation is shown by the lack of panelling between faces.
Solway area. To the south of the estuary it occurs in the circle-head school and, to the north, in work of the Whithorn school.\(^1\) The possibility of some type of link across the Solway must clearly be considered.

**Workington III**

Like Aspatria I this shaft also carries animal ornament. There is, however, a great contrast in zoomorphic types for, unlike the insular beast just discussed, the animals on the Workington carving are firmly in a tradition which stems from Scandinavia. Despite their uniqueness in English sculpture of the period they have been consistently ignored by writers treating insular Viking art, possibly because they did not figure in Collingwood's general survey\(^2\) and possibly, also, because the only available published illustration is highly misleading.\(^3\)

A detailed examination of the characteristics of the beast on the narrow dexter side seems to show that it is the sole surviving example on an English cross of an animal in the Mammen style. The closest sculptural analogies are on the Isle of Man, where this phase is well represented,\(^4\) and it is tempting to see some link in this cross between the island and the mainland.

The three identifying features are the pelleted body, the wavy tendrils and the semi-circular indentation of the beast's contour. In view of the continuity in Viking art it is not

---

1. Penningham; Whithorn 23; Glenluce: see W.G. Collingwood 1925a, plate VI (no.19), plate VIII (no.23), plate XII (no.38).
3. W.S. Calverley 1893, fig. facing 172. The tendrils on the dexter face have been joined together and the rendering of the crossing animals on the sinister edge has been confused by Calverley's belief that they were birds.
surprising to find all of these elements in other Viking styles but their combination is characteristic of the Mammen group.

The two tendrils with their curled terminals are similar to those which decorate the Danish inlaid iron axe which gives its name to the style and it is not difficult to find other work in the same group, like the saddle mounts from the Ukraine, which similarly use these tendrils in association with zoomorphic ornament. In insular sculpture the closest parallel is afforded by Thorleif’s cross at Kirk Braddan on the Isle of Man though for the more elongated and flabby treatment it is perhaps more appropriate to cite the slab from Dóid Mháirí, Islay, whose decoration however is not zoomorphic.

There are, of course, numerous examples of this type of tendril in Ringerike art, and Kendrick’s plates provide adequate illustrations of their presence in the English examples of this style, but the combination with a pelleted, contoured animal is more characteristic of Mammen than the succeeding phase of Viking ornament.

The Workington animal is decorated with both pellets and hatching. This type of decoration of an animal’s body can be found in both metalwork and manuscripts in pre-Viking England and occurs at least twice on southern English sculpture in the same period. In Northumbria, however, it seems to be limited

1. See the theme of D.M. Wilson and O. Klindt-Jensen 1966 and especially 119 with a definition of Mammen style as "in many respects, merely an exaggerated version of its Jellinge predecessors." See also p. 130; "It is often difficult to separate the Mammen and Ringerike styles."
3. ibid., fig. 56.
4. ibid., fig. 52. P.M.C. Kermode 1907, no. 108.
5. R.B.K. Stevenson 1961, plate XI no. 2 though this piece is probably Ringerike rather than Mammen.
6. T.D. Kendrick 1949, plates LXVII-LXIX and LXXII-LXXIII.
7. e.g., Sutton Hoo and Tessem mounts: see P.L.S. Bruce-Mitford 1972, fig. 12 and E. Bakka 1963, fig. 56.
8. Wroxeter and Cropthorne: see G. Baldwin Brown 1937, plates LXXIII and CVI. Note also the speckling of birds at Breedon: see A.W. Clapham 1928, plate XXXII fig. 1.
to sculpture which can be placed in the Viking period. Against the wider perspective of the art of the Scandinavian homeland and the colonies, the contoured and pelleted body can be seen as a persistent element in Viking ornament, largely in the pre-Ringerike phase; and it is thus only its association with tendrils that mark off this Workington beast as a Mammen animal.

There is a similar lengthy usage in Viking art of the semicircular indentation. This is quite distinct from the multiple nicks which are found on English metalwork animals in the eighth and ninth centuries. To Wilson it is a characteristic Mammen feature which recurs frequently on the classic instances of that style but it should be added that examples can be found in most phases of Viking art from the Oseberg carvings onward in both

1. Crofton and Aycliffe: see W.G. Collingwood 1927, figs. 64 and 97; Haughton le Skerne: see G. Baldwin-Brown 1937, plate LXXV. Chester: see T.D. Kendrick 1940, plate XII. All are 'pelleted' except for Crofton.

Further south in the Viking period are:

a) Bakewell: see R.E. Routh 1938, plate IV.


2. See well-known material from Oseberg, the Jellinge cup, the Skåne horse collar, the trefoil brooch from Ostra Herrestad, and the Mammen axe, the Bamberg and Cammin caskets illustrated in D.M. Wilson and O. Klindt-Jensen 1966.


c) Manx crosses: see P.M.C. Kermod 1907, nos. 108 and 109.

d) Silver brooch from York: see R.J. Cramp 1967, plate VII.


7. See references and illustrations as note 6 above.
Scandinavia and the colonies. In Northumbrian sculpture it is found on the animal from Folkton, on Plumbland II, at Gilling in Yorkshire and on unpublished material from York, Sinnington, Ellerburn and Kirkby Moorside. The closest insular parallels in sculpture however come from the Isle of Man (combined with pellets and tendrils) on the Thorleif cross: the sculpture of Man, indeed, makes great use of these indentations on both zoomorphic and knotwork patterns.

The place of Mammen art as an intermediary between Jellinge and Ringerike is well emphasised by this analysis of the ornament of the Workington panel. With the earlier phase it shares the contoured pelleted body, with the later it shares the tendrils. Though it lacks something of the substance of the usual Mammen animal it is to this group that the Workington ornament belongs, thus adding another example of the style to the few which were certainly executed outside Scandinavia. Apart from chronological implications the importance of this identification is twofold.

1. For Oseberg see H. Shetelig 1920, figs. 5f, 65 and 148. Other examples are provided by the Søllested horse collar and the Skaill brooches: see D.M. Wilson and O. Klindt-Jensen 1966, plate XXXVIIb and fig. 53. For examples on the Christiana sword-hilt, a box brooch from Sweden and a gaming piece from Forfar see J. Brøndsted 1924, fig. 195; M. Stenberger 1947, plate 141; D. Wilson 1863, 101.

Examples from late Irish metalwork and manuscripts can be seen in D.M. Wilson and O. Klindt-Jensen 1966, plate LXVIb; F. Henry and G.L. Marsh-Micheli 1962, plate VI (a,c,d) and IX (c). For Bodleian ms. Junius II see T.D. Kendrick 1949, plates LXXII-LXXXIII. Many of these indentations, particularly in later English and Irish material, are at the point where a tendril or limb is thrown off from the main body.

2. T.D. Kendrick 1949, plate LXI.

3. W.G. Collingwood 1907, 323, fig. f. though the detail is not shown in the drawing. See also Steventon, Hants (A.R. and P.M. Green 1951, plate X111A).

4. P.M.C. Kermode 1907, nos. 95 and 108 (latter is Thorleif's). See also nos. 74, 77, 78 and 84.
Firstly it established another link to Manx sculpture since it is only on that island that insular sculpture makes any use of Mammen art. More speculative is the fact that Mammen art has been characterised by Arbman as an "aristocratic art" and this could well be relevant to the problem of the patronage of sculptural activity in the north west.

The other element attached to the animal on the dexter face is not easy to parallel. It could be a form of leaf used in the Anglian period (compare Northallerton) or it might be an exaggerated version of a tail such as is seen in earlier art at Jedburgh. In view of the relative competent drawing of the acanthus leaf on the sinister edge it is difficult to believe that this is another version of that type of leaf. Most probably this is the foot of the animal - analogous to those on Jellinge beasts at Middleton and Pickering.

The zoomorphic ornament on the sinister face is almost as unexpected as that on the narrow edge. Calverley's rendering is, most uncharacteristically, very inaccurate: the scheme is one of two contoured beasts, each with one short leg and another, longer, one which ends in crossed toes. The head or tail of each beast is formed by an acanthus leaf.

The flat carving and the contoured animal are characteristic of Jellinge and Mammen beasts. In Northumbria the closest parallel for the general arrangement is on the ring-head from North Frodingham though here it is the front end of one animal which overlays the rear of another. The small dumpy back leg, with its semi-circular hip is well paralleled at Ellerburn on another Jellinge animal.

3. W.G. Collingwood 1907, 373 fig. e.
4. W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig. 57.
5. Middleton is best seen in A.L. Binns 1956, figs. 4 & 8 and Pickering in W.G. Collingwood 1907, 381, fig. b.
7. W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig. 151. There are other unpublished parallels from York.
Despite Collingwood's claim that the acanthus does not occur in Northumbrian sculpture\(^1\) these animals clearly terminate in a leaf of this type. Its identification is helped by placing it alongside examples from manuscripts of the Winchester school\(^2\) or occasional, earlier, book decoration like the Hatton manuscript of the *Cura Pastoralis*.\(^3\) This type of foliate detail, in combination with animal ornament, is fully developed in the Ringerike phase of Viking art but is also well established in Mammen work. Though plant forms are admittedly present in Jellinge art the stress which this leaf element receives at Workington is not characteristic of the style and there is no difficulty in accepting its contemporaneity with the Mammen animal on the other face. Animal's heads which take the form of acanthus leaves can be found on both the British Museum casket plates\(^4\) and the antler object from Køge, Strand, Zealand the looping of the leaf stem around the leg before joining the animal's contour line can be paralleled on the Dóid Mháiri slab:\(^5\) neither detail is thus alien to Viking art in the British Isles.

Above the acanthus leaves is a triquetra with a markedly squarish form from which a trefoil leaf protrudes. Though this leaf type could be paralleled on ninth-century strap-ends in England it seems more relevant to point to the Manx type of cross-arm decoration where precisely this kind of trefoil emerges from beneath a band and where the square triquetra can also be paralleled.\(^6\)

---

2. See T.D. Kendrick 1949, plates XI, XXVII, XXXI, LXXI, LXXXIX.
3. N.R. Ker 1956, passim.
5. D.M. Wilson 1956, fig. 3.
7. See D.M. Wilson 1964, plate XI.
8. e.g., P.M.C. Kermode 1907, nos. 74, 77, 93, 101, 105.
The plait patterns on the main faces are not very informative but in no way run counter to either a broad dating to the Viking period nor a narrower assignment to the later tenth/early eleventh century floruit of the Mamman style.

Dearham I

This is the most complete and certainly the best known of the circle-heads in Cumbria.

At the centre of the head on both sides is a rosette. This is a survival of a "favourite ornamental fashion" which occurred frequently in the Anglian period and is a motif which is found again within the circle-head group at Gilcrux.

The southern side of the cross-shaft is covered with a variety of ring-chain ornament. The origins of the ring-chain probably lie in a Borre-style motif but the distribution of the known examples (listed and classified in Appendix) shows that this form of ornament was developed within the Viking colonies in the British Isles. The multiple type of ring-chain employed at Dearham only occurs elsewhere in insular sculpture on Gosforth I and on the hogback, Cross Canonby III: this limited distribution suggests that we are dealing with a Cumbrian development of the English version of the ring-chain.

At the base of the shaft on this southern side is a curious bulb-like object carved in high relief, surrounded by various ornamental motifs which are badly confused in Collingwood's drawing. To Calverley the combination of bulb and multiple ring-chain suggested that the artist envisaged the sculpture as a rendering of the Scandinavian world-tree, Yggdrasill. Certainly

1. T.D. Kendrick 1941, 76.
3. The distinction of the Manx and English versions of the ring-chain is worked out in Appendix 4. The multiple ring-chain on the font from Gällstad is probably a later introduction and is not relevant in this context: see G. Baldwin Brown 1937, plate LXXXII and D.M. Wilson and O. Klindt-Jensen 1966, 114.
4. W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig. 185.
5. See W.S. Calverley 1899, 124 where Collingwood also expresses his agreement. For Yggdrasill see: J. de Vries 1957, 380; E.O.G. Turville-Petre 1964, 42ff and 279; H.R. Ellis Davidson 1964, 190-6.

* Note, however, the Bearnan Chonaill (U. Rúftery 1941, plate 124).
the bulb-like shape, half buried in the ground, might suggest that the sculpture was growing from the earth but one must be cautious in accepting Calverley's identification for several reasons.

There is no objection to the assumption that the Vikings in Britain were familiar with the concept of the world-tree even though the fullest descriptions we have of the tree, in Yoluspá and from Snorri, are later than the tenth century. The combined information furnished by such various sources as Hávamál, Adam of Bremen and the general Indo-European comparative material all suggest that a representation of the world-tree in a British Viking-period context would not be impossible. But this is far from proving that Calverley's identification was correct. It might, for example, be objected that only one root of the tree is shown whilst the literary sources (perhaps mistakenly over-codifying) stress that there were three. But this objection is less important than Calverley's silent rejection of the notion of the cross as a cosmic tree. This concept is one which was well known in early Christian thought and, given the total shaping of this cruciform monument, might be thought more relevant than the idea of Yggdrasill. Alternatively Dearham I may, like the Gosforth sculptures, be drawing upon this Christian idea which could be identified with a concept familiar to the Vikings. Calverley's suggestion should not be rejected but it certainly requires modification.

1. Hávamál seems to go back to at least the tenth century and there seems no objection to the identification of Odin's tree as the world-tree: see E.O.G. Turville-Petre 1964, 12 and 48. The importance of the trees at Old Uppsala, described by Adam of Bremen in the eleventh century, is unlikely to have been a phenomenon limited to that century. For the Indo-European background see E.O. James 1966 and for a strongly-argued case for a Finno-Ugric source see R. Pipping 1928. For a tree on a pre-Viking stone from Scandinavia see H.R. Ellis Davidson 1969, 61.

2. E.O.G. Turville-Petre 1964, 279.

3. See especially E.S. Greenhill 1954 and R.E. Kaske 1967. It has been argued, notably in S. Bugge 1889, that Christian influences are present in the Scandinavian concept.
Amongst the ornament around the bulb is a small leaf and a circle penetrated by a bar. The former looks like a rather sad acanthus leaf whilst the latter finds a vague parallel in the decoration of one of the slabs from Bride on the Isle of Man. The two bird-like shapes have equally distant analogues on Man, at Ramsey Maughold.

On the north side of the shaft the ornament is divided between two panels, as on both Aspatria I and Muncaster I. The larger panel is decorated with a basket plait which springs from bifurcating knotwork beneath a form of arch. It is difficult to find anything resembling this type of ornament elsewhere though two of the unpublished circle-heads from Chester employ a similar form of arch. The fret pattern on the narrow panel is unique.

In many ways this is, then, an unusual cross, attempting a more ambitious type of decoration and monument than the general run either of Cumbrian sculpture or of circle-heads.

**ROCKCLIFFE**

The shape of this shaft is quite distinctive. Two offset and ornamented bands surround the shaft: the decoration of the offset is restricted within a panel on each face and does not form a continuous band around the cross.

Within the circle-school this shape recurs at Bromfield where one mid-shaft band survives and another now forms the broad base of the cross. Both crosses are squarer in section than the rest of the group. This type of banding is rare elsewhere: the only known Northumbrian example is from Crathorne, Yorkshire, where the two bands are associated with Viking-age patterns. Further south there are three further relevant pieces, each with a single band, at Sproston in Leicestershire, Creeton in Lincolnshire and Bakewell in Derbyshire; none seem to be earlier than the tenth century. Whilst infrequent as a shaft type it clearly had a wide distribution.

1. F.M.C. Kermode 1907, no.97.
2. F.M.C. Kermode 1907, no.96.
4. G. Baldwin Brown 1937, plate CV.
5. R.S. Davies 1929, plate I.
The origins of the shape cannot be convincingly established. To Baldwin Brown\(^1\) it lay in the collar of ornament below the cross-head found in Anglian contexts at Nunnykirk\(^2\) and, presumably, Acca's cross.\(^3\) Yet there are no intermediate types which would explain the development of this collar ornament into a mid-shaft banding.

A more convincing derivation might be suggested in the ornamental scheme of the round-shafts of the Peak district area.\(^4\) Several of these crosses mark off the junction of the square and round sections of the shaft by a broad band of continuous ornament. Good examples of this occur in Cumberland at Penrith as well as in the Peak District home of the series.\(^5\) The crosses which Kendrick labelled as "round-shaft derivatives"\(^6\) transfer this banding onto rectangular shafts but it is intriguing to note that, in so doing, they break up the continuity of the band ornament: at both Middleton and Gilling,\(^7\) for instance, it is noticeable that the ornament is terminated within each face even though there is no panel border. This may well be the development which lies behind the Rockcliffe type for it would explain both the mid-shaft position of the banding and provide a sequence of types deriving from the round-shaft in which the ornament is restricted to panels on all four faces. The duplication of the banding may be simply a development of this or could be tied in with the ornamental collar which is found on so many of the round-shafts\(^8\): in this connection the shape and

---

2. W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig. 38.
4. Since this was worked out I notice that T.D. Kendrick 1949, 76 had already hinted at this conclusion.
5. Ilam: see W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig. 14; Leek: see T.D. Kendrick 1949, plate XLVI.
7. Middleton: see A.L. Binns 1956, figs. 1 and 2; Gilling: T.D. Kendrick 1949, plate XLVIII.
ornamental scheme of the round-shaft at Stapleford¹ looks particularly suggestive. This derivation is also lent some plausibility by the way in which the known examples are peripheral to the Peak area where the round-shafts have their centre.

Whilst there is, then, a possible origin for the Rockcliffe/Bromfield shaping within English sculpture there is one group of Irish crosses which require some discussion in this context. The group centred on central and south-eastern Ulster²: here the panel immediately under the lower arm of the cross-head is slightly larger in section than the shaft below and this distinction is emphasised by the outline of the panels on all four faces. This distinction is purely functional,³ concealing the junction of head and shaft. These crosses are conventionally dated to the period between the mid-ninth and tenth century but the relative chronologies of the Irish and Northumbrian crosses are not so finely graded as to allow speculation as to whether this is a parallel development or reflects links between the two areas.

The cross-head at Rockcliffe differs in two respects from the rest of the Cumberland school. Firstly, on the weathered west face there are clear signs that the arris edge of the upper and dexter cross-arms are cut so as to appear to cross OVER the circle. (See fig. 14.) The other arris edge of both of these cross-

![Fig. 14](image)

1. T. D. Kendrick 1949, plate XLVI.
2. The best example is Arboe: see F. Henry 1967, plate I. Less marked are the west cross at Kells and Clones: see H. M. Roe 1966, plate XV and F. Henry 1933, plate 65.
arms is treated in the usual circle-head fashion, the circle
overlaying the arms. This is unlikely to be due to careless
miscutting since, if so, it is difficult to see why it should
only affect one arris edge of two separate arms. At Neston
moreover, is part of a circle-head belonging to the Cheshire
group which preserves exactly the same feature.\(^1\) It could be
argued from this that the Rockcliffe cross forms additional
evidence for the interpenetration of ideas between the different
circle-head groups: a less likely alternative is that both the
Cheshire and Cumberland sculptures reflect an analogous treatment
found on the cross-slab from Conchan, Isle of Man,\(^2\) in which the
cross-arms and their arrises are interlaced as separate members.

The second distinctive feature of the head is that the
spandrels are not pierced, as is otherwise invariable in the
Cumberland group. The space between the arms is filled by a
dimpled boss. Circle-heads in Cheshire and North Wales usually
have unpierced spandrels containing a boss, and one\(^5\) even has
the Rockcliffe dimpling, but they consistently differ from the
Cumberland cross in having the boss set in the arm-pit and not
in the centre of the spandril. More relevant as the source of
this type of spandril filling are the Whithorn disc-headed
crosses which frequently have bosses filling the spaces between
the arms.\(^4\) Elsewhere in Britain bosses in this position are
extremely rare\(^5\) though they are more widespread, both
geoographically and chronologically on slabs.\(^6\) Given this localised

2. P.M.C. Kermode 1907, no. 59.
4. e.g., W.G. Collingwood 1925a, plate VII, VIII no. 22, XI
   nos. 33 and 37.
5. The only known examples are the head from Ellerburn, Yorks
   (W.G. Collingwood 1907, 314) and two from Wales (V.E. Nash-
   Williams 1950, nos. 65 and 360).
6. a) Scotland, pre-Viking: Aberlemno no. 3 and Logierait: see J.R.
   Allen 1903, III, figs. 228A and 308A.
b) Scotland, slab reflexes of disc-heads: Glenluce and St. Ninian's
cave: see J.R. Allen 1903, III, figs. 513 and 547.
c) Man: P.M.C. Kermode 1907, nos. 53 (and 113). No. 22 is
   presumably earlier.
popularity of spandril-bossing north of the Solway in the tenth and eleventh centuries it seems quite probable that Rockcliffe, the most northerly of the circle-heads, reflects Whithorn practice. It is thus useful to recall that the site was an important point of embarkation across the Solway in the later period.¹

The ring-chain on the narrow edges of this cross is now very worn but Calverley² interpreted it as being my Type 4.³ Repeated personal inspection in a variety of lights has failed to confirm or deny the accuracy of his drawing but, if it can be accepted, then it is yet another link between the sculptures of this group and the shaft from Lancaster⁴ for the same type of pseudo-ring-chain is used there.⁵

The rest of the ornament is now very difficult to discern, and clearly was well worn by Calverley's day.⁶ The upper panel on the east face is filled with knotwork, which seems to be accurately rendered by Collingwood,⁷ but the only point of interest is that it seems to contain a loose ring.

Rather more can be seen on the broad faces of the two bands though, again, it is difficult to be certain of the detail of the ornament. The raised panels are each filled by an animal with a gaping contoured jaw. Common to both beasts on the upper band is an almond eye beneath a forehead "bump" which is itself set forward of a single ear. The animal on the west face has an upper and lower tooth but these are only inferentially present on the eastern beast. The gaping outlined jaw with teeth, combined with a bump over the eye and a free ear, are best paralleled in Northumbria on the Gosforth cross. The rest of the animal cannot now be seen in any detail though the general

---

¹ See W.T. McIntire 1939, 156 ff.
² W.S. Calverley 1892, plate facing 257, but note on p. 257 "the edges have a design which is in some parts traceable, and which is given approximately in outline in the accompanying sketch".
³ See Appendix 4.
⁴ W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig. 171.
⁵ Another example comes from Osmotherley, Yorks: see W.G. Collingwood 1907, 378, fig. d.
⁶ W.S. Calverley 1892, plate facing 257.
⁷ W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig. 159.
visual impression, reinforced by Collingwood’s drawing, is of a beast with a substantial frame. The lower bands also once carried animal ornament but so little remains that comment is useless.

The worn condition of this carving is frustrating, for in many ways it is an eccentric member of the circle-head group both in some details of its ornament and in its geographical position.

**Bromfield I**

The general shape of this cross immediately places it close to Rockcliffe and it is not perhaps irrelevant to notice that it is, geographically, the nearest circle-head to Rockcliffe. Not only does it share the raised banding but it also uses an identical type of ring-chain to that used at Rockcliffe and similarly employs it on the narrow edges. But whereas the Rockcliffe sculptor placed the ring-chain on the recessed panel, the Bromfield sculptor (if he were a different person), placed it on the raised band. Conversely there appears to be an identity of ornament between the tangled knotwork of the broad faces of the Bromfield offsets and the recessed panels on the broad face of Rockcliffe.

But the stone at Bromfield is not totally like that of Rockcliffe: it does not, for example, have any animal ornament. And in other ornamental details it is linked to the shaft from Aspatria, the cross which is geographically the neighbouring circle-head to the south. With the Aspatria shaft it shares the multiple ringing of the ring-knot and the presence of a rather ungainly version of Romilly Allen’s knot no. 657. Its decoration is thus almost what one would expect from its geographical position.

One feature of the treatment of knot no. 657 requires more extended discussion. At the centre of both panels and also on the lower part of the face panel the twin cords of the knotwork split at the point of crossing, each cord acting as though it

---

were an independent strand (see fig. 15). Throughout the rest

of the knotwork the cords pass over and under together. The
following examination of the various categories of split bands
shows that this was a familiar element in Viking ornament though
it is not totally restricted to that period.

One type of split crossing can be traced back as far as
Salin's Style II\(^1\): this is the type in which a single strand
(often zoomorphic) splits at the point of crossing (see fig. 16).
In Scandinavia this type recurs in Style III work\(^2\) and,
presumably with intermediary examples, in the early Urnes-style
stone, Ardre 3.\(^3\) Another type frequently occurs on Viking-
period sculpture in Man and England.\(^4\) In this the band splits
at the point of crossing with one half joining a half of the
crossing band (see fig. 17). A third type, which is found as
early as the art of the Gokstad ship,\(^5\) but is best seen in
Ringerike and Urnes art, employs two parallel bands (often the

---

1. See N. Åberg 1947, 116–7 and fig. 62.
2. H. Shetelig 1920, fig. 264d.
intermediary stage at Oseberg see figs. 19 and 22. This
is the type seen on Gosforth VI.
4. P.M.C. Kermode 1907, figs. 27 and 28; Spennithorne, Yorks.;
see W.G. Collingwood 1907, 390, fig. b; ? Barwick in Elmet;
see W.G. Collingwood 1915, 136, fig. b.
An earlier Scandinavian stage can be seen in H. Shetelig 1920,
fig. 264d.
contours of animals) which act independently near the termination. (see fig. 18)\(^1\).

![Fig. 16](image1.png) ![Fig. 17](image2.png) ![Fig. 18](image3.png)

None of these provide exact parallels for the Bromfield treatment. In Northumbria this is supplied by a Viking-period cross from Kirklevington in Yorkshire\(^2\) but, rather puzzlingly, the closest analogue is on the Irish slab from Drumhallagh\(^3\) which Henry has placed in the same early group as the Carndonagh/Fahan Mura sculptures.\(^4\) Stevenson's arguments for a late dating of Carndonagh and Fahan Mura may also, one suspects, apply to Drumhallagh but it would be safer to conclude that the Bromfield split bands are of a class which was popular in the Viking period though it is not entirely limited to work of that date.

The other visible knotwork pattern is Romilly Allen's no. 653,\(^5\) the double loop version of which has already been discussed in the section on Aspatria I.

There is no doubt about its popularity in non-sculptural media in all parts of the British Isles before c. 1100. This long period of usage also appears in sculpture: in Northumbria it occurs at least once\(^6\) in an Anglian context though the

\(^1\) See P.M. Wilson and O. Klindt-Jensen 1966, figs. 58, 59, 65 and plates LVII, LIXc, and LXVIII.

\(^2\) W.G. Collingwood 1907, 350, fig.e.

\(^3\) F. Henry 1965, fig. 15a.

\(^4\) F. Henry 1965, 123-4 and see above pp. 89, 94.


\(^6\) Melsonby: see W.G. Collingwood 1907, 368, fig.a.
majority of examples seem to belong to the tenth or eleventh centuries.  

**Bromfield III**

This cross-head is still fixed into the same farmyard wall in which Calverley's photograph records it in 1899. The reverse face and the narrow edges are both buried into the wall.

The Cumbrian decoration of the circle is quite clear but the decoration at the centre of the head is unique among the circle heads and poses problems of interpretation. To Calverley this was "the head of a beast...held by a ring through the snout". There are no parallels for this elsewhere in insular sculpture though this is not, of course, sufficient reason in itself for denying its likelihood.

One other reconstruction might be suggested. Calverley's "snout" could be a conical mitre with the human head beneath it defaced. The "ring" could then be the two horns of the mitre-type seen much more clearly on the so-called Doorty cross from Kilfenora, Co. Clare. The head need not have been attached to a full-length bishop portrait, stretching down on to the shaft (as on several late-eleventh- and twelfth-century crosses in Ireland), since there is a bust portrait of a bishop on the lower arm of a cross from Crofton, Yorkshire. This Yorkshire bishop is capped but the type of mitre seen at Kilfenora and proposed for Bromfield is a form which was used by the eleventh century.

---

1. In Cumbria there are examples at Lowther and Kirkby Stephen. Yorkshire occurrences are at Hauxwell, Lastingham, Sherburn, Dewsbury, Ilkley and Kildwick: see W.G. Collingwood 1907, 568 fig. a, 331 fig. b, 358 fig. j; W.G. Collingwood 1911, 272 fig. f; W.G. Collingwood 1915, 170 fig. s, 191 fig. i and 200 fig. o. For early and late examples from Scotland see Farr and Meigle 25 illustrated in J.R. Allen 1903, III, figs. 51A and 352A; these are dated by R.B.K. Stevenson 1956, 126 and 128; loc. 800 and c.1000.

2. W.S. Calverley 1899, plate facing 86.
3. W.S. Calverley 1899, 86.
4. L. de Paor 1956, plate 71.
5. L. de Paor 1956. For an English example from Bentham, Yorks, see A.G. Gilchrist 1923.
6. W.G. Collingwood 1915, 161 fig. a. See also Hornby, Lancs. in W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig. 71.
7. L. de Paor 1956, 64-5.
Muncaster I

The knotwork on this shaft is notable for its low relief, the broad straps merely abutting against each other. This type of interlace-strand is the type which is universal on the Viking crosses of Man, and occurs on contemporary material on both the east and west side of the Pennines. The layout of long panel and thin lower panel, the Cumbrian type of multiple ring-chain and the Viking-age step pattern have all been discussed at earlier points in this chapter.

Irton II

This cross-head could belong with the shaft now placed alongside it in Muncaster churchyard. The western side, where protected from weathering, confirms Collingwood’s reconstruction of the circle as decorated with the usual Cumbrian three-strand plait. The spandrels (contrary to the impression given by Collingwood’s drawing) are pierced, again in conformity with normal Cumbrian circle-head practice. In one respect, however, the head is isolated within the group for the circle is itself surrounded by a further ring, narrower in section, which does not pass over the arms of the cross. Though not found elsewhere in Cumbria this is exactly paralleled on the circle-head at Gargrave, Yorks, which is closely linked to the Chester group in other details. Whilst providing another instance of possible interpenetration of ideas between different groups of circle-heads it need be nothing more than an ambitious elaboration: a

1. Though P.M.C. Kermode’s drawings do not always convey this: see G. Baldwin Brown 1937, plate LXXXIV. For other non-English, Viking-period, examples at Kilbar and Whiterness see J.R. Allen 1902, III, fig. 118 and E.S.R. Tait 1937 fig. 5.
2. e.g., Middleton: see A.L. Binns 1956.
3. Kirkby Stephen I; Stanwix; Appleby.
4. W.S. Calverley 1899, 238 makes this claim though it should be noted that the cross-head was found at some distance from Muncaster.
5. W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig. 182.
6. W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig. 156b.
similar doubling occurs on the ring-heads at Middleton\(^1\), on Burton in Kendal IV and on both published and unpublished stones from Kirby Moorside and Sinnington in Yorkshire.\(^2\)

**Gilcrux**

More survives of this cross-head than has figured in any publication because the upper part of the shaft and the lower part of the head seem to have come to light since 1899.\(^3\)

The head uniquely combines a circle-head on one face with a normal ring-head on the other. Its broad interlace strands are similar to those at Muncaster, the rosette is paralleled on Dearham I and the decoration of the circle is of the normal Cumbrian type. The ornament on the edges of the head varies greatly in competence of design and execution: on the top is a well cut twist whilst the other parts carry incised patterns of a chevron and a simple incised line. Neither are particularly informative; the chevron has a long life as a sculptural motif\(^4\) and the only parallel for the incised line comes on a Viking-age shaft from Thornhill\(^5\) where the significance of the link may be a shared incompetence.

The shaft ornament is difficult to reconstruct thanks to the rough working but that on the face can only be restored as a ring-knot or ring-chain. Repeated examination in a variety of lights confirms that the continuity of strands on this side is broken by an animal's head with open mouth and curled nose - a type which is easily paralleled amongst the Jellinge beasts of

---

1. *A.L. Binns 1956*, fig. 7 shows this well.
2. One is published in *R.W.Crosland and R.H.Hayes 1955*, plate IV.
4. In an Anglian context it is found locally on Carlisle III (see above p. 385). In the Viking period there are examples at St. John, Chester and at Middleton: see *J.D. Bu'lock 1959*, no. B5 and *A.L. Binns 1956*, figs. 3 and 4.
5. *W.G. Collingwood 1915*, 247, figs. n and q. Collingwood interpreted these as "moulding lines".
Yorkshire carvings.  

It is difficult to avoid Calverley's judgement that this carving is "apparently unfinished".  

**Beckermet St. John VI.**

This has already been discussed in the context of the Beckermet school.

**Workington VII**

The classification of this fragment as part of a circle-head group is, at best, a tentative one since it is no longer available for examination and is only recorded in a single photograph. It seems to have had a band of ornament passing over the end of a cross arm and that ornament is of the usual 2/3 strand plait of the Cumberland circle-head group. The rectangular shaping between the circle and the centre of the head is not paralleled among the known examples but, since there is a large degree of internal variety within the group, this is not necessarily a bar to membership. More serious is the apparent lack of a projecting "ear": its presence may have been obscured by the angle from which the photograph was taken or it might have been a lugless type. It should be emphasised, however, that this classification is very speculative.

Several general points emerge from this detailed discussion of the sculptures which make up the circle-head group.

First, these crosses are clearly a very localised development of a particular type of monument. Their distribution is a very limited one, confined to the coastal plain of Cumberland and there are probably special circumstances accounting for the isolated occurrence of the type at the northerly site of Rockcliffe. This localisation of a type of monument reflects the

1. e.g., Folkton or Leeds: see W.G. Collingwood 1909, 197 and W.G. Collingwood 1915, 210 fig. f.
2. W.S. Calverley 1891b, 237.
3. It occurs on Brigham VII and at Cawthorne: see W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig. 223.
4. This site is isolated on a total distribution map of Viking-age sculpture. For some explanation of the importance of this site in later times, which may have a bearing on the earlier situation, see W.T. McIntire 1939, 156 ff.
same kind of parochialism, the same sort of disintegration of a once-unified sculptural tradition, as was found in the spiral-scroll and Beckermet schools.

This group differs from the schools discussed earlier in not being a development based upon Northumbrian Anglian styles. It also differs in being linked to several groups of similar types of monument found along the eastern side of the Irish Sea. The chronological relationships between these various groups are not clear, though the interborrowing might suggest some contemporaneity, but the very fact that the links of the Cumbrian material are to the west and the south marks another vital difference from the situation in the Anglian period when artistic styles bridged the Pennines. The links of this group are with Viking colonies in western Britain.

Intriguingly this type of monument is not found north of the Solway, on Man nor (in any developed form) in Ireland, though many of the individual motifs employed in the group are linked to ornament used in those areas. This negative evidence suggests that the circle-heads reflect a different situation to that shown by the spiral-scroll or Beckermet schools: whether the difference is political, cultural or social is not clear.

The group obviously belongs to the Viking period. A closer dating within that time span is inevitably more difficult. The Workington shaft, with its Mammen ornament, would suggest a date for that carving in the late tenth or early eleventh centuries. The Anglian elements in the animal art of the Aspatria cross might seem to imply an earlier date were it not for the fact that other parts of the shaft decoration have the waving tendrils of later phases of Viking art. The issue of dating is further confused by the variety of ornamental motifs, panel organisation and shaping of shaft: this variety may be the result of lengthy use of the basic type of head or it may be the result of several artists working contemporaneously, perhaps borrowing ideas from nearby crosses as seems to have happened at Rockcliffe, Bromfield and Aspatria.

1. Not only to the circle-head groups of Cheshire, Wales and Cornwall but also to the shafts at Melling and Lancaster.
A date in the later part of the tenth and the early years of the eleventh century is the most likely but both earlier and later datings for some of the crosses cannot be ruled out.
CHAPTER SIX

Round-shafts and Round-shaft Derivatives of the Viking Period

I

Among the more ambitious carvings of the pre-Viking period in England were crosses whose shafts had the usual rectangular section at the top but whose lower parts were cylindrical. This type does not seem to have been limited to any one area of the country.

The evidence from southern England for this type of cross is not as satisfactory as that available in the north, largely due to the fragmentary survival of all of the probable examples. The decorated fragments from Winchester and Wantage, for instance, show a pre-Viking type of decoration on cylindrical stones but it cannot be conclusively proved that these were crosses and not a type of column. At first sight the material from Reculver, together with the documentary and excavation evidence, would seem to supply a convincing example of a round-shafted cross which could be assigned to the period before c. 900. Undoubtedly there was a masonry foundation for some object at the junction of nave and chancel in the seventh century at Reculver but various assumptions must be made before it can be asserted (a) that the foundations are not those of an altar, (b) that the cylindrical decorated fragments from the new church nearby (and at Canterbury) were fixed to that base in the seventh century, (c) that all the fragments are part of a single monument, (d) that this assumed


single monument was a cross topped by the surviving cross-head fragment and (e) that this was the cross seen by Leland and mentioned in a late thirteenth-century source as in that position.

A fourth cylindrical shaft in southern England is at Wolverhampton. A recent study by Rix\(^2\) seemed to confirm the late ninth-century dating given to the carving by Kendrick\(^3\) and he thus seemed justified in claiming the Wolverhampton stone as evidence for the existence in Anglian England of shafts whose decorated cylinders were separated from rectangular upperworks by an encircling collar/band. In a lecture given at Leicester in December 1971, however, Cramp argued that the presence of a peering, gaping, bird amongst the decoration of the shaft pointed to a tenth-century date for the carving.\(^4\) As preserved in the cast in the Victoria and Albert Museum this bird is not so convincingly allied to the tenth-century type as appears in the well-known early twentieth-century drawing,\(^5\) but there are now sufficient doubts about the date of this stone to make it a shaky foundation on which to base claims for an Anglian date for the type.

It is therefore a relief to turn to the evidence from northern England. Here, once more, there are problems similar to those encountered in southern England: what, for example, was the original complete form of the decorated cylinder at Masham whose ornament is clearly of the Anglian period?\(^6\) Was it a cross


4. The comparison was with the material discussed in T.D.Kendrick 1938a. See also D.W. Wilson 1964, 43ff.

5. The carving itself is now eaten away by industrial pollution.

or an ornamented column? The fragment from Bedale poses similar problems. Fortunately, however, there are also three sites which have Anglian carvings showing a combination of cylindrical and rectangular sections and at one of these sites the survival of a cross-head, decorated in the same distinctive style as a fragment of round-shaft shows that one of these monuments (at least) was a cross and not a column.

This cross-head is from Dewsbury where Collingwood convincingly reconstructed a single cross from several fragments in the church. The junction of round and square sections is here marked by a scallop at the bottom of the panel on the rectangular section and a band running around the cylindrical section (see fig. 19). Part of a similar scallop is also found in Cumbria on the earlier of the two Dacre fragments. The third shaft, from Collingham, in Yorkshire is a useful reminder that the decorative band and scallop were not universally employed at the junction.

If due allowance is made for the fragmentary nature of the

---

1. W.G. Collingwood 1907, 296, fig.a. This shaft is oval in section and its ornamental arrangement in vertical strips is clearly that of a rectangular, rather than cylindrical, shaft.

2. For photographs see G. Baldwin Brown 1937, plates LIII and LIV. For drawings see W.G. Collingwood 1915, 162ff. For reconstructions see W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig. 13 no.6 and W.G. Collingwood 1929a, 28. T.D. Kendrick 1941b, 14 declares himself convinced by this reconstruction.

3. Dacre II.

4. Reconstructed W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig. 13 no.4. W.G. Collingwood 1915, 156 has the best drawing.
surviving material, it seems clear that round-shafted crosses were known in England in the pre-Viking period and it is perhaps permissable to extrapolate the major features of their ornamental scheme. All have elaborate decoration of the cylinder and at least some marked the junction of square and round sections by a scallop and a band or collar. The Wolverhampton cross, if it is of pre-Viking date, adds the use of scallop-derived pendant triangles to the repertoire.

II

Whilst a fine distinction in dating between later ninth-century and tenth-century art in the south of England is not possible it does seem that one area outside those settled by the Vikings continued to produce round-sectioned cross-shafts in the tenth and eleventh centuries. The persistent characteristic of the ornament of these pieces from south-west England is that it runs in bands horizontally around the cylinder. Only one example of this type of round-shaft survives from the Viking period in northern England at Wilne in Derbyshire and its links to mid-ninth-century art argue for its very early date within the Viking period.

The general run of Viking-period round-shafts in northern

1. In this group are Deerhurst, Gloucs., and Dalton, Devon: see D. Talbot Rice 1952, plate 30a and pp. 124 and 148. Two Dorset examples are those at Melbury Bubb and Yetminster: see RCHM 1952, plates 15 and 211 and pp. 158 and 272. A shaft from St. Blagey, Cornwall, shows continuity of the type without cylinder decoration: see A.G. Langdon 1896, 369. This assumes that all were parts of cross-shafts though the same problems of identification arise here as with the Anglian material.

2. R.E. Routh 1938, plate XXI. M.M. Rix 1962, 77 and C.A.R. Radford 1963, 209 both assign this sculpture to the mid-ninth century but the use of bifurcating knotwork suggests a later date.

* St. Blagey is better classed as a round-shaft derivative.
England differs slightly from Wilne. The geographical centre of this group of crosses lies in the Peak District and it has been aptly characterised by Radford as "the impoverished continuation of the native tradition". They differ from the Anglian material and Wilne in not placing emphasis upon the ornament of the cylinder but, in the use of a scallop and encircling band at the point of change from round to rectangular section, they are clearly in a line of development from work like Dewsbury.

Even more impoverished are other round-shafts, coming from the same area, which carry no ornament apart from one or more raised bands and a plain arris marking the scallop. There are more of these than have previously been realised but it remains true that the majority come from the same Staffordshire/Derbyshire/Cheshire borderland area where the Viking-period round-shafts are concentrated. It is reasonable to assume that they are either contemporary with, or later than, the decorated Viking-period round-shafts though the problematic Eliseg's pillar (well distanced from the majority of examples) may indicate that they

2. The exceptions are the shafts from Brailsford and Stapleford illustrated in T.D. Kendrick 1949, plate XLVI (though better seen in T.D. Kendrick 1941b, plate V). Both are geographically peripheral to the Peak District centre of the group. The ornament on the cylinder section of Stapleford is arranged in vertical strips like that at Bedale and is thus of a type more appropriate to a rectangular-section cross. The ornament at Brailsford does not go all round the cylinder.
3. See list below p.396.
4. The sequence of Anglian decorated-plain → Viking decorated is unlikely, as J.D. Bu'lock 1960, 52 points out.
could also occur in the preceding period. Since no plain round-shafts occur in the north-west this group needs no further discussion.

The distribution of the tenth-and eleventh-century decorated round-shafts can be seen from Kendrick's map. Two features are clear from this. Firstly, the concentration of the type lies outside those areas for which there is onomastic and documentary evidence of heavy Norwegian and Danish settlement and this is thus a further argument in favour of the Anglian derivation of this type of monument. Secondly the map demonstrates the isolated, not to say peripheral, nature of the Cumbrian examples.

Kendrick distinguished between two groups within his "Peak" series, separating a Leek type from an Ilam type on the grounds that the former preserves the scallop shaping of the lower part of the panel above the encircling band. It is doubtful if there is much value in this distinction for the detailed lists (Appendix 3) show that the so-called Ilam type accounts for a very small minority of these crosses. There is certainly some doubt about the Ilam type being later than the Leek, as Kendrick maintained.

1. The problem here centres around the genuineness of the inscription. See V.E. Nash-Williams 1950, 123-5 and C.A.R. Radford 1952, who both accept that this is a genuine ninth-century inscription and date the shaft accordingly. T.D. Kendrick 1949, 74-5 and J.D. Bu'lock 1960, 50 doubt whether the inscription is of this date but, as Mr. Bartrum pointed out to me in a useful discussion, it is difficult to find a convincing context for such an inscription in the tenth or eleventh century. If it is of ninth-century date then it must be seen as a geographically and chronologically remote anticipation of a later English fashion: it is interesting in this context that the particular type of band and scallop combination is not repeated elsewhere.


* T.D. Kendrick 1949, fig.7
since (a) comparison of the motifs employed at both Ilam and Chebsey with those at Leek\(^1\) shows no marked difference between the two groups; (b) the argument that the Leek type preserves the typologically earlier concept of "slicing"\(^2\) in its scallop would only be chronologically relevant if Collingham\(^3\) did not exist to show its loss within the Anglian period; (c) Kendrick's argument\(^4\) that the Ilam-type shaft at Brailsford carries late ornament carries less significance when one considers the shaft-fragment from Disley\(^5\) which is certainly of the Leek group yet carries ornament of the sub-Ringerike type which indicates a dating into the eleventh century. If the two types are not contemporary then there is certainly a chronological overlap.

Having established the Anglian origin of the round-shafted cross and the concentration of the type in the Derbyshire/Stafford/Cheshire area within the Viking period, it is time to turn to the Cumbrian examples.

III

The two round-shafts at Penrith can be classed with Kendrick's Leek type. The problem of the unity of the Giant's grave group is discussed below: here the examination will be confined to establishing the dating of the crosses and the links which can be inferred from their ornament.

The shape of Penrith II immediately links it to the shafts at Leek\(^6\) and Chebsey.\(^7\) These also have a single broad band, carrying a simple plait, though the Midland shafts have the band in greater relief than at Penrith. But this banding is the only

---

1. See illustrations of these shafts in T. Pape 1946.
2. The term coined by T.D. Kendrick 1949, 68.
3. W.G. Collingwood 1915, 156.
4. T.D. Kendrick 1941b, 12 (repeated in T.D. Kendrick 1949, 70) where the ornament of the Brailsford cross is used as "contributory evidence" for the lateness of the Ilam type.
6. T.D. Kendrick 1949, plate XLVI.
element which might be interpreted as linking this shaft to the Midlands. In all other respects it is very much a local Cumbrian product.

Like the majority of the round-shafts Penrith II was topped by a cross-head of free-armed shape (another indication of the sub-Anglian nature of the group) but this one has on it a "lorgnette" pattern which is an unknown element in the ornamental repertoire of the Peak district sculptures. It has already been noted, in the study of the spiral-scroll school, that this is a motif which was very popular in the Viking period in Cumbria.¹ The precise type of lorgnette seen here is not, however, exactly paralleled either locally or in Yorkshire.

The double row of ring-encircled plait on the south side of the cross (no.577 in Romilly Allen's classification²) is repeated on the other cross but otherwise occurs only rarely in northern England. Examples from Otley³ and Wighill⁴ show the knot in western Yorkshire but the Penrith round-shafts are lone occurrences to the west of the Pennines. It is, however, an extremely popular knot in the sculpture of the tenth and eleventh centuries in the Whithorn area and in the material from the Clyde basin linked to it.⁵ Its isolated occurrences at Penrith suggests a debt to this

¹ See above p.57.
² J.R. Allen 1903, II, 224.
³ W.G. Collingwood 1915, 228, fig.x, where it is badly bungled.
⁴ W.G. Collingwood 1915, 248.
⁵ a) Clyde area. Old Kilpatrick, Dumbarton; Inchinnan no. 2; Govan no. 35: see J.R. Allen 1903, III, figs. 472,477,492.
   b) Whithorn area. Whithorn (2 examples); Kirkmaiden (2 examples); St. Ninian's Cave; Glenluce; Monreith: see W.G.Collingwood 1925a, plate II no.II, plate IV no. 15, plate VIII nos.24 and 25, plate XII nos. 34 and 38; J.R. Allen 1903, III, fig. 517A/B.

There are numerous occurrences in both these areas of the patterns 579 and 579A with three and four rows of rings.
use across the Solway. 1

The other two knot patterns on the cross are the worn remains of a simple basket-plait and, better preserved, a run of "Como braid". 2 Nash-Williams has argued that the latter is indicative of the Viking period when used in insular sculpture. 3 It is clearly not limited to this date in other media in Britain, Scandinavia or on the continent 4 and even in sculpture it was in use before the tenth century. 5 Yet, as Romilly Allen astutely noted, 6 the English occurrences of this earlier date are all on the ends of cross-arms: its use as a full-length panel decoration is probably limited to the Viking period in Northumbria, with five of the seven examples carrying associated ornament of that date and the other two giving little indication of period. 7 Further confirmation of this chronological horizon is to be found in Collingwood's remark 8 that the Whithorn school seems to have used

1. Note the Penrith change from ring to figure of 8 has its analogy at Kirkmaiden: see W.G. Collingwood 1925a, plate VIII. J.R. Allen 1903, II, 224 notes other examples at St. Neots, Cornwall and Coppleston, Devon.
3. V.E. Nash-Williams 1950, 73.
4. e.g., i) Hunterston brooch: see J.R. Allen 1903, I, fig. 28.
   ii) Continental material illustrated in: W.Holmqvist 1939, 59, plates VI no.2 and XII no. 1; N. Åberg 1945, fig. 35. N. Åberg 1947, figs. 3,9 and see p. 76.
5. Irton I; Eyam and Bakewell: see R.E. Routh 1938, plate IIIa and XIVc; Papil: see J.R. Allen 1903, III, fig. 7 and (for date) R.B.K. Stevenson 1956, 115 and R.B.K. Stevenson 1961,55. Allen lists an example from Catterick which I have not been able to trace.
7. Kirklevington and Pickhill in Yorks.: see W.G.Collingwood 1907, 353 fig.x and 381 fig.f; Hawsker Yorks.: see W.G.Collingwood 1911, 282; Leeds: see W.G. Collingwood 1915, 213 fig.m; Stockburn, Co. Durham: see W.H. Knowles 1907, 112. Without associative dating evidence are carvings at Northallerton and Lindisfarne: see W.G. Collingwood 1907, 372 and C.R. Peers 1925, plate LIV, fig. 2.
this knot as the basis for some of their patterns. The one certain Welsh occurrence belongs to the Viking period.¹

Whilst the "Como braid" is useful in establishing that the shaft is of the Viking period it cannot be used, as Collingwood attempted,² to show that this cross is of tenth, and not eleventh, century date: one of the occurrences of the knot is at Hawsker in Yorkshire in combination with a panel which Kendrick³ rightly recognised as having an Urnes quality and this must be placed into the eleventh century.

The eastern cross, Penrith I, has much in common with the western. It also uses the rare double row of ring-twist, it also is free-armed and the head carried a lorgnette pattern on both faces. The lorgnettes, however, differ both from each other and from that on the other Giant's Grave cross: they also differ from the type used in the Spiral-Scroll school and all that can be deduced from them is that they represent another version of an Anglian-based motif which proved popular in both Yorkshire and Cumbria in the Viking period. As on Penrith II there is a similar broad band of ornament at the junction of the round and square sections of the shaft though the eastern cross uses a three-strand twist as decoration rather than the tighter four strands which encircle the western cross.

The vertical plait is not used on the other Penrith round-shaft and is, in fact, very rare in Northumbrian sculpture. Collingwood quoted an example on a Saxo-Norman carving from Mirfield in Yorkshire⁴ and to this might be added another from Guisley in the same county.⁵ This latter fragment has a somewhat ragged Ringerike ornament and is likely to be late, rather than early, within the sequence of insular Viking sculpture. Of the

1. V.E. Nash-Williams 1950, no. 47 is the only acceptable example. Nos. 303 and 360 are only marginally relevant though both belong to the Viking period.
5. W.G. Collingwood 1915, 180, fig. e.
other two examples in British sculpture, the one from Wales might be as late as the early part of the twelfth century, but the example from the Isle of Man is certainly much earlier and there is nothing to contradict a dating to the tenth century. This latter example is particularly useful in removing another plank in Collingwood's attempt to separate the dates of the two crosses at Penrith for, just as the "Como braid" of the western cross need not be limited to the tenth century, so the vertical plait of the eastern cross need not be limited to the eleventh.

The ornament on the western face is now very weathered but sufficient can be seen in a favourable light to confirm Collingwood's drawing, which shows a man (whose feet are enmeshed in a vertical plait) placed beneath a backward-turning animal. The bound man is yet another variation upon a popular local theme which is examined below p. 171. The animal, four-footed and with a bird-like head is familiar in sculpture of the Viking period. The bird-like head is found locally on the lower part of the crucifixion face of Gosforth I whilst in its general characteristics the Penrith beast is well paralleled across the Pennines at Stanwick, Nunburnholme or Gainford where there are similar animals caught up in a minimal amount of banding. The detail of the banding is not clear though there is certainly a strand laid across the neck as on so many Jellinge and Ringerike beasts. It is, however, not certain whether this neck-band runs through a circle and is thus comparable with the type of binding found on the British Museum casket plates.

2. P.M.C. Kermode 1907, no. 102. The runes and the figures from Norse myth would indicate an early date.
3. See below p. 171 ff.
4. W.G. Collingwood 1927, figs. 152 and 169; F.J. Haverfield and W. Greenwell 1899, no. XXXII.
5. e.g., Hickling, Levisham, Middleton: see T.D. Kendrick 1949, plates LIII, LXIV no 1, LXVI.

D.M. Wilson 1956, 35 and 38 restricted this type of binding to the Ringerike style but see animals at Clifford Street, York, and Nunburnholme; W.G. Collingwood 1927, figs. 144 and 152.
The Penrith Giant's Grave crosses are thus the most northerly examples of a type of monument whose focus, in the Viking period, lay in the Peak District but their ornamental scheme owes nothing to that area. It is very doubtful if they can be widely separated in date from each other: there are certainly no grounds on the basis of ornament for undermining the unity of the two shafts.

IV

The two round-shafts from Beckermet St. Bridget have survived in a more fragmentary state than those at Penrith. They have already been commented upon in the section dealing with the Spiral-scroll school. In that discussion the inscribed shaft, no. I, was tentatively assigned to the Anglian period on the, admittedly inconclusive, grounds that an inscription was more likely to be of that date. Against this dating should be placed the argument that no Anglian round-shaft can be shown to leave the cylindrical section undecorated whilst this is the usual practice in the later period. It is particularly unfortunate that the information from the inscription on this typologically important stone should now be irrecoverable.

When set against the other round-shafts the relative uniqueness of the monument is clear for its use of three encircling bands can only be matched elsewhere at Stapleford and, in a curious form, at Gilling.¹ By contrast, the other Beckermet St. Bridget shaft resembles the general run of round-shafts more closely. The bottom of the decorated panel is also scalloped but differs from no. I in its decoration and has only one unornamented encircling band. A single thick band occurs locally on both of the crosses from Penrith (though these carry decoration).

1. Stapleford: see T.D. Kendrick 1941b, plates Vd; Gilling: see W.G. Collingwood 1907, 323, figs. j-m. The cabled band at the centre of the trio at Beckermet is unique but both at Stapleford and Brailsford, where the shafts are more elaborately decorated than elsewhere, the bands are cabled.
and in the Peak district at both Chebsey and Leek. The ornamental arrangement of simple plaits in double rows is a type which we have already seen as virtually limited to northwest England and south-west Scotland.

It is difficult to believe that these two shafts were part of a single monument: the stone differs, the ornamental scheme differs and the standard of carving differs. It is impossible to prove that the non-inscribed is a weaker copy of its prestigious companion but it is an attractive hypothesis.

The other Cumbrian round-shaft is that from Gosforth which stands so far apart from the rest that it is best discussed with the rest of the sculptures from that site.

V

Chronologically the discussion of these four crosses has been unfruitful. Nash-Williams once referred to the early date of the "Cumbrian group" as compared with the material from the Peak district yet there is no evidence to support this assertion, which, indeed, seems to be based upon a misunderstanding of Kendrick's careful statements on the subject. It is at least theoretically possible for the two areas to have developed independently since they are based upon an Anglian form of cross which was not limited to any one area of the country. Indeed, Dacre II shows that there was at least one round-shaft in the pre-Viking Cumbria. This view that the Cumbrian group had a separate development from the Peak District set would receive

2. This is not very clear on the cross but there is sufficient to confirm Collingwood's drawing and description in W.S. Calverley 1899, 32-3.
3. See above p. 58.
5. T.D. Kendrick 1941b, II and I3 (repeated in T.D. Kendrick 1949, 70) was careful to distinguish only Gosforth I from the rest and not the Cumbrian group as a whole.
some support from the negative fact that none of the ornament of
the north-western round-shafts seems to derive from the
Staffordshire/Derbyshire/Cheshire area. The bound man, the
lorngnette ornament of the head, the double row of ring-encircled
plait, the vertical strips of parallel ornament - all of these
are local motifs. There may have been some links between the two
areas but it is not essential to interpret the Cumbrian round-
shafts as peripheral imitations of a north Mercian group.

As to date, it would seem that round-shafts were being
produced in other areas until at least the end of the tenth
century: this must be the implication of the Ringerike ornament
at Disley. None of the ornament of the Cumbrian crosses at
Beckermet St. Bridget or Penrith is helpful for dating: the strong
persistence of Anglian traditions in the free-armed head and the
lorngnette motif and the deliberate ignoring of Scandinavian-
derived ornament are, unfortunately, less indicative of date
than of cultural taste. In general a tenth-century date would
best explain both the fact that there is a continuity from an
Anglian form of monument and the links to Whithorn: Gosforth I,
which is set apart from the other Viking-period round-shafts,
also seems to be of this period.

VI

One of the most easily recognisable groups of Viking-period
carvings are those which adopt a round-shaft system of decoration
onto a cross-shaft which is completely rectangular in shape. The
two shafts in Sandbach market square\(^1\) show that this adaption was
not limited to the tenth and eleventh centuries but the majority
of examples are certainly of this date.

One type of adaption has already been noted in this thesis:\(^2\)
the raised banding of Rockcliffe, Bromfield I and Crathorne, like
that on the Sproxton shaft from Leicestershire, has already been
interpreted as deriving from the encircling bands of round-shafts.
In Lancashire Kendrick has shown that the curious shape of the

2. See p.\(^{125}\) above.
shaft from Whalley is probably due to a clumsy attempt to graft a round-shaft characteristic onto a rectangular shaft and a similar explanation can be invoked for the shaft at Bolton in the same county. Further round-shaft derivatives (to borrow Kendrick's term) come from Yorkshire and southern Durham where more than ten crosses show an adoption of either the pendant triangles or the encircling band of the round-shaft ornamental scheme.

Most of the round-shaft derivatives lie outside the Peak-district centre of the Viking-age round-shafts. Yet the peculiarities of their ornament suggest that they are a development, not from Anglian round-shafts, but from round-shafts of the later period: this would best explain the fact that there is no adaption of cylinder ornament which always seems to be present amongst the Anglian round-shafts. It would also explain why there is a constant adaption of ornamented or cabled bands and a pendant triangle placed below the (occasional multiple) banding for these are all features of the Viking-period, rather than Anglian, round-shafts.

It could be argued that the various round-shaft derivatives represent a reflex of the Staffordshire/Derbyshire/Cheshire material of the Viking period. It seems more likely however that

1. T.D. Kendrick 1949b, plate VII (b) and p. 17. (repeated in T.D. Kendrick 1949, 76.)
3. Brompton (1 unpublished), Gilling and Lastingham: see W.G. Collingwood 1907, 301 fig.e, 323 figs. d and e, 356.
   Sherburn and Hawsker: see W.G. Collingwood 1911, 272 figs. m-p, 282.
   Collingham: W.G. Collingwood 1915, 160 figs.o-q.
   Sockburn: see W.H. Knowles 1907, 111 and 112.
   Middleton: see A.L. Binns 1956, fig.1. There are unpublished examples at Low Dinsdale, Yorks. and Bywell, Northumberland whilst Kendrick has drawn attention to another at Stoke on Trent.
   It is interesting to note that it was the triangular element of this type of decoration which was adopted onto Christian monuments in Norway: see G. Baldwin Brown 1937, fig. 23. or this ornamentation material see now J. Bringeli 1973.
they reflect the art of those rare round-shafts within their immediate area. The case for this in Cumbria will be argued below but it will be sufficient to note here the presence of round-shafts at both Gilling and Stanwick in the North riding of Yorkshire for these could adequately explain the background for (at least) the Tees valley group of round-shaft derivatives.

In Cumbria there are two other crosses, apart from those at Rockcliffe and Bromfield, which can be placed within this derivative group. One of these, the so-called bound devil stone, Kirkby Stephen I, is only arguably so classified and has therefore been grouped with a miscellaneous set of material in a later chapter. The other shaft is, however, clearly of this group though the reasons for so assigning it are not, perhaps, immediately obvious.

This shaft is the so-called "Giant's Thumb", Penrith III, which stands in the same churchyard as the two round-shafts discussed above. Its relationship to the round-shaft type was not noted by Collingwood in his short study of the cross but its shape admits of no other explanation. Admittedly a broadening towards the base of a shaft of a cross is not unusual since this would clearly aid stability: it is therefore not surprising to find a large number of Anglian shafts with a broadened base. All

1. Round-shafts which, as has been noted above (pl 50) may be linked to the Peak district set or represent a parallel development from local Anglian round shafts.
2. W.G. Collingwood 1907, 323, figs. 1-5.
3. G. Baldwin Brown 1937, plate IXXXVII.
5. e.g., sculptures at Nunnykirk, Otley, Ilkley, Heysham, Ruthwell and Addingham: see W.G. Collingwood 1927, figs. 45, 60, 61, 89, 101 and 133 bis. There is an unpublished example from Norham on Tweed and little-decorated examples from Whitby: see C.R. Peers and C.A.R. Radford 1943, plates XXIV a and b. The type of pedestal seen at St. Andrew's Auckland represents a different type: see G. Baldwin Brown 1937, plate LXI.
of these Anglian shafts (and some of later date from Chester and Wales, ) share two features in common: the broadened area is short in relation to the total height of the shaft and the widening is achieved comparatively abruptly and with either a convex or a straight profile (see fig. 20 a/b).

Though superficially similar, Penrith III cannot be classed with these carvings for the broadened area takes up nearly half of the shaft and, moreover, the broadening is achieved both gradually and with a markedly concave profile (see fig. 20 c). This

![Fig. 20 : Profiles of cross-shafts](image)

is precisely the profile of a round-shafted cross. Indeed in outline Penrith III so resembles the western shaft of the Giant's Grave group, Penrith II, as to suggest that we are here dealing with an adaption from the local monument.

The shaft is very badly weathered and the drawing executed by Collingwood must be, in part, conjectural since an earlier photograph, taken in favourable light, reveals little detail on

---

1. J.D. Bu'lock 1959, fig. III provides a composite figure of the St. John's type.
2. V.E. Nash-Williams 1950, nos. 47, 147, 303, 360 and 364.
3. It is interesting to see that the shaft from Bolton (G. Baldwin Brown 1937, plate CIII, no. I) whose ornament is also derived from round-shafts, has a similar profile. Note also a cross from Pickering: see J. Bøndsted 1924, fig. 145.
4. W.G. Collingwood 1920, fig. facing 53.
5. W.S. Calverley 1899, plate facing 248.
the western face. I am however satisfied, after repeated
examination of the cross, that the details which are discussed
below can still be traced on the cross.

The non-figural ornament helps to place the shaft within
the Viking period. The run of knotwork on the southern side is
not particularly useful in this respect since it occurs on work
of both the Anglian and later periods. Similarly the use of the
drill to emphasise interlace intersections on this face is a
 technique which is fairly widespread, though it is locally popular
in the Beckermet school which flourished during the Viking period.

The pattern above the crucifixion, however, is more
instructive. This is knot 550 in Romilly Allen's classification²
and is much rarer than the double version (no. 551) which has
already been noted on the western shaft of the nearby Giant's
Grave group. Like the double version, knot 550 is not a Viking
invention: it is found, for instance, in continental art of the
Merovingian period³ and at least once in pre-Viking Scandinavia.⁴
It does not seem to occur in any pre-Viking insular context⁵ and
in the whole of insular sculpture it only appears again on a late
shaft from Whitford, Flintshire⁶ and on carvings from Gainford and
Brompton now in Durham.⁷ These three sculptures would suggest

1. Since the pattern is so widely used there is little reason to
catalogue its sculptural occurrences. Examples of pre-Viking
use in Cumbria are on Addingham I, Carlisle IV, Waberthwaite I
and Workington I; Wycliffe and Whitby show it in use at a
similar date outside the western area: see W.G. Collingwood 1907,
412 fig. h and C.R. Peers and C. A. Radford 1943, fig. 3. Cumbrian
usage in the Viking period is represented by Waberthwaite II
and Brigham IX whilst Easington and Ellerburn are but two
from a long list of Yorkshire examples: see W. G. Collingwood
1907, 317, fig. e and W. G. Collingwood 1915, 255, fig. e.

3. See, for example, W. Holmqvist 1939, plate XLII, figs. 77 and 79, plate
VI (2). J. R. Allen 1903, II, 214 cites later examples from Italy.
4. N. Aberg 1947, fig. 29, no. 5 (from Valsgärde).
5. Though the ornament of one of the Sutton Hoo mounts is based
upon this pattern: see N. Aberg 1947, fig. 29 no. 8.
7. F. J. Haverfield and W. Greenwell 1899, nos. XLVII and LVI. J. R.
Allen cites another example from Hawsker but this is an error.
that the occurrences on the Giant's Thumb should place that cross within the Viking period. In view of the relative rarity of this knot it is not unlikely that the use of a single loop version here was suggested by the double loop knot on the western shaft of the Giant's Grave group - a cross whose profile so nearly matches that of the Giant's Thumb.

The scroll-work fits happily into this Viking period context and, in addition, seems to reflect the same handling of the motif which characterises work of the spiral-scroll school. The stripped and rope-like scroll on the northern face is clearly not difficult to parallel in the Viking period but it is probably significant that it is only in work of the spiral-scroll school that there is a similar break in the system of alternating offshoots. Similarly the scroll on the west face has links to the spiral-scroll school in its inorganic linking of branches and its tendency to fall into two parallel strips of vertical ornament.

The basketwork plait on the east face yields little information, though it, again, is not out of place in the Viking period. The figure above, placed within an arched and cabled moulding, cannot now be identified; Collingwood at one time favoured the idea that this was the deceased's portrait but it could equally well be an angel or a representation of Christ in Majesty balancing the crucifixion on the opposite face. The worn state of the carving on this side prevents any definitive statement about the relationship of the frame to the arris moulding but it would appear that this is of the Viking-period north-western type which is also found at Arlecdon, twice at Burton in Kendal and at Halton.

1. Though the nearest is on the hogback, Penrith V, - another possible indication of local copying.
2. See, for instance, Dearham II upper right or Ise I.
3. The only possible parallel for this non-crossing variety of two-stemmed scroll is dependent upon Collingwood's restoration of a Halton fragment (W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig.92) and this is not altogether convincing.
5. For Halton see W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig. 191.
and not of the north-west Mercian form in which the arch springs
direct from the arris edge (see fig. 21). The cabled form of the
arched frame may be a survival of the arris/arch type seen in
earlier art at Bishop Auckland but can be found in the Viking
period at Slaidburn, Yorks² and, in a square form, on the
crucifixion scene on Gosforth I.⁴

The crucifixion scene on the west side is of great interest.
Collingwood’s drawing of this face is at least partly conjectural
but careful examination in favourable light does confirm the
presence (though not the distinguishing features)⁵ of lance and
spear-bearer together with the positions and form of Sol and Luna.
It is not, however, possible to be certain of the type of clothing
worn by Christ though a long robe seems more likely than a simple
loin-cloth.

The arrangement of crucifixion in which Christ is flanked by
Stephaton and Longinus stems ultimately from an eastern (Syrio-
Coptic) tradition.⁶ It had reached western Europe by the
Merovingian period⁷ and became the type which "dominated in

---
1. This distinction, geographically valid only for the Viking
    period, is fully worked out in the discussion of Burton in
    Kendal I: see below p. 239.
2. G. Baldwin Brown 1937, plate LXI.
4. See below p. 100.
5. No comment is therefore possible on the relative positions of
    Longinus and Stephaton.
   Representative examples, without any other accompanying
   figures such as Mary and John, are illustrated in R. Garrucci
   1872-80, plate 279 (St. Achillio, Rome); E. Salin 1959, 361, 364
   and fig. 154 (Conques 1959, Werden Casket).
southern Italy and Spain";¹ it is also found sporadically at a later date in other continental areas including Carolingian France and Ottonian Germany.²

In Anglo-Saxon sculpture the Longinus/Stephaton type of crucifixion is found on at least three crosses of pre-Viking date.³ From the tenth and eleventh centuries a few more have survived, the majority from Northumbria.⁴ Talbot Rice has rightly commented⁵ that this arrangement in the later period is a sign of provincial art and is not the preferred iconography of the court school. It should not be forgotten, however, that the Carolingian and Ottonian art on which the court school drew did, occasionally, use the Longinus/Stephaton type and that it does occur in southern English art.⁶

2. M.H. Longhurst 1926, 70 comments on the rarity of the type in ivories of the tenth to twelfth centuries. For some examples of the Carolingian and Ottonian periods see: J. Hubert et al. 1970, plate 152 (Gospel Book of Francis II); J. Beckwith 1964, plate 120 (Cover of Echternach Gospels); H. Picton 1939, plate XC (Antependium from Aachen).
3. Bakewell, Bradbourne and Hexham: see R.E. Routh 1938, plates II and IX; W.G. Collingwood 1926a, fig.11. There is another example of this period from Hart (unpublished). There are, of course, other types of crucifixion on Anglian crosses which have Mary and John flanking figures or have no figure other than the crucified Christ. There are also the more complex types such as the composition at Sandbach: see C.A.R. Radford 1957, 5-6. An early example of the Longinus/Stephaton type in a Hiberno-Saxon manuscript is in Durham A II 17: see R.A.B. Mynors 1939, plate 3.
4. ? Gosforth VII. Alnmouth and Aycliffe in Northumberland and Nassington in Northants.: see W.G. Collingwood 1927, figs.79 and 97; VCH 1906b, II, 194. There are two unpublished examples from Bothal in Northumberland.
5. D. Talbot Rice 1952, 100.
6. Examples from southern England are illustrated in D. Talbot Rice 1952, plates 14A and 36B.
Whilst accepting that the Penrith crucifixion reflects a provincial taste, there must be some doubt about Talbot Rice’s further suggestion\(^1\) that it is a type which came into the country from Ireland. Certainly Longinus and Stephaton are almost universal on Irish crucifixions, be they in manuscript, metal or stone.\(^2\) Equally there is some justification for arguing that certain crucifixions in Wales,\(^3\) Scotland\(^4\) and Man\(^5\) betray an Irish influence in the running/kneeling pose of the subsidiary figures.\(^6\) Yet the Penrith flanking figures do not adopt this Irish-derived posture and, more importantly, the Penrith stone has Sol and Luna (in non-anthropomorphic form) above the cross arm. Sol and Luna never occur in this form and in this position in the known material from Ireland.\(^7\) Since they do so occur on Anglian carvings\(^8\) the inference would seem to be that the crucifixion type seen at Penrith was one already known in Anglo-Saxon England before the tenth century, its continued use in the Viking period may owe something to an (ultimately) Irish taste

---

2. For examples in metalwork see: F. Henry 1965, plate 46; F. Henry 1967, plates 8, 53 and 54; A. Mahr 1932, plate 50 (no. 8) and plate 29 (no. 11). For the date of these latter two mounts see F. Henry 1967, 122-3.
3. For examples in manuscript see: F. Messia 1947, plate —— and F. Henry 1967, plate 45.
4. For examples in stone see: F. Henry 1965, plate 51, fig. 14a and p. 125 (examples from Duvillaun, Inishkea North and Inishkeel); F. Henry 1964, plate 16 (high cross at Moone). None of the foregoing examples have angels above the arms of the cross such as became the dominant type in Irish sculpture: for this latter type see F. Henry 1933, passim. In the eleventh century a type without either flanking figures or angels was established in Ireland: see F. Henry 1933, 161 and L. de Paor 1956, 60ff.
5. V. E. Nash-Williams 1950, no. 207.
6. The derivation of this type has been convincingly explained by H. M. Roe 1960. Continental examples are noted by L. Réau 1957, 497.
7. See below p. 160.
8. See, for example, Ruthwell.
for Longinus and Stephaton but a direct borrowing of the total Penrith iconography from Ireland is highly unlikely.

Sol and Luna are represented by a disc sun over Christ's right arm and a crescent moon, its horns turned away from Christ, over his left. Some representation of Sol and Luna in this position is a common feature of medieval representations of this scene though it is by no means universal: this area can also be left blank or be filled by angels. As already noted the Penrith arrangement of disc and crescent over Christ's arms effectively negates the possibility of Irish influence here: only rarely does some form of Sol and Luna appear on Irish crosses, once occurring in human form above Christ's arms and in the other cases being placed below the outstretched arms. This latter usage, possibly

---

1. The examples from Alnmouth, Bothal and even Aycliffe, all sites outside the main centres of Scandinavian (and Hiberno-Norse) settlement, render this suggestion unlikely.
2. This detail is not clear in modern photographs nor in that reproduced in W.S. Calverley 1899, plate facing 248. It can be seen only in very favourable lighting conditions.
3. This has been discussed in numerous publications: see F. Cabrol and H. Le Clezio 1907—, s.n. lune; H. Hautecoeur 1921; L.H. Grondin 1935; W. Deonna 1948.
   b) There are differences of interpretation concerning the heads beneath the crucifixion on the Market cross at Kells: see F. Henry 1967, plate 104. H.M. Roe 1966, 39 sees these as the heads of the two thieves and interprets figures in the arms of the cross as personified representations of Sol and Luna.
   c) As personifications above the arms of Christ on the south cross at Kells: see H.M. Roe 1966, 19-22.
   In general see F. Henry 1933, 145 and 157-8 and F. Henry 1967, 162.
Carolingian derived, is found also in England but not in Cumbria.

The position of the Penrith Luna over Christ’s left arm is the usual one in medieval art though the reverse arrangement is by no means unknown. At this date there were potentially several ways in which Luna could be represented. In British sculpture the most popular method was to show it, like the sun, as a disc and this is a type which is not unknown abroad. In the art of the Carolingian and succeeding periods a human figure, often draped and weeping is a frequent method of portrayal, both on the continent and in English art of the Winchester school.

1. Kirkdale, Yorks.: see W.G. Collingwood 1907, 345.
2. Representative examples are: (a) cross-shaft from Aycliffe: see T.D. Kendrick 1949, plate XII. (b) Rabula gospels: see E. Salin 1959, plate VIII. (c) Portable altar from Stavelot: see J. Beckwith 1964, plate 167. (d) St. Gall, Stiftsbibliothek, Cod.390/1: see A. Merton 1912, plate LIIX.
3. Pre-Viking examples are those at Ruthwell, Bradbourne and Sandbach: see W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig. 101; R.E. Routh 1938, plate IX; C.A.R. Radford 1957, fig. 1. Within the Viking period, as well as the Irish examples listed above, there is a Northumbrian occurrence at Alnmouth and other possible instances at Finghall and Kirkdale in Yorkshire: see W.G. Collingwood 1927, figs. 79, 124 and 126. See also R.B.K. Stevenson 1961, plate XI (2). In a non-sculptural context the type can be found on a book cover in the Pierpoint Library: see L. Stone 1955, plate 26.
4. e.g., the Rabula Gospels and the Giessen Gospels: see E. Salin 1959, plate VIII and C.R. Dodwell 1971, plate 83. These are works respectively of sixth and eleventh century date.
5. There are numerous examples illustrated in: A. Goldschmidt 1928; R. Hinks 1935; H. Picton 1939; M. Burg 1922; H. Jantzen 1949; J. Beckwith 1964. The type does occur earlier see R. Garrucci 1872-80, VI, plate 434 nos. 2,5 and 6.
To a similar period belong the more ambitious representation with chariot, bull and horse.¹ The Penrith combination of disc-sun and crescent-moon is one found sporadically on the continent between the sixth and eleventh centuries² but there seems to be no example associated with a crucifixion scene anywhere else in insular art.³ There are, however, sufficient occurrences of the combination in analogous contexts in British art⁴ to suggest that the Penrith carving was not so isolated as it now appears.

There is one other detail of the Sol/Luna representation which deserves comment. The horns of the crescent moon are turned away from the scene, an attitude which is shared by the other insular moons associated with a cross.⁵ Friend⁶ has attempted to show that this is a feature which emanates from the Abbey of St. Denis in the mid-ninth century and that the explanation is to be sought in a translation of a false letter of Dionysius which was made available at the time in that house. But it must not be assumed that the British types are necessarily derived from the St. Denis source. Translations were available elsewhere (and

1. There are numerous examples in A. Goldschmidt 1914-1925. There is an English example of this type in B.M. Tib. B.V: see J.O. Westwood 1868, plate 48.
2. There are examples amongst the material from Monza: see R. Garrucci 1872-80, VI, plate 433, no.3 (and plate 434, no.4). E. Salin 1959, plate VIII shows the Rabula Gospels. Of later date are the murals of St. Maria Antiqua, Casket del Dente, the Wattenscheid font and the Stavelot portable altar illustrated respectively in: W. Oakshott 1959, plate 86b; H. Picton 1939, plate XCVII, no.3; J. Beckwith 1964, plate 167.
3. Unless Nassington, Northants, provides an example: see VCH 1906b, II, 194.
4. e.g., (a) disc sun and crescent moon over an empty cross at Lindisfarne: see C.R. Peers 1925, plate IV. (b) the crescent moon on a slab from Wales: see V.E. Nash-Williams 1950, no. 56. (c) the crescent moon with human face at Aycliffe: see T.D. Kendrick 1949, plate XLI.
5. See note 4 above for this material. This is also the position adopted by both personifications at Kells: see H.M. Roe 1966, 22 and 39.
even at St. Den is itself before the middle of the ninth century\(^1\) and the existence of such representations from as early as the sixth century\(^2\) casts doubt upon the relevance of this particular text. Even if the Dionysius letter is ignored, however, it remains true that the majority of Luna depictions of the Penrith type belong to a period after the ninth century.

The Giant's thumb has thus a twofold interest. Iconographically it is one of the few representations in northern sculpture of a crucifixion with attendant figures. In its general shaping it shows an adaption of a round-shaft profile onto a rectangular-sectioned cross, the immediate inspiration possible coming from the round-shaft in the same churchyard with which it shares the rare use of the "Como braid" knot.

VII

One other cross requires discussion in relation to round-shafts and their derivatives. This is the semi-cylindrical shaft Kirkby Stephen II,\(^3\) which, with its rounded face and flat reverse, is almost unique in shape amongst insular sculptures. The only possible parallel comes from Melsonby in northern Yorkshire where there are two tapering stones which are rightly interpreted as fragments of grave slabs.\(^4\) In his initial publication of these Collingwood suggested the possibility that they were parts of crosses whose shape was a more angular variety of that found at Kirkby Stephen.\(^5\) It is difficult to be dogmatic about their recumbant nature when the full width of the side panels has not survived but the angle of the human busts would suggest that the Melsonby carvings do belong to the group of slabs with which Collingwood eventually classified them.\(^6\)

---

2. e.g., Ampulae from Monza: see R. Garrucci 1872-1875, plate 434, nos. 2, 4, 5 and 6. See also R. Garrucci 1872-1875, plate 279.
4. W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig. 20.
The Kirkby Stephen stone, by contrast, was certainly part of a cross, for a fragment of the head still survives. It is possible to suggest several reconstructions of the head on the basis of the small piece remaining: it could have been a ring-head like Burton in Kendal I, a simple free-arm like St. Bees III or have had a fan-shaped lower arm like the cross from Disley. All of these head-types would be appropriate for the Viking-period dating suggested by the ornament.

Collingwood saw this cross as having links to the round-shafts; in his view it was an eccentric adaption of the wooden tree-trunk prototype he saw lying behind the round-shaft group. This is obviously not impossible, given the existence of wooden crosses and the convenient disappearance of all the relevant evidence. It could equally be, however, that this peculiar shape was suggested by the natural appearance of the unworked stone.

Yet there is some support for Collingwood's association of this carving with the round-shaft material. On the flat reverse the knotwork was clearly carried up into the area of the head: the most plausible reconstruction of this side of the cross would yield a panel which is remarkably similar to that of the two round-shafts from Disley in Cheshire.

The ornament places the shaft in the Viking period. The rather muddled knotwork on the reverse is a mirror image of the knot-pattern classified by Romilly Allen as his type 658a which only occurs elsewhere in Northumbrian sculpture at Beckermet St. John III/IV, on a shaft belonging to the Beckermet school. This association, together with the berryless scroll, closely paralleled on a hogback at Penrith, shows that this is a carving of the Viking period. Despite its idiosyncratic shape, therefore, there is nothing extraordinary in its decorative motifs.

1. W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig. 14 no. 11.
5. See above p. 100.
6. Note that the sculptor has carved the vine-scroll upside down.
VIII

The material treated in this chapter has been more heterogeneous than the groups considered in earlier sections. It has, however, been useful to draw them together for it has illustrated the possible intimate links on the same site at Penrith of round-shaft and round-shaft derivative and has also served to emphasise that, if the origin of this group did lie in the Peak District, then there is little trace of Cumbria drawing any inspiration for round-shaft ornament from that area. Consistently this examination has shown that the round-shafts and their associated derivatives use locally popular patterns and, where those patterns have links outside Cumbria, they are across the Solway rather than to the south. It seems likely that the round-shafts of Cumbria, and their derivatives, are a development of an Anglian form of monument known in the area: this development was parallel to, but unconnected with, the use of round-shafts in the Peak District.
CHAPTER SEVEN

Cross-Shafts with Animal Ornament

The main interest of the seven shafts discussed separately in this chapter lies in their animal ornament. This grouping draws out the variety of zoomorphic ornament in the Viking period in Cumbria—a variety which has already been noticed in the contrast between the Trewhiddle-derived animal on Aspatria I and the Mammen animal of Workington IV. The beasts which are now to be examined all exhibit differing absorptions of the Jellinge style: at one extreme are the serpentine animals of Great Clifton and, at the other, the animals on Waberthwaite II which, but for small details, are almost totally Anglian in character. Once more a theme emerges which has been prominent in other chapters, the persistence of pre-Viking motifs in work of the tenth and eleventh centuries.

I

Great Clifton

Only the shaft of this cross now remains and there is no evidence for the ring-head inferred by Collingwood. Decoration is preserved almost completely on one broad face and in part on the other. One narrow edge has had most of its decoration removed whilst a similar fate has befallen over half of the carving on the remaining side.

Like Kirkby Stephen IV the block of sandstone from which the cross was shaped has been cut across the junction of two beds of differing coloured rock. One broad face is thus red whilst the other is predominantly white. Both Collingwood and Lidbetter suggested that this was a deliberate choice on the part of the sculptor and reflected a love of colour. Since, however, there is no attempt to exploit the colouring in the carving on the main face it seems much more likely that this cross provides evidence for the painting of the complete surface of the stone: any geological colour variation would thus be rendered invisible.

1. W.G. Collingwood 1897-1900a, 259.
2. ibid.
The ornament on the two narrow sides is sufficient, even in its worn and damaged state, to place this shaft within the Viking period. On the sinister side, in a favourable light, it is possible to distinguish a series of serpentine contoured beasts with head lappets. The arrangement is characteristic of the Jellinge style and can be seen on such a classic example as the Mammen horse-collar\(^1\) and on several Jellinge carvings in northern England, all exhibiting the same "wave-like" effect.\(^2\)

The dexter side has traces of contoured animals at both the top and the bottom of the surviving decoration. The very neat basket-work plait,\(^3\) with its central incised line, is not the usual type of interlace found on work of the Viking period. Similar delicate competence is, however, occasionally found in Yorkshire\(^4\) and Man\(^5\) at this date though it is much more characteristic of the Whithorn school, across the Solway, which flourished in the tenth century.\(^6\) A link northwards is likely.

The decoration on the face is quite extraordinary. At the base is a human figure enmeshed in snakes. Above is a tangle of ribbon-shaped animals whose writhing and contoured bodies interlock in two vertical rows. At least five animals are present. In the upper dexter corner a human figure rides on the back of a beast whose head was on the lost upper part of the shaft. Below

---

2. It is frequent amongst the unpublished material from York Minster: for a published example see R.J. Cramp 1965, plate VIII. In Cumbria the hogback, Plumbland II, shows the type and it is found again across the Pennines in the Tees valley at Aycliffe, Haughton le Skerne and Sockburn: see J. Stuart 1867, plate LXXXI; G. Baldwin Brown 1937, plate LXXV (I); T.D. Kendrick 1949, plate LXII.
3. Though note the errors in cutting where the medial line of an "under" strand is cut across the "over".
4. Barwick in Elmet, Bilton and Kirkby Wharfe: see W.G.Collingwood 1915, 136 fig. c, 140 fig. d, 206 fig. i.
5. Most relevant, since line-incised, is F.M.C. Kermode 1907, no.97. See also nos. 91 and 105.
6. This can best be judged from the photographs in J.R. Allen 1903, II, 480 ff.. For the date of the Whithorn sculptures see above p. 72.
the riding figure is the neck and head of another beast whose lower areas dissolve into plaitwork. Beneath this is a human-headed plait. Dominating this face, at the end of the other row, is a coiled beast which overlies another animal who is also being ridden by a human being. The head of a fifth beast can be seen above this riding figure.

On the reverse a similar arrangement of contoured animals in two rows can be seen. In the upper dexter corner is another riding figure astride a serpentine beast.

There is no good parallel in sculpture for the general effect created by the tangle of swelling beasts. Comparison, for example with a Jellinge shaft on Man¹ where broadening animal bodies emerge from plaitwork merely emphasises the lack of coherence in the Cumbrian sculpture. Perhaps the closest parallels come from York where two of the published shafts² have something of Great Clifton's tangle even though the beast types are of a different character. For the broad, spiralling and contoured animal on the main face there are parallels at Gainford³ and, on the Cumbrian side of the Pennines, on the gable-end of Gosforth VI, the so-called "warrior's tomb". Both of these are Jellinge animals. The general organisation of the ornament into two vertical rows has already been identified as a characteristic north-western arrangement.⁴

The head which terminates the spiralling animal was drawn by Collingwood as a mask with protruding snout and broad cheekbones⁵ With a slight variation in detail his drawing resembles a head on a sculpture from Chester which is linked to the lion-masks of southern English art.⁶ Fortunately it is not necessary to

1. P.M.C. Kermode 1907, no. 89.
2. Slabs from All Saints and St. Dennis: see R.J. Cramp 1967, plate VIII and W.G. Collingwood 1909, 165. Attention might also be drawn to the ornament of one of the Oseberg carvings illustrated in H. Shetelig 1920, figs. 34 and 35.
3. F.J. Haverfield and W. Greenwell 1899, no. XXXII.
4. See above p. 58.
5. W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig. 186.
adjudicate between a southern English source and a Borre-style origin\(^1\) for the Great Clifton head: Collingwood's drawing is wrong. As can be seen from the accompanying photograph the animal's head is seen in profile. Both lips carry lappets, the ear is round and hollowed. Though the detail is not clear it seems that there is a thin band passing up from the lower jaw, under the animal's body, emerging to join the beast above: this band appears to cut through the contoured outline of the main animal (see fig. \(^{22}\)).

![Fig. 22 Great Clifton beast](image)

All of these details are characteristic of Jellinge animals. The curled upper lip has already been treated\(^2\) but here we have a rather more complex form which is well paralleled in Scandinavia\(^3\) but is not so frequent on Northumbrian Jellinge sculptures.\(^4\) The lower beard-like lappet is analogous to those on the Jelling cup and, in English sculpture, to details on the hogback Aspatria VII, Haughton le Skerne in County Durham and the unpublished material

---

1. For Borre style material see the accompanying illustrations to the discussion in D.M. Wilson and O. Klindt-Jensen 1966, 87ff., especially plate XXXIIe which would provide the best parallel to Collingwood's interpretation.


4. York Minster has yielded several examples: for a published example see R.J. Cramp 1965, plate VIII. The type is also seen at Sockburn: see T.D. Kendrick 1949, plate LXII. See also below p. 154.
York Minster also provides parallels for the hollow ears on Jellinge-style animals and the contour-penetrating band assuming that this latter detail at Great Clifton has been correctly interpreted.

The zoomorphic ornament is then impressive but, once understood, poses less difficulties than the anthropomorphic elements in the decoration. There are three of these: the human-headed plait, the snake-riders and the bound figure.

The human head which terminates a scrap of plait on this face of the shaft is without parallel in Northumbrian sculpture. There is however, a possibly analogous treatment of the human form on a group of crosses from north-west Mercia (Ilam, Brailsford, Checkley and Sandbach) where the body is formed by interlace. Some of these are provided with legs but others are not and are thus close to the Great Clifton motif.

Elsewhere in insular sculpture the human head is used in abstract compositions, at least once in Scotland at St. Vigeans and in rather more anthropomorphic compositions in Ireland. None of these offer any illuminating parallel to this Cumbrian piece. Nor indeed is it particularly helpful to point to usage of the

1. For the Jelling cup see D.M. Wilson and O.Klindt-Jensen 1966, fig.43. For Haughton le Skerne see G.Baldwin Brown 1937, plate LXXV.
2. There is another unpublished example of this at Sinnington in Yorkshire. In certain lights the penetration appears to be of the semi-circular indentation form seen at Folkton and on unpublished material at Gilling, Kirkby Moorside, Sinnington and York Minster: for Folkton see T.D.Kendrick 1949, plate LXI. See also above p.118, 119.
3. G.F.Browne 1887, has the first full treatment. See also: G.le Blanc Smith 1906, 230ff; T.Pape 1947, 27ff; T.D.Kendrick 1949, 78ff. There may be one example from Yorkshire at Forcett but this is not as clear on the stone as it is in W.G. Collingwood 1907, 320, fig.d.
6. Ahenny, Banagher, Old Kilcullen and Monasterboice: see F.Henry 1933, fig.45 and pp.82-5 and F.Henry 1967, plate 78.
human head in Hiberno-Saxon,\cite{1} southern English\cite{2} and the late Irish\cite{3} illuminations or in Hiberno-Saxon metalwork of the eighth century.\cite{4} If this human-headed plait is to be explained in art-historical terms (and not as the product of a particular iconographical requirement\cite{5}) then it is to the sculpture of north-west Mercia in the Viking period that attention should be drawn.

The two snake riders on the main face and the single surviving example on the reverse are all identical in attitude. They are all expressions of what appears to be a local theme\cite{6} for they are clearly related to the more active figures astride the serpent on Gosforth VII and the figure who stands on the snake’s head on Penrith VI.\cite{7} All are drawn in apparent nakedness and seem to show a struggle with, or domination over, a chthonic being. Interpretation must depend upon the total iconography of this face of the shaft but since neither the Great Clifton figures nor their analogues are armed it seems most unlikely that we have here a representation of Sigurd as dragon killer, which appears so frequently in Viking art.\cite{8}

1. e.g., (a) Lindisfarne Gospels: see T.D. Kendrick et al. 1956, f. 211. (b) Book of Kells and Book of MacDurnan: see F. Henry 1967, plates 22, 25 and I. (c) MacRegol Gospels: see F. Henry 1965, plate 110. (d) St. Gall, Stiftsbibliothek Cod. 1395: see A. Goldschmidt 1928, plate 11A.

2. Vatican, Barb. Lat. 570, fol. 80a: see F. Wormald 1945, plate IIIa. See also the material assembled in F. Wormald 1971, 307.


5. As W. G. Collingwood 1897–1900, 259 when he quoted "early medieval symbol for the serpent of Eden". In W. G. Collingwood 1927, 158 he considered the possibility of Gunnar.


7. Outside the area there is a possible parallel to the Penrith stance at Guiseley in Yorkshire: see W. G. Collingwood 1915, 180 fig. h.

8. H. R. Ellis 1942 has a selection of illustrations of this material. See also: H. R. Ellis 1942; H. R. Ellis Davidson 1950, 124–6. E. Floss 1966 provides the best recent study.
The bound figure has been much discussed though earlier studies, notably that of Holmqvist, have clearly depended upon Collingwood's illustration. This, unfortunately, is not fully accurate since it fails to depict the snakes' heads which flank the human face.

Two major points emerge from a survey of bound figures in insular and Scandinavian art. The first is the popularity of the theme in Scandinavian art throughout the Viking period: examples can be quoted from work in the earliest Viking styles, through tenth-century art and into the Urnes phase. Such long-lasting popularity should suggest reservations to the case for deriving the bound Christ on the Jelling stone from insular art. The second point is that whilst all of the Northumbrian examples of bound men on sculpture date to the Viking period, they exhibit such a variety of both general conception and detailed treatment that it is impossible to view them as a unified group or to infer that they have either a common origin or represent the same theme.

Two groups of bound men from Northumbria can be immediately isolated and dismissed from this discussion. The first is the depiction of Weland the Smith on two shafts from Leeds and the second are the multiple groups of figures, bound together across

1. W. Holmqvist 1951.
2. Representative examples are: (a) (from an early phase) a brooch from Østnes, Bjarbøy and a carving from Oseberg: see J. E. Forssander 1943, fig. 36 and D. M. Wilson and O. Klintd-Jensen 1966, fig. 29. (b) Skaill brooches: see H. Shetelig 1920, fig. 321d; a wooden fragment from the Jelling tomb conventionally assigned to the early tenth century: see D. M. Wilson and O. Klintd-Jensen 1966, plate I and (for a differing date) S. Anjou 1934, and W. Holmqvist 1962, 165ff. (c) Incised stone from Aspo, Södermanland: see E. I. Seavers 1939, fig. 20.
3. As argued in W. Holmqvist 1951, though the naturalism may be an insular contribution.
4. W. G. Collingwood 1915, 213, fig. j2 and 217, fig. w. See also W. G. Collingwood 1915b. Doubts about this identification have been expressed by H. R. Ellis Davidson 1950, 129. With this Leeds depiction can be grouped the figure on the shrinetomb or hogback from Bedale: see W. H. Longstaffe 1847, 258.
the stomach, which are centred on the Tees valley. This latter group seem to represent ecclesiastics, to judge from the books with which some of them are equipped.

The other examples are not, however, so conducive to classification. On Gosforth I a bound figure, with snake near its head has both hands and feet fettered: the accompanying female serves to identify this as Loki. On Kirkby Stephen I a figure has both hands and feet fettered whilst on Brigham V and at Bolton le Sands in Lancashire a figure grasps the snake in which he is entwined with one hand and raises the other in triumph. On Penrith I a man has his leg caught in the plait below.

These miscellaneous examples of bound men, perhaps significantly concentrated in the Hiberno-Norse areas of northwestern England, provide parallels for individual details of the Great Clifton figure, such as the ring and bar binding of Leeds, Bedafe and Kirkby Stephen I - a detail also seen on the Jelling wooden piece and on the Jelling crucifixion - but provide little other illumination. The closest parallel is that provided by the local Brigham cross-head but even here there are possibly significant differences in clothing, hand position, the snake identification of the interlace and the head covering.

Doubts about the relevance of the other bound figures do not help identification of the Great Clifton example. And there are other problems. There is, firstly, the problem of whether the figure is a religious figure. He may be nimbed, (on the analogy of the nimb type seen at Burton in Kendal), but equally there is the possibility that the apparent nimb is either hair

1. Kirklevington: see W.G. Collingwood 1907, 353, fig.w; Gainford: see F.J. Haverfield and W. Greenwell 1899, nos. XXXI and XL; Aycliffe: see W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig. 97. To this group perhaps belongs Stanwick: see W.G. Collingwood 1907, 395, fig.o. For a possible interpretation see W.G. Collingwood 1907, 279.
2. VCH 1906, 266.
3. The figure at Forcett, (W.G. Collingwood 1907, 320, fig.d), could be an example and there is another possible one at Northotterington: see W.G. Collingwood 1907, 376, fig.i.
or some kind of hood. Lack of nimb would not rule out a Christian identification but serves to make it less conclusive.

Since there is no exact parallel elsewhere whose significance is clear from its setting, one has to consider if this scene is a variation of a theme known in a differing form elsewhere. Several possibilities can be suggested though none are completely convincing.

If the figure is not nimbed then it could be a representation of Loki or Gunnar, both of whom had unpleasant encounters with snakes when bound, encounters recognised elsewhere in Viking art in Scandinavia and on the Isle of Man. The lack of identifiable accessories (such as Loki's wife with the bowl which she carries at Gosforth or the harp which Gunnar holds at Hyllestad) guarantees that any such identification is fraught with difficulties. There is also the additional problem that we cannot know the precise form in which stories of Gunnar or Loki were known in north-west England. Thor's struggle with the world serpent (one episode of which is depicted at Gosforth) is another possible explanation of the scene as perhaps is the final struggle of Viðar.

A second possibility, again taking the figure to be non-saintly, involves stressing the placing of animal's heads on either side of the man's head. Miss Roe dealt in some detail

1. There is clearly no problem about this interpretation where nimb and hair are both present. On balance one would have expected any hood to have been shown continuing down the chest like that on the figure from Numburnholme: see G. Baldwin Brown 1937, plate XCII. Long hair can be given a terminal curl (see W.G. Collingwood 1915, 212, fig. j (1)-) but clearly need not be so distinctively represented.

2. See E.I. Seaver 1929; H.R. Ellis 1942; H.R. Ellis Davidson 1950, 126ff.; P.M.C. Kermode 1892-6; P.M. C. Kermode 1907, 178.


4. W.G. Collingwood 1915, 214 suggested the possibility of Viðar.

5. H.M. Roe 1945. Her group I is the most relevant.
with a group of depictions which show a man flanked by whispering beasts (a theme which bears upon studies of Sutton Hoo) and suggested a Scandinavian or Germanic background for its development. None of the examples which she quoted have snake-like characteristics—her case is that these are men dressed as animals—but it is possible that Great Clifton preserves this same theme in a highly stylised manner.

A third set of possibilities involve more Christian themes. Is this the Devil in Hell who is shown as bound in contemporary Anglo-Saxon art? Or is it a stylised representation of Daniel in the lion's den, though here without the worshipping stance normally taken by the animals?

The figure could, finally and most plausibly, represent Christ. As a possible explanation of the meaning of this face of the stone it could be suggested that the men struggling with chthonic beings are the men who struggle with the Devil and that the lower scene shows Christ in Hell in the moments before the triumphant gesture of victory which are shown at Brigham and Bolton le Sands. It may be that this Christian message was deliberately presented in a manner which would evoke such non-Christian ideas as the whispering beasts, bound men and the Ragnarök struggle with monsters. Such deliberate evocation finds its parallel at Gosforth.

This interpretation is, however, speculative. What is certain is that we have here an impressive Jellinge-style carving which also uses certain local themes. A date in the tenth century is likely.


2. Analogous stylisation is shown by the example illustrated in H.M. Roe 1945, 7 and (if relevant) the Reinstrup brooch and the Aspo stone: see R.L.S. Bruce-Mitford 1950, fig. 10 and E.I. Seaver 1929, fig. 20.

3. e.g., D. Telbot Rice 1952, plates 68 and 83a.

4. For the portrayal of the Devil as Dragon or Snake see the material assembled in M.E. Goldsmith 1970. The devil as snake appears as the base of numerous crucifixion scenes. For Christ trampling down evil as a snake see below p. 215. For the damned in hell tortured by snakes see D. Telbot Rice 1952, plate 89. Another possible interpretation is that of the struggle with the devil at the moment of death: see C. Rush 1968.
Cross Canonby I

The Viking-period dating of this shaft fragment is assured by the ring-encircled twist and the basket plait.\(^1\) The animal ornament confirms this dating.

On the main face are four animals which are not rendered very accurately in the published drawings of Calverley\(^2\) or Collingwood\(^3\). The animals, which are backward biting, are bipeds with one rear leg and a raised front paw. All are given tails and a curly ear-lappet. The two beasts who survive complete are given different types of head: the upper one has a twisted, lappeted lip whilst the lower one is given a tooth in the upper jaw and the lappet is reduced to an indentation of the upper line of the jaw. The upper beast has a collar and there are traces of contouring on both animals.

Kendrick has called these beasts "entirely and absolutely Hiberno-Saxon" since "the same creatures have already made their appearance in Northumbrian art of an earlier age"\(^4\); the animals on the Franks casket are quoted in support of this claim. The animals certainly have a traditional Anglian element in them though it would be dangerous to limit their genealogy to the Hiberno-Saxon area as that descriptive term is now understood: the crouched backward-turning beast has a long history in all insular art, as has already been seen in the discussion of the Aspatria animal.\(^5\) A glance at Haseloff's illustrations\(^6\) shows its frequent occurrence in the seventh and eighth centuries. In the ninth century the immediate forbears for the Cross-Canonby animals with raised paw can be found amongst the menagerie from Trewhiddle\(^7\) and examples of this style from northern

---

1. See above p. 100.
2. W.S. Calverley 1899, 106.
3. W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig. 142. The photographs in
   T.D. Kendrick 1949, plate LXV, though over-reduced for close examination, are much more valuable.
5. See p. 113.
6. G. Haseloff 1951, esp. figs. 8-17.
England. We have already seen, in the discussion of the Aspatria beast, that the Trewhiddle animal rarely occurs in pre-Viking sculpture but, like the four-footed version, biped derivatives of the ninth-century animal occur elsewhere in the tenth century. Cross Canonby does not stand alone in this respect.

Two other features of these animals seem to derive from earlier insular art. The first are the collars given to the beasts: there seems to be no background for this feature in Scandinavia but one is available in insular art since late Saxon metalwork of the eighth and, particularly, the ninth century furnishes several examples. Since the equivalent phase of ninth-century Irish art also uses collared beasts (and since

1. e.g., (a) the Burghead mount: see D.M. Wilson and C.E.Blunt 1961, plate XXIX.B. (b) strap-end from Coldingham: see D.M. Wilson 1964, fig.3. (c) strap-end from Whitby: see C.R.Peers and C.A.R. Radford 1943, fig. II, no.5. The equivalent art-phase in Ireland also has similar bipeds: see M.MacDermott 1955, 81-5.
2. See above p. 113.
4. See D.M. Wilson 1964, II and 33. There are good examples on the Strickland and Fuller brooches and on the Boulogne ring: see R.L.S. Bruce-Mitford 1956, plates XX,XXII and XXVI. For others see D.M. Wilson 1964, plate XI no.2 and C.R.Peers and C.A.R. Radford 1943, fig. 10 no.8 and fig. II no.2. St. Andrew's, Auckland provides a Northumbrian Anglian example in sculpture: see G. Baldwin Brown 1937, plate LXI.
5. M. MacDermott 1955, figs. 13 a and c.
the collars also occur on Manx animals which lack any Trewhiddle background\(^1\) it is perhaps dangerous to claim that the Cross-Canonby collars are specifically Anglian in origin. Certainly they are insular and not Scandinavian-derived.

The second detail is less certainly of insular origin. This is the curled ear-lappet; see (fig. 23). The Wamphrey slab

![Cross Canonby beast](image)

provides the closest parallel but the current dispute over the date of the Dumfriesshire carving renders the comparison valueless.\(^2\) Within the Viking period there is a similar handling of the lappet at Crathorne\(^3\) but both this Yorkshire carving and Cross Canonby may owe the detail to a pre-Viking treatment since the slab from Wensley\(^4\) already displays it in a clear Anglian context.

In other respects, however, these animals are not "entirely and absolutely Hiberno-Saxon" for both their contoured outlines and their head shapes show them to be products of Viking art. We have already seen that the heads differ in shape but the upper animal clearly has a lip lappet related to the type examined in the discussion of Great Clifton.\(^5\) Within Northumbria the very ugly head of this animal is best paralleled at York and Levisham.\(^6\) The lower animal has a much narrower nose, the lappet taking the form of a curling tip (like the Jellinge animals at Folkton and Leeds\(^7\)): its general rather leafy appearance is similar to that on the Sutton brooch.\(^8\) Whilst granting an insular element in the background of these Cross-Canonby animals, therefore, it would be foolish to ignore features which stem from Viking art.

1. P.M.C. Kermode 1907, nos. 100 and 103.
3. W.G. Collingwood 1907, 304, fig.e.
4. E. Bakka 1963, fig. 35.
5. See above p. 169 and 101.
7. W.G.Collingwood 1915,210,fig.f and W.G.Collingwood 1927,fig.140.
The animals on the narrow side of the shaft have no such claim to any Anglian background. The ornament appears to be a linked-up series of beasts arranged in the characteristic composition of "a frieze of elongated animal figures with bodies bent in a rhythmically waved line.\(^1\) This is the composition which was examined in the discussion of one of the narrow sides of Great Clifton.\(^2\) But, in contrast both to Great Clifton and to most of the Jellinge material quoted there, the Cross Canonby artist has stressed the swellings and bifurcations of the animals' bodies rather than their regular width. In this he inherits a legacy from an earlier phase of Scandinavian art:\(^3\) it is a feature which occurs elsewhere in work of the Jellinge style in Scandinavia.\(^4\)

The shape of the animal head on this side of the shaft is now difficult to determine (Collingwood's drawing\(^5\) is at least part restoration) but seems to have been of a type analogous to those at Gosforth and Aspatria, based upon a roundel and with a small, pointed ear with heart-shaped opening. The most interesting feature is the incised eyebrow which ends in a curl at the junction of neck and head and apparently continues forward beyond the eye. A similar type of brow is found on a hogback from Brompton\(^6\) in the Tees valley and, further south, in work which is possibly of the Viking period.\(^7\) The background for this detail is far from certain however: the Thames mount\(^8\) and the St. Ninian's Isle spoon\(^9\) might suggest that it is insular but

---

1. H. Shetelig 1920, 429.
2. See above p. 167.
4. See, for examples, D.M. Wilson and O. Klindt-Jensen 1966, plate XXXIIId and e. The closest parallel for the Cross Canonby treatment is the brooch illustrated in H. Shetelig 1920, fig. 311.
5. W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig. 142.
6. F.J. Haverfield and W. Greenwell 1899, no. LVIII.
7. Deerhurst and Gloucester: see G. Baldwin Brown 1925, fig. 82 and R.A. Smith 1925, fig. 19.
against these must be set the head-post from Gokstad.¹

Like the Great Clifton shaft this fragmentary carving is also probably of tenth-century date, displaying on two adjacent faces the type of variety possible within insular Jellinge work.

III

Brigham III

Only two faces of this shaft² now remain, and these only fragmentarily. On the broad face, above the two lines marking the bottom of the panel there are traces of a contoured ribbon-beast bound up in broad, line-incised, interlace. Similar broad interlace is found on the narrow edge together with foliate elements.

The contoured animal overwhelmed by course interlace is a familiar insular Jellinge beast³ who can be closely paralleled in Yorkshire at Otley⁴ and Folkton⁵—where beasts are similarly overwhelmed—and at Middleton,⁶ Ellerburn⁷ and Pickering⁸ where ribbon-animals have been given contoured outlines.

Thanks to the mutilation of the decoration it is difficult to reconstruct the lay-out of the panel⁹ and the shape of the animal. In particular it is difficult to be certain of the function of the spiral in the lower sinister corner (see fig. 24).

---

3. T.D. Kendrick 1949, 87-97, in his discussion of English Jellinge frequently uses terms like "Heavily vigorous": such a term is justified for English Jellinge but not so for the Scandinavian manifestations of the style.
4. W.G. Collingwood 1915, 228, figs. aa and cc.
5. W.G. Collingwood 1909, 197, fig.a.
7. T.D. Kendrick 1949, plate LXIV.
8. W.G. Collingwood 1909, 381, fig.b.
9. Thus the animal must have been severely contorted to twist up the shaft, nor can it be certain that the contoured body,
It could be a curling back leg (like that of the Levisham beast\(^1\)) with a well-marked hip above and curling tail below. Equally it could be a spiral hip because this characteristic feature of Jellinge and later Viking art is frequently shown as almost external to the body.\(^2\) Yet again it could merely be a spiral offshoot of a type familiar in other examples of Jellinge art.\(^3\) Despite these doubts as to interpretation, however, all the details fit with the Jellinge phase.

The narrow face, by contrast, draws heavily upon ornamental motifs evolved during the Anglian period. The line-incised knotwork (also used on the main face) was well established in the Anglian period\(^4\) and continued into the tenth century.\(^5\) The treatment given to it here, in which the interlace is formed of abutting lengths of broad strand is particularly popular in the north-west of England\(^6\) and has analogues in the treatment accorded interlace on the Isle of Man.

9. (continued from previous page) apparent well-marked hip, spiral and the "tail" in the corner are all parts of the same animal.

1. T.D. Kendrick 1949, plate LXVI.

2. Characteristic examples are provided by the Ödeshög silver brooch, the Mammen die and the Skail brooches: see D.M. Wilson and O. Klindt-Jensen 1966, plate XXXIIIc and e, figs. 45 and 53. See also D.M. Wilson 1961, 22 for the Canterbury disc brooch. For the Mammen style Odd's cross at Braddan see D.M.Wilson and O.Klindt-Jensen 1966, fig.55. If the Brigham feature is interpreted in this way the apparent hip would belong to a beast other than the contoured animal and the "tail" would be his leg (see fig.24 ).

3. e.g., the York scabbard chape: see T.D. Kendrick 1949, plate LIX fig.3; Manx crosses: see P.M.C*Kermode 1907, nos. 105, 108 and 109.


5. e.g., North Frodingham,Lancaster, Aspatria, Collingham and Beckermet: see W.G. Collingwood 1927, figs.151,171,178,188 and 192.

6. e.g., Appleby hogback, Dearham I, Kirkby Stephen I, Muncaster I, Stanwix.
In the lower dexter corner are two foliate elements, a loose knob-like berry and a lance-shaped leaf with two berries at its base. This type of leaf was a very popular one in both sculpture and manuscripts in Northumbria during the Anglian period.

The snake-like appearance resulting from the drilled holes in the berries may be intended to give the leaf a zoomorphic appearance but, since the same drilling is found on Anglian scrolls at Crayke and Carlisle, it may be simply a traditional embellishment of the leaf type.

The knob in the lower dexter corner is derived from either a berry or a leaf. As parallels may be quoted the Yorkshire sculptures at High Hoyland and Collingham. Neither of these examples are closely dateable though Collingham seems to be of late ninth or early tenth-century date and High Hoyland is probably Anglian. High Hoyland is particularly interesting as

1. e.g., Cundall, Easby, Rothbury, Ruthwell, Jarrow: see W.G. Collingwood 1927, figs. 32, 53, 94; D.M.Wilson 1960, plate LIII; R.J. Cramp 1965, plate 9.
4. T. Sheppard 1939 fig. VIIIa.
5. Carlisle II.
6. If it were a pellet then it would not be joined to the interlace strand - even the pellet at Gainford (F.J.Haverfield and W. Greenwell 1899, no.LIV) which is squashed right against the strand, is still separate from it. It could be the swollen end of an interlace strand (compare Stonegrave: see W.G. Collingwood 1907, 400 fig. 6 or Burnsall: see W.G.Collingwood 1915, 149 figs. i and g or Irton) but (a) the only visible non-continuing strand leads to the snake-like leaf (b) the knob is joined to the strand it abuts (c) the foliate origin is convincing for the snake-like leaf and there is no cause to seek a different origin for this feature.
7. W.G. Collingwood 1915, 158 and 184 fig.a.
the lateral arms of the cross-head preserve the scroll basis of the berry leaf attached to the interlace on the upper member.¹

This narrow face thus mixes knotwork and scroll elements. This conflation of the two ornamental motifs had already taken place in Northumbrian sculpture of the Anglian period² though, with the possible exceptions of Ilkley and High Hoyland³ the scroll remains the dominant element in the mixture: dominance of interlace over scroll, such as we have at Brigham, comes in the Viking period.⁴

There is thus a perfectly plausible evolution for the foliate knotwork of the Viking period from the knotted foliage of the Anglian period. It is doubtful if the art of other areas and other media needs to be invoked to explain this evolution though it is perhaps relevant to note that a Northumbrian manuscript of the late eighth/early ninth century has a foliate termination to knotwork.⁵ It must be admitted that ninth-century Trewhiddle art is full of knotwork with leafy ends,⁶ but these metalwork examples are all on small simple knots and the same is true of the foliate knots in tenth-century Irish metalwork which derive from them.⁷ There is no reason to assume that any of

¹. Assuming that the lateral and upper arms are parts of the same cross-head - an assumption justified both by the identity of arris edge and by the measurements of the fragments.
². E.g., Irton I. For non-Cumbrian examples at Hexham, Stamfordham, Ilkley, Masham and Hoddom see W.G. Collingwood 1927, figs. 39, 41, 63, 113 and C.A.R. Radford 1953, plate IIIb.
³. See note 7 above, p. 182.
⁴. For Yorkshire examples at Kirkby Wharfe and Barwick in Elmet see W.G. Collingwood 1915, 136 and 206.
⁷. M. MacDermott 1957, 190.
these types lie behind the evolution of the foliate interlace of Viking-period sculpture in Northumbria. They merely demonstrate that mixtures of foliage and interlace were known in other media at the time they were evolving in Anglian and Viking sculpture.¹

Like Cross Canonby I, therefore, Brigham III has a strong Anglian element in its decoration though this element is not found in the zoomorphic decoration. Another sculpture from Brigham, however, does show an Anglian traditionalism present in the animal ornament at the site. This is examined in the next section.

IV

Brigham IX

There are several examples of Northumbrian crosses standing in their original sockets² but almost all of these are undecorated and either pyramidal or block shaped³. Decorated sockets, such as the Brigham example, are rare.

---

1. From Northumbria the crosier-drop from Hoddom provides a close parallel on an object which has links with Irish metalwork but may have been made in the area: see M. MacDermott 1957, 187. Southern English manuscripts of the Winchester school have acanthus foliate motifs: see F. Wormald 1945, plates Ia, VIIb and VIIIc and D. Talbot Rice 1952, plate 57b. These manuscript examples are quite distinct (both in general type and the particular leaf form) from the Brigham sculpture.

2. Among others there are examples at Sandbach, Halton, Bewdastle, Whalley and Aspatria. There are also sockets which have lost their shafts at Lindisfarne, Whitby, Ecclesfield etc.

3. Both the block-shaped and pyramidal types can be defined as sockets whose height is as great as, or greater than, their width. Pyramidal types have sloping sides. Note that some of these undecorated sockets have been shaped, presumably because they protruded above the ground: for examples from Lindisfarne and Whitby see C.R. Peers 1925, plate LV and C.R. Peers and C.A.R. Radford 1943, plate XVIIIc.
In shape the Brigham socket is closely linked to Beckermet St. John VII and is quite distinct both from the Anglian-period decorated, pyramidal, type of St. Andrew's Auckland and Lindisfarne and the similarly shaped group of later period from West Yorkshire. Again, the Welsh and Irish decorated sockets are quite distinct. Though the evidence is clearly not very substantial it is enough to suggest that the sockets at Brigham and Beckermet represent a local fashion.

The carving on the stone is now rather worn but various types of zoomorphic ornament can be distinguished on the top and on three of the sides. It would appear that the fourth side was never ornamented, suggesting perhaps that it was placed against a wall or in some such position where it was not visible.

The top and one of the side faces are decorated with knotwork, terminating in beast heads. The knotwork, though irregular and thus more analogous to Viking-period rather than Anglian treatment, is not bifurcated. The animal's heads find their closest parallels in such work as the grave-slab from St. Denis York and the shaft from Pickering or, in metalwork, the Jellinge animals of the British Museum casket-plates.

1. G. Baldwin Brown 1937, plate LXI. A socket from Bakewell can also be classed with this: see R.E. Routh 1938, 13.
2. C.R. Peers 1925, plate LIV, fig. 4.
4. V.E. Nash-Williams 1950, nos. 1, 28, 206, 212, 186 and 234 – all of the block or pyramid type.
5. F. Henry 1964, 15.
6. As do the West Yorkshire group, which are also of the Viking period.
7. Neither W.S. Calverley 1883, 211 nor Collingwood in W.S. Calverley 1899, 72 show any split bands in their drawings. Note that the knotwork on the edge is more complex than that on the top.
9. J. Brøndsted 1924, fig. 144.
10. D.M. Wilson 1964, fig. 53. Also relevant are the heads on the Canterbury disc-brooch: see D.M. Wilson 1964, fig. 14 h.
The ornament on the other two edges confirms the Viking-period dating indicated by the rest of the decoration. Equally important, it clearly depends to a great extent on an Anglian tradition of animal drawing.

The most interesting face is that labelled D in Collingwood's drawing. Though very worn (and thus open to discussion in interpretation) it seems clear that what survives is the rear of a crouching animal, with spiral hip, rudimentary tail and a single rear leg with toes. The eye of faith can even discern a contour line to the body. It is not clear whether the beast is backward- or forward-looking.

This Brigham animal is thus a crouching biped and can be classed with similar beasts from Aspatria and Cross Canonby as an example of a Viking-period usage of a motif long established in insular art, though rarely making its appearance on crosses until a post-Anglian date. The open spiral hook at the hip and the double outline have already been examined as Viking-age characteristics at an earlier point in this chapter. In a sense therefore Collingwood was right to describe this animal as "quasi-Jellinge" but basically wrong in going on to assert that it had "no tokens of Anglian influence in the design".

A similar Anglian ancestry can be claimed for the other animal on the socket. This beast has a small head which is flanked by splayed forelegs; the body dissolves into knotwork. This type of zoomorphic ornament was well known in pre-Viking England. Animals whose lower parts dissolve into interlace were established in Mercia during the eighth century and can also be

1. W.S. Calverley 1899, 72.
2. Compare this description with that of W.S. Calverley 1883, 212.
3. See the discussion of Aspatria I and Cross-Canonby I on pp. 112, 113 above.
5. The description given by W.S. Calverley 1883, 211-2 makes wild claims for mythological significance.
6. e.g., Gandersheim casket: see D.M. Wilson 1964, plate Ia and p. 12.
found in sculpture of pre-Viking date from the same area.\(^1\) It is presumably from Mercia that this type of animal entered the Northumbrian sculptural repertoire during the ninth century.\(^2\) Amongst this Anglian art there are animals whose two paws flank a head seen in plan (the arrangement seen at Brigham): the Gandersheim casket\(^3\) provides the best example though similar beasts can be found in other media in southern England.\(^4\) The Gandersheim type of animal had entered Northumbrian sculpture before the Viking invasions.\(^5\) This decoration on the Brigham socket is, in fact, a piece of traditional Anglian design and there is no difficulty in finding similar continued use of the motif on other carvings of the Viking period at Gloucester\(^6\) and at Sproxton in Leicestershire.\(^7\)

As with so many of Cumbria's sculptures of the Viking period therefore a close analysis reveals the extent to which artists were still using traditional motifs. In this connection it is interesting to notice that Collingwood,\(^8\) whilst dismissing thoughts of such traditionalism in this piece, noted "the deep and smooth chiselling, unusual if not unique in its execution".

---

1. e.g., (a) Breedon: see A.W. Clapham 1928, plate XXXVb; (b) Castor: see R.A. Smith 1925, fig. 12; (c) Hedda's tomb, Peterborough: see R.A. Smith 1925, fig. 4 - though with some reservations about accuracy; (d) Sandbach: see C.A.R. Radford 1957, plate 3.
2. e.g., Ilkley and Thornhill: see W.G. Collingwood 1915, 186 fig. a and 189 fig. e and W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig. 68.
4. e.g., Vatican, Barb. Lat. 570: see F. Wormald 1945, plate IIIa. See also the ninth-century ring illustrated in D.M. Wilson 1964, fig. 48.
5. Melsonby: see W.G. Collingwood 1907, 368 fig. c; for photograph see L. Stone 1955, plate 16b. The bipeds of e.g., Rothbury, Ruthwell or Jarrow have been excluded since they do not dissolve into interlace.
7. G. Baldwin Brown 1937, plate CV.
8. J.S. Calverley 1899, 75.
Wabertonwaite II

When one considers the size of this monument and the variety and interest of its ornament it is surprising that it has received little detailed study. The cross has weathered badly in the course of the present century and this may partly explain the neglect. The present west face carries a full-length panel of knotwork which has several intriguing features. The date of the cross is signalled by the use of bifurcation and a loose ring, both sure signs of the Viking period when used on sculpture in Northumbria, and this chronological horizon is further supported by the way in which knotwork is laid out in two parallel vertical rows for this has already been distinguished as a popular ornamental arrangement in the north-western area during the tenth and eleventh centuries.

The most intriguing feature of this face are the "buttons" which decorate the junctions of the interlace at two points. They seem to be unparalleled in insular sculpture but there is some justification for tracing their origin to a decorative taste seen in Scandinavian metalwork and woodwork. It is the woodwork which provides the best parallels on various of the Oseberg carvings where decorative silver knobs are applied to zoomorphic and knotwork decoration. On many of these the silver nails almost replace the carvings as the centre of interest—a process which achieved its ultimate expression on the Borre sledge-pole. Shetelig has commented that such silver nails are typical of the tendency of Norwegian taste in the ninth century.

1. The only (relatively) extended study is that of W.G. Collingwood 1925. This provides the best drawings of the shaft.
2. See spiral-scroll school discussion on p. 58 above.
Metalwork does not provide such relevant material. Both in England and in Scandinavia the ninth century saw the use of decorative bosses and rivets, linked by bands, to delimit areas of ornament. This system continued into the tenth century in England, in Scandinavia and in the Irish sea area but, whilst this material usefully demonstrates a taste for decorative bosses within a Viking-period context, it is not directly relevant to Waberthwaite since the boss is a delimiting element rather than one applied to the ornament.

These bosses are thus not out of place in tenth-century Viking Northumbria but probably represent an ornamental type adopted from another medium. What little woodwork survives suggests that this was the source of inspiration; like these wooden prototypes the Waberthwaite bosses may have stood out from the interlace in a different colour.

The knotwork on the narrow edges contains bifurcating strands and possibly, though Collingwood does not show it, traces of the appliqué buttons. The pattern is Romilly Allen's no. 568 which is found in pre-Scandinavian sculpture in Northumbria on a number of occasions as well as in the later period. It thus

4. See the early oval tortoise brooches.
6. The Orton Scar and Virginia penannular brooch (R.J. Cramp 1964, plate I) should perhaps be excepted as the animals burrow beneath the bosses.
7. Though it is not suggested, of course, that the inspiration is direct from Oseberg but rather from post-Oseberg woodwork.
9. See discussion above p.155.
has little chronological significance, though its use on the earlier vine-scroll shaft from the same site may not be entirely fortuitous.

The decoration on the lower panel of the east face uses the Stafford knot, Romilly Allen's no. 597, arranged in two circles. There is a vague parallel for this from Greens, Carnwath, in Lanarkshire. Both could represent the adoption of a cross-head pattern onto the shaft. We have, however, already seen that the running Stafford knot is virtually limited to Cumbria in insular sculpture: the Waberthwaite ornament is best interpreted as an idiosyncratic version of the main motif of the spiral-scroll school.

The shaft is thus a work of the Viking period. The animal ornament on the present eastern face, however, is strongly Anglian in type and only small details betray the influence of Scandinavian art styles. The strength of this Anglian element can be vividly illustrated by the fact that Brøndsted thought that the stone was Anglian in date.

The composition of the upper panel is shown by Collingwood as two confronting birds, their heads turned backwards, with their lower parts dissolving into knotwork. Comparison with the photographs published by Calverley, which show the stone's condition at the end of the nineteenth century, seems to confirm that the two animals are backward-looking. These earlier photographs offer no support, however, for the restoration of the heads as those of birds. Zoological and comparative-artistic arguments are the only justifications for this.

In discussing the dissolving animal of the Brigham socket stone we have already touched upon some of the material which furnishes the Anglian background for the confronting animals of Waberthwaite. The dissolving winged beast is, in fact, more

3. i.e. the popular type seen on such Viking-period examples as Ellerburn and Middleton in Yorkshire: see W.G.Collingwood 1927, figs. 138-9.
frequently encountered in the art of eighth and early ninth-century Mercia\(^1\) than the type which yielded the Brigham animal: it is however sufficient to refer to the Gandersheim casket\(^2\) and Hedda's tomb\(^3\) to establish the ultimate source of the Waberthwaite motif. But it is not necessary to assume that Waberthwaite is directly indebted to Mercia because there is good evidence that Anglian Northumbria was not isolated from southern English art\(^4\) and the crosses at Ilkley\(^5\) and at Thornhill\(^6\), show the confronting birds composition already established in Northumbria on Anglian shafts.\(^7\) There is thus nothing Viking about this panel though, equally, it would evoke some response in a Viking whose own metalwork art made a great deal of the facing-birds motif.\(^8\)

Collingwood's\(^9\) drawing of the panel below the birds is again slightly inaccurate when compared with Calverley's\(^10\) photograph. The neck of the animal is much more curved and the point where

---

1. For this art see: R.A. Smith 1924; J. Brøndsted 1924; T.D. Kendrick 1938, 164ff.; E. Bakka 1963.
3. R.A. Smith 1925, fig.4. There must be reservations about the restorations suggested in this drawing.
5. W.G. Collingwood 1915, 186, fig.a.
6. W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig. 68.
7. At Jedburgh this Mercian motif is fused with Northumbrian scroll-birds: for photograph see G. Baldwin Brown 1927, plate XLIX and, for dating, C.A.R. Radford 1956 and R.J. Cramp 1962, II (the latter dating is the more acceptable). I can see no trace on the stone of the everted wing tip which is quoted as a mark of southern influence in D.M. Wilson 1964, 12.
8. e.g., J. Petersen 1928, 34, 35, 42 and 51c.
10. W.S. Calverley 1899, plate facing 275.
Like the confronting birds this animal has a clear ancestry in Anglian art. An immediate demonstration of this can be made by comparing him with the beast on the Ixworth brooch\(^1\) which has a similar curved neck, puffed out chest and raised paw. This brooch belongs to that same Mercian art group which also used the confronting-birds motif.\(^2\) Bakka has recently traced the evolution of this beast in southern English art from the stage represented by the Ormside bowl\(^3\) and his account is preferable to that proposed by Brøndsted.\(^4\) Ninth-century manuscripts\(^5\) and sculpture\(^6\) in southern England provide good parallels for the stance. This is not to deny that some Northumbrian scroll-beasts do have something of the same alert pose but these examples which can be quoted seem to be linked to this southern art.\(^7\) As was the case with the confronted birds

---

2. For references see above, p. 191.
4. J. Brøndsted 1924 who traced it from a scroll beast but without making the distinctions in scroll types which is so valuable in Bakka's treatment.
6. Wroxeter and Cropthorne: see G. Baldwin Brown 1937, plates LXXIII and CVI.
7. e.g., Croft, Easby and Ilkley in Yorkshire: see W.G. Collingwood 1907, 307 fig.d, 314 fig.e and W.G.Collingwood 1915, 186 fig.a.
there is good evidence for the presence of the once-Mercian animal in Northumbrian art before the Viking period. It is clear from the examples quoted, therefore, that all of the features of this Waberthwaite animal are to be found in earlier English art and there is thus no need to seek its derivation in the analogous animal tradition of Scandinavia. Continued English usage in a Viking-period context can be seen on such well-known carvings as Middleton and Derby.

Though the animal's ancestors are Anglo-Saxon it is a product of the Viking period and some of the details in the drawing reflect the art of Scandinavia and the art developed in the colonies. The irregular knotwork issuing from the lappet behind the neck is typical of work of this period in the north. So too is the crescent-shaped nick in the outline of the neck where the knotwork strand passes behind the animal: this is a detail which can be exactly paralleled in Yorkshire at Folkton, and Gilling.

1. e.g., Melsonby and Masham in Yorkshire: see L. Stone 1955, plate 16b and W.G. Collingwood 1907, 365. Note also Crofton in Yorkshire and Closeburn in Dumfriesshire: see G. Baldwin Brown 1937, plate LXXXVII (?) a re-touched photograph) and R.J. Cramp 1961, plate V.

2. Thus the raised paw can be seen at Melsonby, the bird face at Crofton and Wroxeter. D.M. Wilson and O. Klindt-Jensen 1966, have argued that the animal type seen on the Jelling stone or the Bamberg casket, develops from Scandinavian prototypes. This argument is contrary to that of Bondsted who saw them as Anglian-derived. All that is relevant here is to note that, though all features can be seen in earlier English art, the Waberthwaite animal would also answer to tastes which can be seen in Scandinavian art of the period.

3. A.L. Binns 1956, fig. 9.
5. e.g., Gainford: see F.J. Haverfield and W. Greenwell 1899, nos. XXXI and XXXII; Gloucester: see D.M. Wilson and O. Klindt-Jensen 1966, plate XXXIX.
7. W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig.143 (though the detail is not shown in this drawing).
and on unpublished material from Sinnington, Kirby Moorside, Ellertburn and York Minster. It has already been noticed in the discussion of the Workington Mammen beast where attention was drawn to its frequent occurrence in Scandinavian art.

Given the variety of ornament and the fact that so much of the shaft has survived, dating of this shaft ought to be easier than with many others. Collingwood, recognizing the extent of Anglian influence in the decoration, argued for an early date within the Viking period and this is certainly attractive. Yet we cannot be sure of the limits of date at which extant Anglian carvings, or more mobile art, could provide inspiration. A tenth-century date would nevertheless best fit both the Anglian survival and the Jellinge touches.

VI

Glassonby

When fully extracted from the wall in which it had been placed, sufficient carving remained to indicate a Viking-period dating for this shaft. Unfortunately the stone is now lost and Collingwood's drawing is our only source of information about its decoration.

What was once its narrow edge carried a T-pattern. The closest type to this in Romilly Allen's classification of such double patterns is his no. 906 which only occurs elsewhere in Northumbria in the Grovesner Museum at Chester.

In view of the variation in the relationship between the two

1. See above, p. 118.
3. W.G. Collingwood 1901, gives full details and suggests that the stone may have come from nearby Addingham.
5. J.R. Allen 1895, 155. It also occurs in north Wales on three shafts: see V.E. Nash-Williams 1950, nos. 1, 38 and 190. The latter two have other apparent links with Cumbria.
rows, however, it is probably better interpreted as a double row of his no. 899,\footnote{1} reflecting once more that north-western taste for parallel strips of vertical ornament.\footnote{2}

The T-pattern has been claimed by Collingwood\footnote{3} as characteristic of the tenth century and this view has been shared by other writers.\footnote{4} A full survey of the sculptural usages in Northumbria, Man, Scotland and Wales confirms the belief that (in all of those areas) T-patterns do not occur before, at earliest, the later part of the ninth century. In areas settled by the Vikings they are characteristically associated with ornament betraying influence from Scandinavian art. There is an additional negative indication of this late dating in Northumbrian sculpture because T-patterns are not found associated with organic vine-scroll or good figure drawing. In other media, Viking art of both the homeland and the colonies shows the popularity of the pattern during the period.\footnote{5}

But the pattern is not an invention of the Viking period. Metalworkers in England\footnote{6}, Ireland\footnote{7} and Scotland\footnote{8} had all used it

\begin{itemize}
  \item \footnote{1}{J.R. Allen 1903, II, 334.}
  \item \footnote{2}{See discussion above p.\footnote{5} and compare the three rows of such ornament at Elrig: see R.S.G. Anderson 1923, 18.}
  \item \footnote{3}{W.G. Collingwood 1927, 63.}
  \item \footnote{4}{e.g., H. Shetelig 1925, 2; V.E. Nash-Williams 1950, 51,67 and 177.}
  \item \footnote{5}{e.g., (a) the Scandinavian material illustrated in J.Petersen 1928, fig.37 no.5 and M. Stenberger 1947, plate 174, no. 17; (b) the handle from Jarlshof in J.R.C. Hamilton 1956, plate XXIX; (c) Irish metalwork illustrated in A.Wahr 1932, plate 74, T. Kettle 1941, 124, M. MacDermott 1957, plate LVI and F. Henry 1970, plate 44.}
  \item \footnote{6}{e.g., the Egbert shrine mounting or the Ingleton sword: see T.D. Kendrick 1937, plate LXXVIII, fig.D and D.M. Wilson 1964, plate XXIX, no.65. Note also the manuscript example illustrated in D.M. Wilson 1964, plate V.}
  \item \footnote{7}{e.g., Moylough belt reliquary: see F. Henry 1965, plate 34; the material from Ballinderry Crannog no. 2 and Lagore is probably of pre-Viking date and includes several T-patterns: see H.O'N. Hencken 1942, figs. 22 and 24 and H.O'N. Hencken 1950, p.60, and figs. 6,97 and 98.}
  \item \footnote{8}{bowl from St. Ninian's Isle, A.C. O'Dell 1959, plate XXIXb.}
\end{itemize}
before the tenth century as had sculptors in Ireland\(^1\) and southern England.\(^2\) This point requires some stress: the reason for assigning an unassociated fragment of sculpture decorated with T-pattern to the Viking period when it occurs in Northumbria is not because the pattern as such belongs solely to that milieu or period\(^3\) but because all those examples of Northumbrian sculptured T-patterns which have associated ornament seem to belong to this date.\(^4\)

The evidence thus confirms Collingwood's view that this is a pattern characteristic of the Viking period but there seems no reason to follow him in restricting its employment to the tenth century and thus excluding its use in the eleventh. The evidence of the cross at Disley,\(^5\) with its Ringerike elements, of an association with an eleventh-century inscription in Wales\(^6\) and with Urnes art in Ireland\(^7\) are good reasons for rejecting such a restriction. Equally his argument that the pattern "was brought in from Ireland"\(^8\) is not supported by the evidence of its distribution in England for it is rather more common in areas like Yorkshire, Staffordshire and Cheshire than it is in Cumbria where the linguistic evidence for Hiberno-Norse settlements is at its strongest.

\(^1\) A slab from Clonmacnois: see P. Lionard 1961, fig. I, no. 14 with comments on pp. 109 and 157.
\(^2\) Cropthorne: see G. Baldwin Brown 1937, plate CVI.
\(^3\) It is sufficient to note such diverse examples as the Hornhausen sculpture and a comb assigned to the Carolingian period from the Frisian terpen: C.A.R. Radford 1942a, plate IV and A. Roos 1962, 18 and plate XIX no. 4.
\(^4\) R.B.K. Stevenson 1956, 126 writes, with reference to a similar point, "It is not that these motifs are now introduced but that they now become very fashionable".
\(^5\) J.R. Allen 1895, 147.
\(^6\) V.E. Nash-Williams 1950, no. 303.
\(^7\) Disert O'Dea: see H.S. Crawford 1926, plate VIII.
\(^8\) W.G. Collingwood 1901, 291.
Collingwood's drawing\(^1\) shows that the animal ornament on this shaft was probably a different type to those examined so far in this chapter. It belongs to the category which Brøndsted labelled as the Anglian great beast\(^2\). Unfortunately there was not enough of the animal surviving to evaluate the relative contributions to his make-up of Northumbrian scroll-beasts, Mercian or Scandinavian animals: the small head does, however, seem to reflect a Scandinavian tendency which can be seen from the period of Oseberg. Similar beasts, backward-turned and bound in the course, irregular knotwork of insular sculptural Jellinge can be quoted at Folkton\(^3\) and Gainford.\(^4\) The ring around the neck is clearly derived from Scandinavian art and is a familiar feature of Jellinge and the later phases of Viking animal ornament.\(^5\) Similarly the crude pelta which appears to spring from one of the knotwork strands near the beast's lower jaw is exactly paralleled in Jellinge carvings both on Man\(^6\) and in England.\(^7\)

---

1. W.G. Collingwood 1901, 290.
2. J. Brøndsted 1924, 192.
4. F.J. Haverfield and W. Greenwell 1899, nos. XXXI and XXXII.
6. F.M.C. Kermode 1907, no. 108.
7. See Waberthwaite II. Yorkshire examples are those at Gilling, Sinnington and Levisham: see W.G. Collingwood 1907, 323 fig. d and 387, fig. f; D.M. Wilson and O. Klindt-Jensen 1966, plate XLIIb.
The details of the drawing of the small head are not very clear but the lower lip appears to have a backward springing lappet of the type seen at Great Clifton.\(^1\) The upper lip presents even more of a problem since it could be a mutilated lip-lappet or, alternatively, the projection might be forward-pointing ears of the type seen on one of the Manx stones\(^2\) and in Scandinavian art, mainly in the Mammen and post-Mammen phases.\(^3\)

This animal thus has many of the characteristics of insular Jellinge but some of the details seem to owe more to the succeeding stages of Viking art: unfortunately none of these details are particularly clear in the only illustration now surviving.

The reverse of the shaft was even more worn and it is impossible to be dogmatic about reconstruction. There need, however, have been only a single human figure since a reconstruction taking the human face as central on the shaft would yield a width of over 12" - both a reasonable width for a main face and sufficient to allow ample room for the rear part of the animal on the opposite face.

This figure has been identified as a saint with a nim\(^4\). This cannot be assumed. The difficulty is similar to that faced in dealing with the figure at Great Clifton, that is the difficulty of distinguishing between hair and nim\^\(b\) in the, at times, crude figure drawing of the Viking period. There is less difficulty in recognising the full-circle nimb\(s\) of this period\(^5\) than the half-length type ending at ear level - the type which is relevant for this stone. Examples of this latter type can be seen

---

2. F.M.C. Kermode 1907, no. 93.
3. D.M. Wilson and O. Klindt-Jensen 1966, figs.58,62a,63a-e and plates XXXVIa,XLIX,LII,XLVIa,LXXI.
5. Such as those from Burton-in-Kendal I or Finghall: see W.G. Collingwood 1907, figs. 195 and 124.
at Kirkdale and Kilmorie in Northumbria\(^1\) and, further north, at Elgin:\(^2\) in all three of these examples the nimb curves into the head. At Glassonby there is no such curve and it is just as likely that this is a cruder version of a hair-style such as that sported by the men from York\(^3\) as it is to assume that it is a sharply cut-off version of the Kirkdale type of nimb.\(^4\) At Kirkby Wharfe in Yorkshire\(^5\) and Neston in Cheshire\(^6\) a similar type of head-covering has more claim to be a nimb since the figures are plainly types which should be so equipped but there is no such associative information at Glassonby. The figure on the shaft from Leeds\(^7\), who at first seems such a promising non-saintly parallel, renders little help: there is no reason to assume that he is Sigurd\(^8\) and he might well be St. John.\(^9\) Glassonby, then, presents several problems which will not be solved until the carving re-emerges.

**VII**

**Kirkby Stephen V**

Yet another style of animal drawing, on yet another lost

---

1. W.G. Collingwood 1927, figs. 126 and 113.
2. J.R. Allen 1903, III, fig. 137.
3. G. Baldwin Brown 1937, plate LX.
4. See also P.M.C. Kermode 1907, no. 101 where a cross-marked (and therefore ?) halo is given a hair-like termination.
5. W.G. Collingwood 1915, 205 fig a.
7. W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig. 193 for the whole shaft. For the particular panel see G. Baldwin Brown 1937, plate LXXX.
8. As was pointed out long ago in M.R. Ellis 1942, 232.
9. Compare Bewcastle and, indeed, Ruthwell.
shaft, Kirkby Stephen V. This was published by Collingwood in 1912 together with a restoration drawing which, by comparison with the RCHM photographs, is slightly inaccurate.

The persistence of an Anglian tradition is clear in both the free-armed head and in the vine-scroll on the narrow edge. The scroll is far evolved in stylisation: the closest analogy in treatment is on Penrith III. The late, Viking-period, dating of the shaft indicated by this parallel is further confirmed by the basket plait on the reverse face.

The animals are crudely drawn quadrupeds, one of them backward turning, the eyes indicated by a drilled hole, their bodies showing no trace of modelling. Though it is clearly dangerous to argue chronological and cultural points from a rendering which may be merely indicative of artistic incompetence, it does seem that the best parallels come from an area embracing North Wales, the Isle of Man, south-western Scotland, north-west England and the Norwegian settlement area of Yorkshire on sculpture of the Viking period. The ultimate origins of this type of animal are doubtful: the vine-scroll animals of Northumbrian art, the naturalistic animals of Pictish art or

1. W.G. Collingwood 1912a, especially 159ff. The drawing on 161 renders the nose of the upper animal incorrectly and tends to make the restoration with backward-turning animal more plausible than is suggested by RCHM 1936, plate 5h.
2. See similar crude drawing in a context completely divorced from this material in L. Coutil 1930, plates facing 24 and 26.
3. V.E. Nash-Williams 1950, nos. 38 and 190.
4. P.M.C. Kermode 1907, nos. 66,72,93,97,98,100,102,103 and 105.
6. Heysham: see G.Baldwin Brown 1937, plate CXVII.
7. Forcett, Kirkby Hill, Stanwick,Stonegrave and Wath: see W.G. Collingwood 1907, 320 figs.b and e,339 fig.i,395 fig.n,400 figs.c and d,406,fig.e;Gargrave: see W.G.Collingwood 1915, 176, fig.m.
8. This is the source proposed for the examples in south-west Scotland in R.B.K.Stevenson 1961,49-50. The Manx examples could be Irish-derived (the animals on the base of the southern cross at Kells approach this type of drawing) but their disposition down the side of a cruciform shape recalls the organisation of the Scottish shafts.
even the free-style drawing of Scandinavia\(^1\) could be invoked but it is impossible to arbitrate between these various claims.

In spite of these problems over the ultimate source of this style two points seem worth recording. The first is that it is a style which, though widely distributed, focusses around the area of Norwegian activity in the Irish Sea. Secondly, the Kirkby Stephen shaft seems to be closely linked to the Manx group in the arrangement of the animals which are placed in a vertical plane and appear to run up the shaft. Outside the Isle of Man this type of arrangement only occurs on the large cross from Gosforth:\(^2\) either the two Cumbrian shafts are drawing independently upon the same (\(?\) wood-carving) tradition as the Manx sculptors or else there is a direct link between the two areas for this is the dominant arrangement on the island.\(^3\)

---

1. The tradition fragmentarily surviving in the Oseberg tapestries, the Gokstad hunting basket and the Swedish rune-stones: see D.M. Wilson and O. Klindt-Jensen 1966, plate XIX and XXVI.

2. The Forcett shaft (W.G. Collingwood 1907, 320, fig.b) has animals in a vertical plane but their disposition is controlled by the cruciform shape which they surround.

3. P.M.C. Kermode 1907, nos.66,67,72,97,100,103,105.

---

This chapter has not confined itself to zoomorphic ornament but its main concern has been with this type of decoration. On certain crosses the treatment of animals owes much to Scandinavian taste: the ribbon-animals of Great Clifton, Cross Canonby I and Brigham III are good examples. At the other extreme are the confronting birds of Waberthwaite II or the crouching animals of Cross Canonby I and Brigham IX where the Anglian ancestry is clear. Alongside this demonstration of a range of animal types a second theme has also been present: the existence of local motifs and preferences in socket shapes, double rows of ornament, bound men and snake riders.
CHAPTER EIGHT

Three Crosses with Christian Scenes

The three crosses which are studied in this chapter, Brigham V, Burton in Kendal I and Dacre I are not linked to each other as the work of one man or one school. Nor are they the only sculptures which carry Christian scenes - the crucifixion at Penrith, for example, has been discussed earlier in this thesis. It seemed useful to bring them together, however, since they are dominated by their figural ornament and because they show the norm of Christian iconography in the area to which the Gosforth sculptures present such a contrast. The first two also startlingly illustrate the archaic nature of the depiction of Christian scenes in Cumbria in the tenth and eleventh centuries.

I

The cross-head Brigham V, which now stands over the vicarage porch, was first published by Calverley.¹ His interest, like that of later writers who have alluded to the stone,² was focussed upon the bound figure which occupies one face of the cross. It was only in 1963 that attention was drawn to the human mask on the upper arm of the reverse side, which, it was suggested, was an example of a primitive type of crucifixion iconography.³

There can be little doubt about the dating to the Viking period. It has long been recognised that the bound man motif (whatever its ultimate origin and significance) was a popular one in Cumbria in work of the tenth and eleventh centuries.⁴ Confirmation of this dating comes from both the shape of the cross-head and the shape of the panels on the lateral arms of the reverse side. The free-armed head is clearly in an Anglian

¹ W.S. Calverley 1883, 212.
² e.g., W.G. Collingwood 1906-7, 134 or W. Holmqvist 1951, 12.
⁴ See e.g., T.D. Kendrick 1949, 125 and the discussion above p172.
tradition but the relatively short, dumpy, arms are of a type which is best paralleled on Yorkshire crosses which carry ornament of the Viking period. Though not shown in Calverley's drawing the panels of knotwork on the reverse are given a shape which Stevenson has happily named "elephant ear". This is a type which is limited to the Solway area in the Viking period.

The knotwork does not contradict this dating though it is not chronologically very informative. It is now impossible to disentangle the pattern on the worn panel on the sinister lateral arm but that on the dexter is clearly Romilly Allen's no. 658. This knot is found locally in the Anglian period on the head of Irton I and, elsewhere in Northumbria, it occurs on sculpture of both the Anglian and Viking periods. A similar lengthy usage can be demonstrated for the pair of Stafford knots which fill one of the arm-ends. Calverley's drawing of the other arm-end, if correct, would only be paralleled on the circle-head Dearham I but inspection shows that this knot is a duplex (Romilly Allen's

1. Forcett, Kirkby Hill and Sintinnigton are good examples: see W.G. Collingwood 1907, 320 fig.a, 339 fig.a, and 387 fig.d. See also W.G. Collingwood 1927, 92.
2. Art.cit. in note 1, p.22 and also in W.S. Calverley 1899, 76.
4. The type is discussed on p.267 below. The other examples are Brigham VII, Drummore and the Netherton cross, Hamilton. For the two latter see W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig.18 and R.B.K. Stevenson 1961, plate X.
6. Anglian examples. Abercorn: see T.D. Kendrick 1938, plate L; Crofton and Ilkley: see W.G. Collingwood 1912, 161 fig.e and 195 fig.i; Lindisfarne: see C.R. Peers 1925, plate LII fig.6. Viking period examples. Hauxwell: see W.G. Collingwood 1907, 331 fig.a; Lythe and Tanfield: see W.G. Collingwood 1911, 288 fig.k and 300 fig.c.
7. e.g., Anglian Rothbury or Viking-period Bilton: see W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig. 95 and W.G. Collingwood 1915, 140 fig.a.
This is an extremely popular knot in Northumbria, Man and Wales in the Viking period though there is no certain example of its earlier use in sculpture; it may therefore be considered another pointer to the Viking-period date of the cross-head.

The group of seven bosses, set within a ring, can be exactly paralleled in the Anglian period at Heysham, both in the number of bosses and their disposition, whilst there are groups of five bosses, from the same period, on cross-heads at Irton, Lancaster and Northallerton. The persistence of this motif into the Viking period can be seen at Kirkby Hill, North Frodingham and Winston. In the arm over the bosses there are the mutilated remains of a human mask. This represents the crucified Christ.

2. e.g., Gilcrux in Cumbria. In the North Riding of Yorkshire there are examples at Kirkby Hill, Kirklevington and Hovingham: see W.G. Collingwood 1907, 339 fig.f and 350 fig.r and W.G. Collingwood 1929, III. For examples at York and in the West Riding at Thornhill, Ellerburn and Kildwick in Craven see W.G. Collingwood 1909, 163; W.G. Collingwood 1915, 198 fig.d, 247 fig. k and 255 fig.d. For examples in the Tees valley at Brompton, Sockburn, Aycliffe and Billingham see F.J. Haverfield and W. Greenwell 1899, no. LIV; W.H. Knowles 1907, 112; J. Stuart 1867, plates LXXXIX and CXI. For Penpoat and Kirkconnel see W.G. Collingwood 1926b, plates facing 56. For Disley and West Kirby in Cheshire see J.R. Allen 1895, 150 and 153.
3. P.M.C. Kermode 1907, nos. 52, 57, 74, 94, 97 and 103.
5. W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig. 128.
6. For Northallerton and Lancaster see W.G. Collingwood 1927, figs. 30 and 128.
7. Winston is unpublished. For Kirkby Hill and North Frodingham see W.G. Collingwood 1907, 339 fig.a and W.G. Collingwood 1911, 263 fig.c. For the possible significance of these as representing the five wounds of Christ see M. Swanton 1970, 102.
8. Calverley shows this in his drawing but I am grateful to Mr. R. Hogg for his careful cleaning of this section of the sculpture which confirms its presence.
type of crucifixion depiction, in which Christ’s head is placed over a cruciform shape without the rest of his suffering body being shown, originated in Syrio-Palestinian art and is best known on the pilgrim reliquary flasks which were brought from those areas to western Europe in the fifth and sixth centuries. The type is closely related to the Coptic crux ansata. By the seventh century this type was accepted in western Europe and it was either from this area or directly from the eastern Mediterranean that it reached Ireland. Its occurrences in Ireland have been fully discussed by Roe in a recent article where it was claimed that the type became obsolete by the middle of the eighth century. This dating was questioned in 1963 since the one Scottish example cited by Miss Roe, from Kiloran on Colonsay, came from a chapel and burial ground of “tenth or eleventh-century Norse-Hebridian

2. For the Monza flasks see A. Grabar 1962, C.R. Morey 1955, 123 assigns the group to a date before 614.
3. The crux ansata certainly reached Ireland and Gaul. For Gaul see L. Coutil 1930, figs. facing 28, 30 and 53 and plate VII no.6. (and p.30). For Ireland see P. O'hEalidhe 1967, for a discussion of the so-called St. Berri hert’s cross-slab no. 7a (his figure 2) with full references to other Irish material. For Wales see V.E. Nash-Williams 1950, no. 31. For a possible example from Cornwall see A.G. Langdon 1896, 85. For Scotland see J.A. Balfour 1909, fig. 7.
4. Rome, St. Stephano: see C.R. Morey 1955, 292 and plate 196; Mosaic at St. Agnese sulla via nomentana: see R. Garrucci 1871, plate 274; Faha near Trier: see A.C. Thomas 1971, fig. 61; Stele from Moselkern: see E. Salin 1952, fig. 35; see also J. Hubert et al. 1969, plate 150.
6. Roe includes a detail from the Book of Kells as an example but since this shows hands and the lower part of the body it is only marginally relevant. See the crucifixion at Lancaster (W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig. 128) for a parallel.
The addition of the cross-head from Brigham vicarage, belonging to the Viking period, strengthens the case for a longer life for the type in the Irish Sea area even though there remains no doubt about its primitive nature.

Whilst it is possible that this type of crucifixion iconography was known in Anglo-Saxon England before the Viking period, both the distribution and the date of the two non-Irish examples would suggest that it was introduced by the tenth-century settlers from the western side of the Irish Sea.  

On the other side from the crucifixion the whole of the cross-head is occupied by a naked figure whose waist and lower limbs are entangled in knotwork. His right hand grasps the interlace strand whilst the left is slightly raised, with palm facing the onlooker.

2. There are two other possible Scottish examples, both from the west coast. On the cross-slab from Boghouse, Mochrum, Wigtownshire, R.S.G. Anderson 1927a, 118 notes that "it has been suggested (that there is) something like a face on the upper arm". It is difficult to find any such trace on the slab now. More certain is an example on a slab from North Rona: one face of this is illustrated in H.C. Nisbet and R.A. Gailey 1962, plate XVII A but the only publication of the relevant side seems to be H. Cochrane 1900, 96.

I have excluded from this discussion those Northumbrian cross-heads on which a mask is found in place of a boss at the centre of the head; W.G. Collingwood 1911, 286, 287 and W.G. Collingwood 1915, 153 illustrate examples of this from Kirkdale, Lythe and Cawthorne in Yorkshire and with them can be grouped the head from Glencairn, W.G. Collingwood 1926b, plate facing 57. Similarly excluded are shafts with human heads on the shafts such as those discussed by P. Ó'h'Eilidhe 1958 or the Doorty cross published in L. de Paor 1956, fig. 5. For similar material in Wales and Cornwall see A. Langdon 1896, 335-7 and Arch. Camb. V, 188, 124.

The popularity of both the crucifixion type of mask and those noted in the last two paragraphs may owe much to earlier, pagan, use; see A. Ross 1967, 116ff and E. Salin 1959, 267ff.
There are, as we have seen, a large number of figures struggling with, or bound in, (often serpentine) knotwork on sculpture of the Viking period, particularly in north-west England. This material, which is fully studied in the discussion of the Great Clifton shaft, is clearly in no sense uniform in general conception or detailed presentation and it is often difficult to decide upon the significance of any particular bound figure.

Locally, the nearest parallel to the Brigham figure is the one at Great Clifton in which the knotwork is equally complex but, at the same time, is certainly serpentine. But, unlike the Brigham figure, the one from Great Clifton is clothed, his arms are pinioned and there are snakes heads on either side of his head. Given these differences it would be hazardous to suggest that these two figures must be interpreted in the same way.

Further south, at Bolton le Sands in Lancashire,¹ there is a now much damaged scene on a hogback which is a better analogy for the Brigham cross-head. Here a figure, grasping a snake's tail with his right hand, raises his left and has his lower limbs entwined in a loop of serpentine knotwork. He is unclothed. All of these are features found at Brigham.

Whilst this establishes a parallel within the Viking period in the north-west it does not help in interpreting the figure. Without a halo it cannot be certain that this is not some secular or mythical being, though equally, Christ and Christian saints appear without nimbs.² The most satisfactory interpretation of both Brigham V and Bolton le Sands would be that this represents the moment of triumph by Christ in the struggle with the Devil.³

1. VCH 1906, 266. There seems to be no published illustration.
2. e.g., the figure of the crucified Christ at Kirkburton, Yorks: see W.G. Collingwood 1915, 202. The form of the hair at Brigham seems to be unparalleled.
3. For the devil as dragon see M. Goldsmith 1970. Another interpretation, appropriate to a funereal monument, would be that of the struggle between the soul and the devil at the moment of death. For this concept see A.C. Rush 1945.
This would effectively complement the crucifixion on the other side of a cross which cannot be closely dated within the Viking period.

II

The largest of the surviving sculptures from Burton in Kendal has two scenes which are certainly Christian. The dating of the shaft to the Viking period is based upon the evidence of several of the accompanying motifs as well as on the remains of a ring-head.

Despite the worn condition of the stone there is no doubt that the broad reverse face is decorated with a ring-chain motif, three-cord interlace strand, and stopped-plait. The Viking-age popularity of the first two motifs has already been noted whilst the use of stopped-plait clearly represents a most interesting link between Burton and the spiral-scroll school on the other side of the Cumbrian mountains.

The somewhat fleshy lobes of the scrolls are not entirely characteristic of those employed in spiral-scroll work (where they are usually rather wiry) but they can be paralleled within the school on Workington II as well as on sculpture which, though of the Viking period, is not all directly linked to the Cumbrian spiral-scroll group.

The narrow edges are decorated with a simple ring-twist and a fret pattern. The ring-twist is a firm indication of the Viking period but the fret pattern is not only unparalleled but is also a relatively rare type of decoration in Northumbria. On work of

1. This accounts for the differences between W.S. Calverley 1899, fig. facing p. 89 and W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig. 195. In certain respects Collingwood's drawing is inferential and in such details as the straightening of the small cross-shaft he has improved on the sculptor.

2. See above p. 87 ff. and 122.

3. e.g., Melling, Lancashire: see W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig. 179. See also F.M.C. Kermode 1907, nos. 65, 72 and 96.
the Anglian period it occurs at six sites\(^1\) and it is only slightly more frequent in the subsequent centuries.\(^2\) It is tempting to see its use as symptomatic of Celtic influence since it frequently occurs in Ireland, Scotland and Wales\(^3\) but the Northumbrian examples are so spread in date and distance that any such influence must have been exercised at a variety of times and in a variety of areas. The occurrence of a fret pattern is not, however, out of context on a cross which other evidence clearly shows is of the Viking period.

The figural scenes on the shaft are of great interest. At the top Collingwood's\(^4\) drawing shows a small unoccupied cross flanked by two figures. The one on the dexter side holds the shaft. Both figures appear to be nimbed\(^5\) and there is a clear distinction in clothing between the sinister character who is swathed in a long garment and the one on the dexter side of the cross who is either naked or wears some form of trousers.

The closest parallel for the Burton arrangement of figures

---

1. Dacre II, Irton I, Penrith IV and Workington I in the north-west. For Northallerton see W.G. Collingwood 1907, 373 fig. 6. There is also an unpublished example from Norham. For examples, probably of this date, from Lindisfarne see C.R. Peers 1925, plate LIII, figs. 1-4.

2. For Alnmouth in Northumberland and Whalley and Winwick in the north-west see W.G. Collingwood 1927, figs. 79, 132 and 155. For Stanwick in North Yorkshire see W.G. Collingwood 1907, 395 fig.m. For Hurworth and Stainton le Street in Durham see F.J. Haverfield and W. Greenwell 1899, nos. XXVII and XXX. For Sockburn see W.H. Knowles 1907, III.

3. It is rare in Man, though see P.M.C. Kermode 1907, nos. 72 and 97.


5. We have already encountered the problems of distinguishing between representations of nimbus and hair: the former seems the most likely interpretation here since the outline follows that of the head down to the shoulders.
is found on a shaft of the Viking period from Kirkby Wharfe in Yorkshire\(^1\) where a similar distinction in dress is employed. Neither figure is nimbed and both grasp the cross.

The identification of the Burton and Kirkdale scenes must take account both of the careful distinction in dress and of the nimbi on the Burton example. On both grounds the figures cannot be interpreted as military and thus cannot represent Stephaton and Longinus\(^2\) or the version of the resurrection representation in which sleeping soldiers flank a cross.\(^3\) On the same grounds the figures are unlikely to be ecclesiastics, (who are often shown in insular art beneath an empty cross\(^4\)) or some combination of male and female divine.\(^5\) The most likely identification is with Mary and John\(^6\) and the panel thus represents the crucifixion.

---

1. W.G. Collingwood 1915, 205, fig.a.
2. Longinus does appear once in nimbed form in an insular context: see M.H. Longhurst 1926, plate 15 and the accompanying discussion. It is useful to remember other misattributions of iconographic details: see D. Talbot Rice 1960, 199.
3. For a typical example on an early saracophagus see F. van der Meer and C. Mohrmann, 1959, plate 466. There are numerous illustrations of this type in E. le Blant 1878 and E. le Blant 1886. This is a scene found on Irish sculpture at both Kells and Monasterboice: see H.M. Roe 1965, 220.
4. For insular examples of this type see F. Henry 1965, fig. 15 a and J.R. Allen 1903, III, figs. 239A and 259A. There is also another type in which the figures beneath the cross-arms are almost certainly evangelists: see J.R. Allen 1903, III, fig. 137.
5. As, for example, the male and female figures shown flanking a cross in J. Beckwith 1964, plate 126.
6. It would be perverse to ignore more remote possibilities such as the combination of Moses and Ecclesia as at Hildesheim: see A. Goldschmidt 1928, II, plate 102.
Roe has rightly commented that this type of representation of the crucifixion "preceded the full narrative rendering of the seventh and eighth centuries". Its use at Burton and Kirkby Wharfe is therefore an archaism. Yet these two carvings do not stand alone in insular sculpture during the Viking period: another clear example is at Margam, Glamorgan, where, though both figures are dressed in long garments, one is given a moustache and book.

Other occurrences of this John/Mary combination are less certain but, even if the material now to be reviewed is not totally relevant it does show the popularity of human figures placed beneath an empty cross which could have helped the persistence of the John/Mary type.

Given the fact that the Margam sculpture shows both Mary and John in long garments it is possible that the two figures flanking the cross at Halton, Lancashire, can be similarly identified. These stand on chalices, or chalice-shaped pedestals, and the dexter figure (like that at Burton) grasps the shaft of the cross. The two persons standing beneath a ring-cross on a sculpture from Nash, Glamorgan, have been similarly interpreted by Nash-Williams and here, once more, it is the dexter figure who grasps the cross-shaft. In Scotland there are three possible examples remaining after the obvious evangelists and book-armed ecclesiastics/saints have been removed: two are at St. Vigean's

1. H.M. Roe 1953, 205.
2. V.E. Nash-Williams 1950, no. 294.
3. For illustrations see W.S. Calverley 1899, 187 and W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig.191. For photographs see T.D. Kendrick 1949, plate XLII no.3.
5. a) St. Vigean's no.II, J.R. Allen 1903, III, fig.282A. Here the sinister figure is bookless and need not be the angel Allen believed him to be: see the close analogy in lay-out with the definite John/Mary at Margam.
   b) St. Vigean's no.17, J.R. Allen 1903, III, fig. 288A. Allen describes both figures as carrying books but illustrates only one doing so.
and one at Meigle.\(^1\) Over in Ireland the (apparently) early slab at Fahan Mura provides a further probable illustration of this type.\(^2\)

Though the slab from Fahan Mura is probably of the seventh century all of the Northumbrian and most of the other occurrences of this crucifixion type belong to the Viking period.

The persistence of this primitive depiction until such a late date, and indeed its popularity at this period, is worthy of notice. Important also is the fact that the material reviewed seems to show that there is a distinct iconographic placing of Mary and John below an unoccupied (as opposed to an occupied) cross. The normal, though not completely invariable, position of the Virgin is below the crucified Christ's right arm but, in every example in which the sex can be distinguished in the group under discussion, the Virgin is on the sinister side of the empty. It is probable that the recurrence of the feature of the dexter figure grasping the cross-shaft is a part of this separate iconography.\(^4\)

1. Meigle no. 23, J.R. Allen 1903, III, fig. 351. Here neither figure has a book.
2. F. Henry 1965, plate 54. For the controversy about the date of this slab see above p. 89.
4. This discussion has deliberately ignored some apparently analogous scenes which are not relevant to the problem under discussion. These include: a) seated figures beneath a cross such as those at Maughold: see P.M.C. Kermode 1907, no. 67; b) figures facing over a cross such as those on Urswick I; c) the types at Lindisfarne and Monkwearmouth; see C.R. Peers 1925, plate LVI and W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig. 17. More relevant are the two orantes from Llanhamlach whose interpretation poses grave problems: see V.E. Nash-Williams 1950, no. 61. The thin shaft at Lancaster (W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig. 128) may have been occupied by a figure of the crucified Christ (compare Kirklevington, W.G. Collingwood 1907, 350, fig. 1) and has not therefore been included in this discussion.
The scene below the crucifixion is no less interesting though the interpretation of the figure who treads on a snake is made difficult by the wearing this panel has suffered. As a result the detail is not always clear: Collingwood,\textsuperscript{1} for instance, was able to trace the lines of a beard and loin cloth which it is now impossible to see though the strongly marked navel shows that the figure was probably unclothed. Both Calverley\textsuperscript{2} and Collingwood\textsuperscript{3} agree in showing the figure as holding two rods which appear to have floriated terminals: examination of the stone in various lights suggests that this is almost certainly correct but it would be unwise to rule out completely the possibility that the scene shows a nimbed figure grasping at flanking foliage (such as is seen at Closeburn in Dumfriesshire.\textsuperscript{4}) It is also difficult to decide on the number of snakes present, though it seems likely there is only one.

There is no exact parallel for this scene but there are close analogies for the various elements in it which indicate a probable interpretation of "Christ Triumphant".

Figures with two flowering wands over their shoulders are found in several media in insular art. In insular sculpture there are examples at Kirklevington and Kirkheaton\textsuperscript{5} in Yorkshire and Checkley in Staffordshire\textsuperscript{6} whilst others have been claimed in the Book of Kells\textsuperscript{7} and on the Fuller brooch\textsuperscript{8} and Alfred jewel.\textsuperscript{9} None of these have rod terminations which are identical to those used at Burton. The two metalwork examples differ from the others in

\textsuperscript{1} in W.S. Calverley 1899, 89.
\textsuperscript{2} W.S. Calverley 1899, plate facing 89.
\textsuperscript{3} W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig. 195.
\textsuperscript{4} J.R. Allen 1902, III, fig. 458. See also R.J. Cramp 1961, plate II and pp. 18-19. and R.J. Cramp 1967b, 103 for this type of scene.
\textsuperscript{5} W.G. Collingwood 1907, 350, fig.k and W.G. Collingwood 1929a, 43.
\textsuperscript{6} T. Pape 1947, plate facing 29, This figure is not mentioned in the accompanying text.
\textsuperscript{7} F. Henry 1967, plate B.
\textsuperscript{8} R.L.S. Bruce-Mitford 1956, 173-190.
\textsuperscript{9} J.R. Clark 1961, frontispiece.
that the rods appear to be joined, and both have recently been interpreted as depictions of the sense Sight,¹ but the others seem to show the same iconographical elements as are present on the Burton shaft. Clarke² has noted a Frankish depiction of Christ in a similar pose, whilst Coptic textiles³ show that the two flowering rods have a long history in Christian art.

With this material can be associated figures which carry a flowering rod and a cross over their shoulders. This is the standard equipment of the portraits of Christ in Glory and Judge on Irish crosses⁴ and the same two attributes are found in the depiction of St. Luke in the Lichfield Gospels⁵ and on the smaller of the Sandbach crosses.⁶ This combination also has a lengthy ancestry in Christian art.⁷

It is clear from the contexts in which these rods are used that they are symbols of saintliness and authority, perhaps even

3. J.R. Clarke 1961, plate IV. See also references to Coptic material in O.M. Dalton 1901 and D. Talbot Rice 1952, 239.
5. F. Henry 1965, plate F.
6. C.A.R. Radford 1957, plate 4. The photograph in RCHM 1936, plate 7 seems to show that the Burton figure carries a cross over the dexter shoulder as does the figure at Sandbach. The photograph is misleading in this respect.
7. This is the implication of F. Henry 1967, 164ff. though no earlier example is quoted. Note also the existence of a type with two crosses which is known on an unpublished stone from Frodsham in Cheshire as well as in Merwingian France: see E. Salin 1949, plate IV and V.

* See now M. Werner 1972, 11 – 12.
sceptres.\(^1\) It should be noted, however, that McRoberts\(^2\) has recently argued that some, at least, are *flabella* and he would group under this heading decorated rods as various as those in the Book of Kells and those held by the clerics on a slab from St. Vigean's.\(^3\) Fortunately, even if his claims could be granted\(^4\) and the Burton rods fell into this classification, the attributes implied are still those of authority and saintliness. The parallel material clearly shows that they can be attributes of Christ though they are not necessarily limited to Him alone.\(^5\)

No other figure carrying two flowering rods tramples upon snakes like the man on the Burton shaft but on two of the Irish representations of the Last Judgement,\(^6\) where Christ carries a cross and flowering rod, He stands on top of a serpent. The significance of this parallel is not that it indicates that the Burton scene is meant to be the Last Judgement, for it clearly lacks the accompanying figures. What is important is that the Irish examples show, in a contemporary insular context, a type of Christ in Glory (for such is the Last Judgement scene\(^7\)) who

---


2. D. McRoberts 1962, 308ff. The identifications of *flabella* on both sculpture and manuscripts are not affected by the arguments that the St. Ninian's material is not an ecclesiastical hoard: see D. M. Wilson 1971. The identification is not, in any case, convincing for most of the insular material quoted by McRoberts.

3. J.R. Allen 1903, III, fig. 282B.

4. An explanation as stylised versions of crosiers or crosses seems more likely for many of McRoberts' examples.

5. The figure in the Lichfield Gospels, for example, is an evangelist.


7. See F. Henry 1967, 162: this is also implied by the inscriptions on the Ruthwell cross above the largest panel. See also the use of an identically equipped Christ figure in the Judgement scenes listed on p. 214 note 4 above and the Apocalyptic Christ in Glory figure (with attendant evangelist symbols) on the Kells cross.
is equipped with flowering rod and tramples on a snake. Other portraits of Christ in Glory of a non-Judgement type, as will be seen, show that this must be the interpretation of the Burton panel.

There are other scenes in insular sculpture which show figures (without rods) trampling on or near snakes. Not all of these are relevant to an interpretation of the Burton figure. Thus the two orantes flanked by dragonesque creatures on the cross at Whalley, Lancashire, are probably representations of Daniel in the Lion's Den — an identification which is aided by the better-documented Merovingian material. It seems likely that the orantes at Kildwick in Craven, Yorkshire, and possibly also the figure at Kippax, can be similarly interpreted. This still leaves a residue including the man at Andreas, who holds a cross and book and is accompanied by a fish, a figure holding a cross as Asfordby, Leicestershire and the phallic armed figure from Whitford Flint. Like Burton (though with less certainty) these can be fitted into one of the types of Christ in Glory.

1. W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig. 132.
2. See E. Salin 1959, 310-24 and the accompanying illustrations. These show a similar barbarisation of the animals into snakes together with examples of the non-worshipping animal position which also (in a different form) occurs in Irish sculpture on the cross at Moone: see F. Henry 1964, plate 13. For other examples of this theme see H. Roe 1945, 2-6.
3. W.G. Collingwood 1915, 198, fig. g: for flanking animals whose heads face in different directions compare the buckle illustrated in E. Salin 1959, plate VI.
4. W.G. Collingwood 1915, 201, fig. e. The hand position might be that of an incompetent orans or may be a type of Christ crucified: compare the hand position of a Merovingian example illustrated in E. Salin 1959, fig. 189.
5. P.M.C. Kermode 1907, no. 102.
6. T. Pape 1942. I have been unable to trace publication of this stone.
The theme of Christ in Glory depicted as trampling upon the beasts is one with a long history in Christian art, deriving from a passage in the Psalms which is explicitly quoted on a representation of the scene on a diptych from Limbourg of c.800. It is possible to divide the material into various categories though it should be stressed that there is a good deal of overlap between the groups.

In its fullest statement Christ accompanied by angels is flanked by a dragon and snake and treads on the asp and basilisk. This is not a type known in Anglo-Saxon England. Closely related to this type is that with two beasts and two angels which was certainly known and used in England in work of the Winchester style.

By the period of the Burton shaft other types were also being used in contemporary art, both abroad and in Britain. There are figures who are only accompanied by two animals of which "from the eighth and especially from the tenth century onwards a

1. This section leans heavily upon E. Baldwin Smith 1918 and F. Saxl 1943 who illustrate much of the relevant material.
3. J. Baum 1937, plate XLI.
4. Conveniently illustrated in F. Saxl 1943, figs. 9 and 11 on a lamp from the Palatine and the Carolingian ivory book cover of the Lorsch Gospels. For their date see J. Beckwith 1964, 36.
5. The relative unimportance of this distinction can be judged from F. Saxl 1943, 12 footnote 6.
6. e.g., the non-British Trèves Apocalypse, the Troja tympanum and the Utrecht Psalter: see F. Saxl 1943, figs. 10, 12 and 13. The British copies of the Utrecht Psalter supply insular examples as do the Arenberg Gospels: see F. Saxl 1943, fig. 14.
considerable number of examples ..(are)...

Another group is formed by representations in which Christ wears warrior's garb and shoulders a cross and it is probably from an allied concept (ultimately deriving from portraits of the emperor) that the Whitford figure takes his origin.

The Burton figure, with its single snake, is linked to yet another type which has an equally long history. It is found on the Christian lamps which were so frequently used around the Mediterranean in the fifth century and examples can be quoted from Akhmin and Carthage whilst another occurrence at an equally

---

1. F. Saxl 1943, 12. This type appears early in an aberrant form on a fourth-century Gerona sarcophagus and on one from the fifth century at Ravenna: see F. Saxl 1943, figs. 8 and 17. Though Saxl refers to the eighth or ninth-century Augustine Sermons as the earliest medieval example (see his fig. 18) the type is found on a wooden pail from a Merovingian grave at Miannay, Abbeville. Later English examples include the Alcester tau cross, the Jevington sculpture and the psalter, Bodleian ms. Douce 296: see D. Talbot Rice 1952, plates 10, 40 and 75 and F. Saxl 1943, 13, note 8. Another possible example is a late Saxon sculpture from All Hallows, Barking: see T. D. Kendrick and C. A. R. Radford 1943. The Ruthwell and Bewcastle figures belong to this category though other elements enter into their interpretation owing to the worshipping attitude of the beasts: see F. Saxl 1943, 13ff. and M. Schapiro 1944.

2. The type owes much to emperor portraits. For some early examples see F. Saxl 1943, fig. 23 and E. Salin 1959, fig. 178. Later occurrences in the Stuttgart Psalter, on a Carolingian ivory in Brussels and on a Bodleian book-cover are illustrated in F. Saxl 1943, figs. 24 and 25 and J. Beckwith 1964, plate 26.

3. Note the armed figure of Christ trampling on a serpent on the Merovingian plaque from Gresin: see E. Salin 1959, plate XI. Like the Whitford figure this is phallic. The concept of Christ being armed is persistent in all of the groups listed above since the cross which He carries often takes on a spear-like shape and function.

4. E. Baldwin Smith 1918,
early date, is on an earthen vessel from Cairo.\(^1\) By the early sixth century it is known from Ravenna\(^2\) and by Merovingian times the type was familiar in France which it could have reached either via Ravenna or more directly from the east on such imported goods as the Orleans vase\(^3\) or Coptic textiles.\(^4\) In this type Christ usually holds a cross which he thrusts at the snake and there is thus no difficulty in placing the Andreas figure into the group.\(^5\) Not all later, post-Merovingian, examples of this type hold a cross however - witness the figure in the manuscript Douai 253\(^6\) - and the Burton figure should not be excluded from this grouping on that account. There is, in fact, a danger of over-categorising these portraits of Christ trampling upon the beasts for a careful study of all the scenes listed above shows that there are detailed variations within the broad groups distinguished and a good deal of cross-fertilisation between them.

The Burton figure thus takes its place as an example of a traditional portrait of Christ triumphant.\(^7\) The Christ figures at Durrow and Clonmacnois show that it was not unknown (in at least insular art) for such figures to be invested with symbols of authority and sanctity and it is perhaps apposite to note that on two Ottonian book covers\(^8\) Christ holds a cross and an orb which

---

1. References to illustrations of this material will be found in E. Baldwin Smith 1918. To the same horizon belongs the terracotta from Sicily illustrated in R. Garrucci 1874, plate 466, no. 2.
2. Wall mosaic from Sant' Apollinare Nuovo.
3. F. Saxl 1943, fig. 15.
4. E. Salin 1959, fig. 179.
5. Even the accompanying book is found on the Ravenna mosaic quoted in note \(^2\) above.
6. F. Saxl 1943, fig. 16.
7. I reject the possibility that the scene shows the Harrowing of Hell because, although Christ there tramples and attacks the devil serpent, the Burton carving shows no trace of the attendant souls.
8. a) Book cover for the Poussay Gospels; see M. Burg 1922, 44.
   b) Book cover for the Ratman Missal, Hildesheim; see F. Saxl 1943, fig. 21. Note also (with two beasts) the shrine of St. Hadelin of c. 1075 where Christ holds a book and a flowering rod; see H. Swarzenski 1954, plate 98.
similarly indicate his dominance as he tramples on the beasts.

Parallels for this arched panel are not difficult to find. Similar panels set within the arris edge of the cross, some architectural,\(^1\) others not,\(^2\) can be found on sculpture of the Anglian period. In the Viking period the few examples seem to be concentrated on the western side of the country\(^3\) and the only exceptions to this distribution\(^4\) have, unlike the others, a markedly architectural appearance. It is worth noting that one of the parallels for this type of panel is on the shaft from Halton, Lancashire, which provided a close parallel for the upper figure scene at Burton.

Like the Brigham cross-head, the Burton shaft combines elements which appear to be limited to the north-western area with an iconography which is in part markedly archaic. In its limited way, however, the two scenes of crucifixion and triumph present a satisfactory statement of Christian belief. So, in a different manner, does the next cross to be discussed.

III

One of the best known of Cumbria's Viking-period carvings is Dacre I whose shaft is now firmly manacled to the chancel wall in the church. Though the reverse is now inaccessible it is clear that any ornament it once had has been cut away\(^5\) and the cross has also lost both its head and some part of the lower section of the shaft. What remains, however, is in fair condition though the shallow carving requires a strong side-light to bring out details.

The loss of all but a small part of the cross-head makes an immediate dating difficult since it would be possible to restore

---

1. e.g., Dewsbury, Halton or Rothbury: see W.G.Collingwood 1927, figs. 91,92,94.
2. e.g., Collingham and Heysham: see W.G.Collingwood 1927, figs. 87 and 89.
3. For Halton see W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig. 191. The others are Penrith III and Burton in Kendal III and possibly Arleccon.
4. Stainton le Street: see F.J.Haverfield and W. Greenwell 1899, no. XXVII.
5. This can be seen in the loss of one arris edge on both narrow panels and from comments in C. Mathews 1891, 226.
the head as either a ringed or free-armed head. Nor is the four-strand plait on the narrow edges very informative from a chronological point of view. The shaft's dating to the Viking period relies, as will be seen, upon the motifs employed on the main face and on the style of figure carving which is not one used on known Anglian pieces but is quite familiar on work of the Viking period.

The lowest panel on the main face presents no difficulty in identification for it is clearly a Fall scene. Like other Old Testament themes this is rarely represented on pre-Norman sculpture in England: there are only two other examples, one at Newent, Gloucestershire, and the other at Breedon, Leicestershire. Other examples which have been claimed in the past, notably those at Pickhill and Wath in Yorkshire, lack such associated elements as the tree and snake and cannot be accepted. In other media, English art of the pre-Norman period only furnishes two examples, both on manuscripts of the Winchester-art phase.

In Wales there are no examples either amongst the material collected by Nash-Williams or in any publication subsequent to his corpus. There is one slab on the Isle of Man which might be pre-twelfth century. In Scotland the theme is hardly more popular than in England for there are only two illustrations of it, one of them (significantly) on a cross from Iona with marked

1. Collingwood remained non-committal: see W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig. 172.
2. As was noted long ago by W.G. Collingwood 1907, 279.
5. W.G. Collingwood 1907, 381, fig. d and see 385. This is perhaps similar to the theme at Bilton: see W.G. Collingwood 1915, 140, fig. b.
6. W.G. Collingwood 1907, 406, fig. b. Other possibilities which were rejected were on carvings at Bolton, Eccleshall and Bakewell.
7. For the Caedmon manuscript see I. Gollancz 1927, 13, 20 and 24. J.R. Allen 1887, 186 also listed an example in Ælfric's Heptateuch. These narrative sequences provide no exact parallels to Dacre.
9. P.M.C. Kermode 1907, no. 116. The reasons for a twelfth-century dating given by Kermode are not convincing.
10. Iona and Farnell: see J.R. Allen 1903, III figs. 232 and 398.
Irish affinities. Only in Ireland is the subject found frequently in insular sculpture: Henry's modified chronology places the earliest example in the eighth century though the majority belong to the ninth and tenth centuries where "no subject is more common." This Irish usage, in its frequency, is much more in line with the general tendency of Christian art throughout the rest of Europe.

The scene shows little variation in presentation throughout its long history. The central tree is almost always present, though occasionally it appears to one side of the figures. Eve is usually shown as passing an apple across to Adam or else both are shown standing modestly by the tree at the moment of the fall.

The complete Dacre representation cannot be exactly paralleled but all of the elements on the panel can be found elsewhere in contemporary insular versions of the scene. Thus Eve is usually shown to the spectator's right but the Dacre position can be found, not only on early Christian sarcophagi, but on the

1. These links have frequently been noticed though the dates of the sculptures and the direction of the influence have been disputed: see C.L.Curle 1940, 96-7; F.Henry 1940, TIII; C.A.R. Radford 1942, 4-6; F. Henry 1965, 146-7.
4. J.R. Allen 1887, 188. For a list of this material see W.W.S. Cook 1927, 154, footnote 9.
5. En passant it is perhaps worth noting that this symmetrical arrangement may owe something to similar arrangements in pagan Greek art: G.McN. Rushforth 1936, 156.
6. e.g., (a) Sarcophogi of Velletri, Rome: see F. van der Meer and C. Mohrmann 1959, plate 104; (b) Genesis illustrations in both the Alcuin Bible and the Moutier-Grandval Bible: see J. Hubert et al. 1970, plates 122 and 123. (c) Ælfric's Heptateuch. See also W.W.S. Cook 1927, figs. 11-13 and 15.
7. e.g., (a) Naples: see F. van der Meer and C. Mohrmann 1959, plate 99; (b) Gaul: see F. le Blant 1886, nos. 22, 87, 120 and 204. For later examples from Spain see W.W.S. Cook 1927, figs. 2 and 9.
insular art of the Irish crosses,¹ and on the slab from Bride, Isle of Man,² and on one of the Scottish carvings. Similarly, whilst
the moment of plucking is not a common one as part of a single
scene—though it occurs in the Genesis cycle of two Tours
manuscripts³—it is found occasionally⁴ and one such example is
on the shaft from Breedon⁵ where, like Dacre, Adam also picks
the fruit.

The serpent is usually shown as wrapped around the tree
though this is not always the case; occasionally in insular art
he is not present at all⁶ and at Farnell in Scotland he is even
duplicated.⁷ The serpent on the ground, the type found at Dacre,
has been claimed as a non-western type⁸ and it certainly does
occur in the eastern Mediterranean area⁹ but it is found on
western material¹⁰ and, as part of a Genesis cycle, it takes up
this position frequently.¹¹ The Dacre serpent, if he is not on

1. For Monasterboice and Durrow see F. Henry 1967, plates 81 and
   100. For Moone and Tihilly see F. Henry 1964, plate 16 and
   A.K. Porter 1931, fig. 104.
2. P.M.C. Kermode 1907, no. 116.
4. See early examples in R. Garrucci 1872-80, III, plate 171;
   R. Garrucci 1872-80, V, plate 301; R. Garrucci 1872-80, VI,
   plates 461, 463. See also W. Holmqvist 1939, plate LIII (3).
5. R. Abbott 1964, plate I (a).
6. This appears to be the case at Graignamanagh, Kinitty, Durrow,
in Ireland and at Bride on Man: see F. Henry 1933, plates 50
   and 92; F. Henry 1967, plate 100; P.M.C. Kermode 1907, no. 116.
   Occasionally in earlier Christian art he is absent: see R.
   Garrucci 1872-80, II, plates 95 and 96.
7. J.R. Allen 1905, III, fig. 232B. This is presumably the
   significance of the serpents who flank the scene.
9. e.g., Dura-Europas: see M. Rostovtzeff 1938, 131.
10. F. Le Blant 1886, nos. 87 and 120. R. Garrucci 1872-80, II
    plate 55.
11. e.g., Moutier-Grandval Bible and the Hildesheim doors: see
    J. Beckwith 1964, plates 46 and 136.
the ground as a result of the artist's's aberration, can therefore either be seen as a (at this date) solitary example of an ultimately eastern type or as the result of an assimilation of a sequence of scenes from some Genesis cycle.¹

The suggestion that the grounded serpent represents an assimilation of a sequence of scenes (not necessarily an assimilation performed by the Dacre artist himself) receives some support from the fact that one of the figures is clothed because this, properly speaking, indicates a stage of awareness which was only reached after the Fall. Again this could be explained as a thoughtless error but, whether due to lack of thought or to assimilation, other clothed Adams and Eves are known in insular sculpture on the sculpture at Farnell² and on the cross at Graiguenamanough.³ The Dacre sculptor is not therefore alone in his misconception.⁴ The Graiguenamanough scene is particularly interesting in relation to Dacre because it also has the combination of both profile and frontal figures which is very rare elsewhere: it must, however, remain sufficient to notice the closeness since the evidence does not imply a direct link between the two sculptures.

This examination shows that the Dacre scene, though unique in its total composition, fits into known medieval and insular representations of the scene. In some of its characteristics, such as the grounded snake and the clothed figures, it is possible that the Dacre artist (or, more likely his models) were combining various parts of a pictorial cycle. Yet, particularly since both of these elements occur in single scenes elsewhere, it is a hazardous point to press.

1. An example of an analogous assimilation of separate illustrations is that in which the snake is offering the apple but the human figures are shown in a state of realisation of their nakedness: E. Salin 1959, fig. 189.
2. J.R. Allen 1903, III, fig. 232B.
3. F. Henry 1933, plate 50. If the scene at Freshford (F. Henry 1933, fig. 156) shows this episode then it can be added to the list.
4. Though he is alone in representing just one figure as clothed.
The comparative rarity of the scene in Britain outside Ireland inevitably suggests the possibility of Irish influence on this panel. The link to Graiguenamanough might be seen to favour this but against it must be placed the existence of the scene in a pre-Viking English context at both Breedon and Newent and the negative fact that the tree is not of the Irish cascading type\(^1\) or the only other variant known in Ireland.\(^2\)

The Fall scene is set within its own panel. The scenes above are not clearly divided one from the other and it is, indeed, arguable that the artist intended them to be associated with each other. This is an issue which will be discussed below in relation to the total iconographic organisation of the shaft: in the present context it is convenient to separate the "hart and hound" motif from the carvings above. Such a separation is perhaps justified by the division suggested by the blank area above the wolf/hound.

The upper scene shows a backward-turning quadruped beneath which two human figures join hands over a rectangle which stands on two legs.\(^3\) The figure to the spectator's right is larger than that on the left.

Calverley\(^4\) interpreted this scene as commemorating the meeting between Ægelstan and Constantine which took place on the Eamont, possibly at Dacre itself.\(^5\) Collingwood, writing more cautiously,\(^6\) tended to the same conclusion, suggesting that this panel showed the baptism associated with the 927 agreement. This

---

1. e.g., the broken cross at Kells: see F. Henry 1967, plate 96.
2. The type seen at Durrow: see F. Henry 1967, plate 100.
3. The legs are not clear in Collingwood's drawing in W.S. Calverley 1899, facing 114 but can be seen in both Calverley's drawing in ibid., facing 113 and W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig. 172. See also D.M. Wilson 1965, plate XXXIX c.
4. W.S. Calverley 1891a, 228 and see also C. Mathews 1891, 227-8.
5. The D version of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle locates the site as Eamont and it is William of Malmesbury who places it at Dacre: see W. Stubbs 1887, 147. For comments see F. Stenton 1971, 332; RCHM 1956, 1-11; P. Hunter Blair 1962, 85.
6. in W.S. Calverley 1899, 115.
suggestion had the merit of providing an appropriate antithesis to Adam and Eve. He later withdrew this interpretation but offered no substitute. 1

The recent discovery of a shaft from Breedon 2 makes it certain that the Dacre scene does not depict a local Cumbrian historical event. On this Leicestershire carving there is a Fall scene above which are two figures facing across a rectangular object which also has two legs. The taller figure (to the spectator's right) seems to strike at the other with a curved instrument. In view of the identical association with the Fall scene and the similarity of setting it seems certain that the Dacre scene is a crude version of that found at Breedon and that both are Christian and not secular/historical.

It is still, however, difficult to identify the scene. Various possibilities were considered 3 including that of Cain and Abel. 4 Though this first murder is certainly iconographically linked to the Fall 5 it was eventually rejected because no parallel could be found for the presence of an altar in this scene before the thirteenth century. 6 It is argued below that all of the elements in the Dacre/Breedon scenes are present in the Isaac sacrifice as found elsewhere in Early Christian art and that this

3. Including the Annunciation, the Baptism of Christ, Anthony and Paul. All of these scenes could have a square object between two figures but were rejected because other features would not fit such identifications.
5. They are very closely linked on some Irish sculptures such as those from Kells and Monasterboice (H.M. Roe 1966, plates II and VII and F. Henry 1967, plate 81) where the identification is made certain by the presence of Abraham/Isaac elsewhere on the crosses.
6. L. Réau 1956, 94.
is the most convincing interpretation.¹

Abraham's sacrifice of Isaac was a very popular theme in early Christian art. It is often found in the catacombs² and by the early fourth century St. Gregory of Nyssa was moved to comment on its frequency.³ Its popularity was undoubtedly due to the typological relationship between this event and Christ's own sacrifice⁴—a relationship which can still be seen in paintings and mosaics of the sixth and seventh centuries in Ravenna⁵ and which Bede records in his descriptions of Jarrow.⁶

Study of the iconography of the Isaac sacrifice has been greatly helped by Moore-Smith's treatment.⁷ It is therefore discouraging for any identification of the Breedon/Dacre scene with the Isaac sacrifice to find that he does not list any variant of the composition which has two figures flanking a central altar.⁸ Further study shows, however, that Moore-Smith's classifications are not completely exhaustive of the full range of variants.⁹ A central-altar type was known in western Europe from (at latest) the fifth century and, presumably from some western source, was adopted into insular art in Ireland, Scotland and England.

The early western European material with central altar is widely scattered. The earliest is probably that from the cemetery.

¹. This interpretation of the Breedon scene has been reached independently in R.J. Cramp 1965, 9.
². See R. Garucci 1872-1880, passim.
⁴. On this whole question of typological relationships see J. Danielou 1950, 97-III.
⁵. e.g., St. Vitale and St. Appolinare in Classe: see C.R. Morey 1953, 165 and 180.
⁶. C. Plummer 1896, I, 373.
⁷. A. Moore-Smith 1922.
⁸. The usual western Mediterranean type has Isaac on the altar.
⁹. It omits, for example, an abbreviated version like that on a Merovingian buckle: see E. Salin 1959, fig. 141.
of Ss Marcellino and Pietro in Rome whilst four examples of fifth-century date are known from Spain and Gaul: two are on cups, another on a sarcophagus and a fourth on a stone slab. After the fifth century only one continental example of this central-altar type has been noticed—a carving, probably of seventh-century date, from S. Pedro de Nave in Spain. The relative paucity of the type after the fifth century may in part be attributable to a decline in the popularity of the scene between the sixth and eleventh centuries. The example from S. Pedro de Nave shows, however, that a central-altar type was in use on the continent at a date when Christian iconography was being carried to England and Ireland.

In Ireland the earliest example of the scene, from Moone, has been assigned by Henry to the eighth century though other chronologies would place it into the following century. The other sixteen Irish examples are generally agreed to belong to the

1. R. Garrucci 1872-80, II, plate 43. See also ibid., VI, plate 463.
2. From Boulogne sur mer and Trèves: see E. Le Blant 1892, nos. 43 and 44A. For dating see E. Salin 1959, 343, note 2.
3. Ecija's sarcophagus, Santa Cruz, J. Baum 1937, plate LXX, 184.
6. A decline noted by A. Moore-Smith 1920 though his comment clearly has no validity for Ireland.
8. For Arboe, Camus, Clones, Donaghmore, (? Killary, Graigue, Ullard see F. Henry 1933, plates 67, 66, 65, 69, 61, 52 and 49. For two examples at Castledermot, two at Kells and one at Monasterboice see F. Henry 1967, plates 66 and 71, 75, 89 and 102. For Armagh and Durrow see F. Henry 1964, plates 38 and 54. For two examples at Galloon see D. Lowry-Corry 1934, plates XX and XXI. Another possible example is that at Drumcliff though this lacks any features which would distinguish it from Cain and Abel: see F. Henry 1970, plate 51 and p. 126.
ninth and tenth centuries. Though varying in some of their details\(^1\) they all, with but one exception,\(^2\) use a central-altar type. A similar arrangement occurs on the only known representation of the scene in Scotland on a shaft from Kildalton, Islay,\(^3\) which has long been recognised as having Irish links.

From England we have literary evidence of the presence of a depiction of this scene in the later years of the seventh century at Jarrow:\(^4\) unfortunately Bede's description gives no indication of the relative positions of the figures. In the late art of southern England there are several examples\(^5\) but none have an altar set between two figures. A clear example of a central-altar type from pre-Viking, ninth-century England does exist, however, at Newent in Gloucestershire.\(^6\) There can be no doubt about the identification since the characteristic details of the hand of God, the lamb in a thicket and the faggots are all present.

With the aid of the Newent scene and the Irish examples already noted there is no difficulty in identifying the Breedon carving as a depiction of the same Isaac sacrifice. The rectangular object can be seen as an altar with two legs, the apparent column rising from it designed to represent smoke.\(^7\) On the ground, behind

---

1. Thus the Moone cross, earlier than the others, shows Abraham sitting to the spectator's right whilst others show variants in the presence or placing of lamb, axe, wood and angel.
2. Graiguenamanagh: see F. Henry 1933, plate 52, no. 2.
3. J.R. Allen 1903, III, fig. 410. Another possible example from Iona is that illustrated in F. Henry 1964, plate 25 though J.R. Allen 1903, III, 382 does not suggest this identification.
5. Cluny altar plate; D. Talbot Rice et al. 1966, plate J.R. Allen 1887, 210 cites examples in Psychomachia of Prudentius and in the illustrations to Ælfric's Heptateuch.
6. E. Conder 1907, plate facing 478. This face of the cross is no longer visible in the present setting of the cross.
7. Compare the two-legged altars at Moone and Castledermot and, for the fire, Ecija's sarcophagus.
the dexter figure, are the faggots, as at Newent whilst every other detail can be paralleled either in Ireland or on the continent.

The similar disposition of the figures at Dacre and Breedon, and their identical linking with a Fall scene, must imply that the Cumbrian shaft also shows Abraham and Isaac. As at Breedon the taller figure is to the spectator's right and the two-legged altar is present. The weapon, smoke and faggots are not represented but it is surely not fanciful to suggest that the animal above the two figures is the sacrificial sheep occupying the dominant position on the cross which befits a type of Christ.

If this identification of the Dacre scene as that of Isaac and Abraham is accepted then there still remains the problem of the origin of this iconography on a Cumbrian sculpture of the Viking age. Wilson has hinted that the source lies in Ireland and that it was brought to England by the Hiberno-Norse settlers. The occurrence of the type at Breedon and Newent, on carvings which seem to antedate the Viking settlement and from areas outside those affected by Hiberno-Norse activity, throw doubt on this explanation. They suggest, rather, that the Dacre representation derives from a central-altar type already existing in Anglian England, a type which was introduced into England at

1. The faggots are on the ground in an earlier context: see R. Garrucci 1878, plate 7 and R. Garrucci 1879, plate 426 (6).
2. For the placing of Isaac to the spectator's left see the Moone cross, the cup from Trèves and the carving from S. Pedro de Nave. For the raised hand warding off the blow see Cubiuxo di S. Cecilia (R. Garrucci 1878, plate 24).
3. Unless the uncarved area below the dexter figure represents the faggots: they are placed in this position at Newent.
4. This concept is fully treated in J. Daniélou 1950, 97-III. The sheep is shown on some of the Irish scenes though it does not occupy such a prominent position as the Dacre beast.
5. D. M. Wilson 1966, 107 (though a reference to Dacre may not have been implied).
6. A worn scene on the Masham cross, seen in R. A. Smith 1926, fig. 6 (second course dexter), may provide an example which pre-dates both Breedon and Newent.
the same time as a variant type,¹ with Isaac leaning over the altar, was brought to Ireland. Both the English material and the continental prototypes are admittedly few in number and it would be dangerous to reach assertive conclusions but there is no compulsive call to look westwards to Ireland for the origin of the Dacre iconography.

Before attempting an overall interpretation of the iconography of the scenes on this cross shaft it is necessary to discuss the so-called "hart and hound" motif, not least because it is the main indication of the Viking-period dating of the shaft.

F.S. Scott has dealt in detail with this motif in Northumbrian sculpture² but some parts of his treatment stand in need of correction and amplification. He rightly showed that the motif is restricted to north-west England and to Yorkshire;³ there are clear examples of the theme at Lancaster and Heysham⁴ and, over the Pennines, at Kirklevington.⁵ At Middleton near Pickering one of the shafts⁶ adds a further example though with a unique arrangement of the motif. Other possibilities claimed

1. Or types since the seated Abraham on Moone and the altar placed to one side at Graiguenamanagh show that other models were available. It should be noted that the Newent disposition is not clear and may be of the leaning Isaac type whilst a slab from Inishkeel may preserve the non-leaning type otherwise only known in Britain at Breedon and Dacre: see D. Lowry-Corry 1934, plate XXVII.

2. F.S. Scott 1959, The terms "hart" and "hound" should not be strictly interpreted: the attacked beast must have horns to qualify but, in non-hunt contexts, the attacker could equally be a lion or wolf.

3. The theme of the deer attacked by a serpent, which is probably allied to the hart and hound, is much more widely distributed: see C.A.R. Radford 1962, 209-10 and H.C. Puech 1949.

4. W.G. Collingwood 1927, figs. 171 and 207.

5. F.S. Scott 1959, plate XXXIX no.2.

by Collingwood\textsuperscript{1} are on crosses at Stanwick\textsuperscript{2}, Melsonby\textsuperscript{3} and Wath:\textsuperscript{4} of these only the latter carries conviction.\textsuperscript{5} Scott has added Lythe\textsuperscript{6} to this Yorkshire list though this also is a very doubtful candidate for inclusion.

Of the four examples accepted here as certain, Lancaster and Middleton are demonstrably of the Viking period (on the basis of their associated ornament and cross-head types) and the Heysham hogback cannot easily be referred to an earlier period without grave dislocation of current chronologies. The example from Kirklevington has no associated ornament.\textsuperscript{7} The evidence is thus in favour of a dating to the Viking period of this motif in Northumbrian sculpture - a dating which was accepted by Collingwood.\textsuperscript{8}

The dateable occurrences are not, however, sufficiently numerous to rule out the possibility that the motif was not employed in the pre-Viking period. Such a possibility is strengthened by the fact that the art of Mediterranean areas which have long been recognised as influencing Northumbrian sculpture had stag-hunts among their repertoire of motifs. The hunt is, indeed, a common theme in Mediterranean art from Hellenistic times onwards.\textsuperscript{9} Within an immediately relevant period it is found in early Christian art in the eastern Mediterranean\textsuperscript{10}

2. W.G. Collingwood 1927, 150 and fig. 169. A stronger case could be made for the Stanwick fragment illustrated in W.G. Collingwood 1907, 395, fig. 1.
3. W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig. 20 (e).
4. W.G. Collingwood 1907, 406 fig. e.
5. F.S. Scott 1959, 279 note, claims that this is a doubtful but personal inspection favours Collingwood.
7. Nor has Wath.
9. See, for example, G. Hodenwaldt 1933, 195ff. and 206-11.

Representative examples are illustrated in O.M. Dalton 1911.
in an area where the depiction of a lion leaping onto a stag's back was also a separate motif with its own long history. In the western Mediterranean hunts are depicted in late Antique art (Venationes representations) and continued to be used in the ensuing Christian period; among these depictions of hunts are lions/dogs leaping onto the backs of stags though I have failed to find the motif treated separately in the west. It is presumably from this western Christian Mediterranean art that the Hornhausen depiction derives: this shows a hart and hound scene as part of a hunt and is evidence for the adoption of the theme into a Germanic milieu by c. 700 A.D.

Reservations concerning the apparent lack of this motif in pre-Viking Northumbrian sculpture are further strengthened by the clear evidence for the presence of hunt scenes with "hart and hound" motif in both Ireland and Scotland in the eighth century. For examples on early Christian sarcophagi see: G.T.Rivoira 1910, 105; E.le Blant 1886, no. 151; A.K.Porter 1928, I, plate 5; J.B. Ward-Perkins 1958, 98 and note 3; E.Salin 1959, figs. 88 and 89; M. Durliat 1953, plate IV. See also buckle plates from Spain with wolves pursuing deer, E.Salin 1959, 147 and references.

There are numerous examples of hunts in eighth and ninth century Irish sculpture but many of these do not contain the hart and hound. Three clear examples are those at Killamery, Ahenny and Castledermot: see F.Henry 1933, fig. 89; F.Henry 1965, plate 80; F.Henry 1967, plate 65. Killamery and Ahenny are probably eighth century in date whilst Castledermot is

--- cont. on next page ---
and ninth centuries. These representations probably derived from the Mediterranean sources discussed above. Never-the-less the present evidence suggests that it is a motif used in the Viking period in Northumbria and its distribution would imply that it is a Viking innovation.

On the evidence presented so far it would seem that the theme must have been brought into Northumbria by Norwegian settlers who had adopted it from the art of either Ireland or...
Scotland. This is the view adopted by F.S. Scott. Before accepting this it would be wise to take into account an example of the motif which has hitherto escaped notice. On the underside of one of the floor boards of the Oseberg ship there is scratched a rendering of a wolf/dog leaping onto a hart who has been struck by an arrow. It could be argued that this shows the existence of the motif in Scandinavia and that its employment in Viking Northumbria is not necessarily to be interpreted as a sign of Irish/Pictish influence. Yet, since the motif does not appear again in Scandinavian art of the ninth to eleventh centuries but recurs frequently in Britain, it is more plausible to see this Oseberg occurrence as an example of insular influence on the art of Oseberg—a stronger example than those Forssander was able to employ in his now largely discredited paper.

1. F.S. Scott 1959, 284 and fig. 3. En passant it may be noted that Scott's comments on, and map of, the dispersion of this motif (which he sees as running from Scotland to Ireland) misrepresent R.B.K. Stevenson 1956, 125 and imply that the examples from Govan are not only geographically but also chronologically intermediate between the East Scottish and Irish material. This is highly unlikely; see C.A.R. Radford 1968, C.A.R. Radford 1968a, 125-6 or R.B.K. Stevenson 1961, 49 for studies which place these stones in the tenth or eleventh centuries.

2. A.W. Brøgger and H. Shetelig 1951, 107 is the most accessible reproduction. As separate entities the animals can be found in D.M. Wilson and O. Klindt-Jensen 1966, fig. 2.

3. The only possible example noted is on the Alstad stone (D.M. Wilson and O. Klindt-Jensen 1966, fig. 59) but the larger animal lacks horns and the whole scene can be interpreted as showing a story of Sigurd.

4. For Manx and Welsh examples see notes on p. 236. For Scotland see Govan. In Ireland there are examples on the Market Cross at Kells and on the Cumdach of the Stowe Missal: see F. Henry 1964, plate 33 and F. Henry 1970, plate 32.

5. J.E. Forssander 1943.
From Pictland or (on historical and geographical grounds) more likely from Ireland, the hunt motif, including a hart and hound component, was carried to Man\(^1\) and to northern England\(^2\) during the Viking period. In the same period it was also brought to Wales.\(^3\) The Manx and English examples are closely linked together: in both Man and north-west England the animals are occasionally given spiral joints\(^4\) and, more importantly, in both the hart and hound motif is found separated from (as well as involved in) hunt representations.\(^5\) This suggests that we are dealing with a direct relationship between the two Viking colonies: Wilson has suggested\(^6\) that the inspiration ran from Cumbria to Man but the contrary argument has as much (or as little) support.

The evidence summarised above would suggest that the "hart and hound" motif is probably an abstraction of an element from the hunt scenes which the Vikings encountered in insular art of Ireland and, perhaps, Pictland. These hunt scenes in turn probably had a Christian Mediterranean source. This abstraction probably

1. P.M.C. Kermode 1907, nos. 65,66,97,103,104 and ? 105. Kermode's chronology placed nos. 65 and 66 into the pre-Viking period but there seems to be no objection to the dating first proposed by B.R.S. and E. Megaw 1950 which would place them into the Viking era. Professor H. Arbman was in agreement with this dating during discussion at the conference of the Society for Medieval Archaeology conference held at Douglas in 1961.

2. Heysham and Middleton provide examples of the motif, or variations on it, with a hunt setting. It may be noted that no hunt is depicted in Northumbrian sculpture other than these two with hart and hounds.

3. V.E. Nash-Williams 1950, nos. 38 and 234. The former stone has both shape and motifs which link it with other Viking-period sculpture in Man and north-west England. The latter is less obviously Viking-period.

4. P.M.C. Kermode 1907, nos. 65,103,104,105;W.G.Collingwood 1927, fig. 171.

5. P.M.C. Kermode 1907, nos. 66,97,104. See also note 2 above.

took place in either Man or north-west England.¹

The significance of the "hart and hound" motif is, inevitably, debatable. If we ignore Collingwood's initial misinterpretation of the beast's antlers as a bough and thus his invocation of the "mystic stag of St. Julian, St. Eustace and St. Herbert"² we are left with three possibilities. It could be a naturalistic scene portraying a standard hunting procedure³ in a sport linked with the man commemorated by the monument.⁴ Secondly it could betray a survival of either Celtic⁵ or Scandinavian⁶ pagan symbolism into the Christian period. A third interpretation, that the scene has a Christian significance, is much more likely though this is not to deny that the ultimate origin of the motif is non-Christian⁷ and that its usage may have been encouraged by pre-Christian familiarity.⁸ The overwhelming likelihood of a Christian interpretation is suggested both by the popularity of hunt scenes alongside specifically Christian scenes both in

---

1. The other possibility that the abstraction was suggested by the separate existence of the motif in Scythian (and presumably Scythian-derived) art should not be overlooked. It could be argued that the Oseberg incised drawings and (if early in date) the St. Blane's carving show that this abstraction had already taken place before the Viking settlement of Man.

2. In W.S. Calverley 1899, 115.


5. A view fully argued in A.K. Porter 1931, 12-14 and receiving some support in F. Henry 1965, 155; her plate 7 illustrates a deer hunt from a pre-Christian context. See also A.Ross 1967, 333.

6. A.L. Binns 1956, 23. See also E. Plass 1966 for a link between the stag and Sigurd and his plate 24.

7. i.e. in its Scythian representations.

Britain and abroad, and by such accompanying symbolism as the crosier carried by the hunter on the Banagher cross. Textual evidence shows that a Christian interpretation is perfectly possible.

Several Christian interpretations have been suggested: Christ or the Clergy's pursuit of the soul, the Devil pursued by Christian virtues, Christ or the Christian beset by temptations. It would be dangerous to assume that these interpretations are mutually exclusive, for multiple symbolism is a commonplace medieval approach, but it might be helpful to consider the probabilities in the light of the iconographical organisation of the whole of this face of the Dacre shaft. Such an approach inevitably assumes that the artist had, or was following, an iconographic scheme - an assumption which can only be justified if such a scheme can be discerned.

The linking of the Fall and the sacrifice of Isaac is a frequent one and there are numerous examples amongst the material which has been treated earlier in this section. The closeness of

1. To such material as the architectural decoration of the eastern churches, the sarcophagi of the west and the insular crosses could be added the hounds and stags of ninth-eleventh century Irish metalwork and architectural decoration: see F. Henry 1970, 178, fig. 26 and plate 32.
2. F. Henry 1965, plate 94 and see also the Bealin sculpture in fig. 18.
3. With particular reliance upon Psalm 42.
5. H. M. Roe 1962, 44-5.
7. It is always salutary to be reminded of the iconographic muddles which can occur in such unlikely contexts as Lindisfarne and Breedon: see D. Talbot Rice 1960, 200.
8. Thus it is found in the art of the catacombs, on early Christian glass vessels and sarcophagi and on the Irish crosses (the scenes are adjacent at Moone and Arboe). For catacombs see R. Garrucci 1874, plate 57 and R. Garrucci 1874, plate 463. For glass vessels see E. Salin 1952, 346 and references or R. Garrucci 1874, plates 170 (i) and 171. At Breedon the Fall is placed beneath the Abraham/Isaac scene; at Newent they are on opposite sides.
this link is further emphasised, if somewhat esoterically, by the fact that the Sunday after the Transfiguration is dedicated to Adam and Abraham in the Armenian church.¹

One theme which lies behind this frequent linking in early Christian and medieval art is that known as the Helps of God.² In its basic form this is a prayer for the dying, appealing for God's help and giving examples of salvation afforded by God in times past. This prayer was widely used and its sequence of examples (expanded, contracted and reorganised) reappears again and again both in prayers for the dying and in other contexts. It is the scheme of these prayers which seems to lie behind the arrangement and choice of scenes in the art of the catacombs, of the sarcophogi of Arles and Italy and of the Irish crosses. This art, and indeed some of the prayers,³ show the series of exemplifying Helps enlarged into an illustration of the theme of Redemption, adding both the Fall and the Traditio Legis. Yet sadly, lacking the other face of the Dacre cross and thus any figural panels on it, we cannot be sure that these ideas explain the choice of scenes.

Whilst not doubting that the Help of God theme is present on the cross the symbolism seems to be more complex. To the early Christian fathers⁴ and, through them, to Anglo-Saxons like Bede and Ælfric⁵ the sacrifice of Isaac prefigured that of Christ himself. "Isaac qui fuit typus Christi" wrote St. Cyprian⁶ and the organisation of church decoration in Rome, Ravenna and Jarrow show the wide acceptance of this equation.⁷ Both texts and

3. F. Henry 1967, 143 quotes a relevant Irish example.
4. This material is conveniently assembled in J. Daniélou 1950, 97-111.
5. S. J. Crawford 1922, 32.
ecclesiastical art also show that the ram (as well as Isaac) were foreshadowings of Christ.¹

It is clearly dangerous, as Morey pointed out in a different context,² to equate the mentality of the Christian fathers with that of a humble craftsman, and thus to use patristic texts to explain a relatively crude cross, yet this interpretation seems to have been such a commonplace in both art and homiletic literature that such a method seems justified.³

The scenes on this face thus provide a complete Christian statement. At the base is the Fall, the occasion for the need of Redemption and Salvation by Christ. At the top of the shaft is (at one and the same time) an example of the help afforded by God to the faithful in the past and a type of the crucifixion,⁴ the Redemption offered by Christ, the second Adam. The prominence given to the ram, himself a type of Christ, can be explained in terms of the interpretation offered by such writers as Tertullian, Augustine, St. Hilary and Gregory of Nyssa.⁵ Both the Fall and the Salvation are present: the alpha et omega nature of this face of the shaft can perhaps be more fully appreciated when it is realised that the so-called Caedmon manuscript of Old English poetry completes its account of Genesis with Abraham and Isaac, ending at the same incident as does Bede's commentary and Alcuin's use of the first book in Sigewulfs' Interrogatones.⁶

One of the several possible interpretations of the "hart and hound" symbol fits neatly into this scheme. Françoise Henry⁷ has

---

¹ For the ram caught by the horns as the crucified Christ in art see: F. Cabrol and H. Leclercq 1907 —, s.n. Léviier.
² C.R. Morey 1953, 60.
³ For methods of popular dispersion see comments of R. Woolf 1957, 806-7.
⁴ and, indeed, also of the Eucharist.
⁵ J. Daniélou extracts the relevant quotations.
⁶ A point neatly made by G. Shepherd 1966, 30. "Plainly this was considered the proper place to end. In Isaac is foreshadowed Christ, whose work should undo all that followed from the revolt of Lucifer".
quoted textual evidence to show that the hunt can be taken as symbolic of Christ's pursuit of the soul — another symbol of salvation which, perhaps deliberately, was not entirely cut off from the panel containing the Isaac sacrifice. Such an iconographic scheme is entirely satisfactory and perfectly orthodox.

IV

This somewhat lengthy analysis of the iconography of three Viking-age carvings shows both a conservatism and a marked lack of originality in the presentation of the Christian message. The contrast with the work at Gosforth is very marked.
CHAPTER NINE

Miscellaneous Cross-shafts and Slabs of the Viking Period.

No common theme links the material treated in this chapter. The sculptures are therefore examined in separate sections. Cross-shafts are treated first, then slabs and finally a stone which was probably a grave-marker.

The so-called "bound devil" stone from Kirkby Stephen, Kirkby Stephen I, is clearly part of a cross-shaft. The reverse has been cut away but the decoration on the narrow edges still survives: the two- and three-strand plaits are formed of the same broad, flat, adjacent blocks of interlace which are found on Muncaster I, the hogback at Appleby, the Stanwix cross-head and the Manx crosses. Together with the loose rings of the bindings on the main face this interlace treatment is indicative of a Viking-period dating for the shaft.

On the main face is a broad-shouldered human figure, with pointed beard, whose arms and legs are shackled to a ring which passes over his body and behind his legs. Objects resembling horns spring from either side of his head, curling downwards. Beneath the man is an inverted V which curves away towards the arris edge. Pellets are scattered about the panel.

Practically every aspect of this stone is contentious. One of the less important issues, the explanation of the pointed element below the bound figure, can be examined first. Several interpretations are possible. The first would explain it as a part of the scene below, perhaps some house-like structure (much simplified) such as is known in the Anglian period at Aldborough,

1. G. Stephens 1884, 300 suggested that the reverse was plain because it stood against a wall: the loss of the arris edge on the narrow sides of the stone clearly show that the reverse has been cut away.

2. See above p. 55 and p. 133.

3. Thus, for example, W.G. Collingwood 1927, 158.
Hoddom and Heysham: the curvature, however, make this unlikely. A second possibility is that this is the top of an angularly arched panel: the Viking-period shaft from Sherburn provides a rather distant parallel for an unconvincing suggestion.

A more plausible explanation is forthcoming when this carving is set alongside the Anglian shafts at Sandbach and the Viking-period crosses at Bolton-le-Moors and Whalley. (see fig.26) The two latter crosses have already been classed as round-shaft derivatives, exhibiting an unusual adoption of the concept of "slicing" which involves setting the scallop termination to the panel at the corners of the face. The pre-Viking crosses at Sandbach imply that this adoption was one which had already taken place in the western area before the tenth century. With these

![Fig. 26](image)

1. W.G. Collingwood 1927, figs. 32, 88, and 89.
2. W.G. Collingwood 1911, 272 fig.e. Mr. J.T. Lang informs me that Collingwood's drawing of this detail is inaccurate and that the supposed arch is capable of a different interpretation.
4. G. Baldwin Brown 1937, plate CIII.
5. T.D. Kendrick 1949, 76, and see above p. 152.
6. As distinct from the more usual positioning at the centre of the face as at Sockburn: see T.D. Kendrick 1949, plate IXII.
examples in mind the Kirkby Stephen curved and inverted V can be seen as another western example of a system established at Sandbach: Sandbach,\(^1\) indeed, provides a possible source for the two lines which curve in from the Kirkby Stephen arris to meet the inverted V, thus forming small triangular panels at the corners of the cross. Unfortunately the fragmentary remains of this stone prevent a certain classification of the Bound Devil stone with the round-shaft derivative group.

Collingwood\(^2\) long ago pointed out that the figure has rounded shoulders, a deformity which he saw as linking this sculpture to others on the eastern side of the Pennines, notably in the Tees valley.\(^3\) The parallels are certainly striking but so too are those which can be drawn with figures at Maughold and Bride on the Isle of Man,\(^4\) analogues which Collingwood did not list. Both of the Manx carvings are of the Viking period\(^5\) and the Maughold figure is particularly close to that from Kirkby Stephen in the broad shoulders and the hanging arms.\(^6\)

---

1. The larger of the two crosses in the Market Square.
3. The most relevant are: (a) Gainford: see F.J. Haverfield and W. Greenwell 1899, no. XLI. (b) Crathorne and Forcett: see W.G. Collingwood 1907, 304 fig.g and 320 fig.c. (c) Kildwick in Craven, Otley and Slaidburn: see W.G. Collingwood 1915, 198, fig.f, 228 fig.u and 239. For general comments see W.G. Collingwood 1907, 281.
4. P.M.C. Kermode 1907, nos. 51 and 97.
5. The Bride figure is clearly of this date. The Maughold carving was referred to a pre-Viking date in P.M.C. Kermode 1907, 128 but the accompanying ring-encircled patterns are paralleled at both Forcett and Chester-le-Street in tenth/eleventh century contexts. A later dating of this stone was suggested in a review of Kermode's corpus by W.G. Collingwood 1906-7a, 408-9. See, more recently, B.R.S. and E. Megaw 1950, 150.
6. The non-anatomical splaying of the legs of the Bride figure is presumably a reflex of Scandinavian art: see D.W. Wilson and O. Klindt-Jensen 1966, fig. 29 and plate XXIVa; H. Shetelig 1920, fig. 32ld.
There are then reasonable grounds for claiming that the hunched shoulders of Kirkby Stephen reflect a style of figure drawing which is found in an area stretching from Man, through the lands around the Solway Firth, to Yorkshire. It is not, however, possible to establish where the style first began: Collingwood's suggestion that it was developed in Teesdale is no more convincing than his later suggestion that it came from Scotland or Ireland.

The figure style, wherever its precise source, is thus clearly an insular type. As a bound figure this character can obviously be grouped with the other insular bound figures which have been discussed under Great Clifton. The discussion there showed that there was a great variety in these figures and that the theme had a lengthy popularity in Scandinavian art from the period of Oseberg onwards. Comparison between the Kirkby Stephen figure and this material reinforces the point that there are no near analogies though many of the elements are repeated elsewhere.

Thus the ring and bar binding has a lengthy history in the animal art of Scandinavia from the relatively early Viking phase represented by the figure from Kaupang through to the Ringerike style of the silver brooch from the Swedish Espinge hoard. It is equally persistent in the art of the insular colonies. Applied to anthropomorphic designs it appears in Scandinavia on the wooden object from the Jelling mound which appears to belong to an

1. It is found on the northern side of the Firth at Kilmorie: see W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig. 113.
2. W.G. Collingwood 1906-7, 133.
3. W.G. Collingwood 1915b, 310. His suggestion in W.G. Collingwood 1907, 281 that there is some relationship to the hunch-shoulders of Winchester-style art ignores the fact that the latter figures are seen in profile.
4. See p. 172.
7. For well known examples see D.M. Wilson and O. Klindt-Jensen 1966, plates XXXVIIIa; XL; LXVb; LXVIa.
incipient Mammen-style phase and on the Jelling crucifixion stone. In Britain close parallels are provided by one (perhaps two) of the shafts from Leeds depicting Weland the Smith and by a hogback at Bedale.

Similarly the bearded figure with loose, hanging, arms recur elsewhere on the bone plaque from the River Thames — though with the severely contorted legs of the earlier bound men of Scandinavia. Slightly further distanced in stylisation, but still with the pointed beard, is the figure on the Skaill brooch.

These parallels, however, merely show that the Kirkby Stephen figure shares certain decorative treatments which are common over a long period in the art of Scandinavia and the colonies. They neither establish a narrower dating nor explain the figure's identity.

This second problem of the figure's identity rests mainly upon the interpretation of the apparent horns on either side of the man's head. An identification of the figure as the Devil assumes that these are, indeed, horns but it should be noted that all of the other horned figures which appear on Northumbrian

3. The clear example is that illustrated by W.G. Collingwood 1915, 217 fig. w. This seems to have a near identical motif to that seen on the more complete shaft in the church illustrated in ibid., 213 fig. j2. On the latter the clearly visible bindings employ Gaut's tendril pattern — the less visible binding on the leg is rendered as a ring by Collingwood but this is not certain on the stone.
4. W.H. Longstaffe 1847, 258. See also Great Clifton discussion, above p. 172.
6. See p. 172 above.
7. H. Shetelig 1920, fig. 321d.
sculpture (at Dewsbury, Gainford and Crofton) all have horns which curve upwards. These apparent horns could be merely decorative volutes of the type found, without human figures, at Kippax and Kirkheaton. Again, this scene may be a variation, perhaps even a misunderstanding, of the whispering beasts motif discussed by Miss Roe and examined in the section on Great Clifton. Or, and this is closely linked to the material from Great Clifton and Brigham, this might be a bound figure attacked by snakes. Given this range of possible interpretations of the so-called horns I see no more reason to interpret this figure as the Bound Devil than to see him as Mors, a soul in hell, Loki, Gunnar or some other half-remembered being from the Scandinavian (or Celtic) past.

A close dating is impossible. Kendrick referred to the stone as "an obvious Jellinge carving" though his classification of it with his "Great Beast" style seems to indicate that his "Jellinge" can be re-interpreted as the Lindqvist/Wilson "Mammen". This identification would yield a date of the last half of the tenth and first quarter of the eleventh century. In some ways the association of the Kirkby Stephen stone with Mammen art is an attractive one for three well-known works of this style-phase, (the Thames bone plaque, the Jelling wood-carving and the

1. W.G. Collingwood 1915, 166 fig.g. The orans' s stance would preclude an identification as the devil.
2. F.J. Haverfield and W. Greenwell 1899, no. XLI.
4. W.G. Collingwood 1915, 201 fig.e and 208 fig.c.
5. H.M. Roe 1945.
7. A concept which is seen in contemporary manuscripts: see D. Talbot Rice 1952, plates 68 and 83A.
8. F. Wormald 1952, no. 49.
9. D. Talbot Rice 1952, plate 89 gives a manuscript illustration of this concept.
10. W.S. Calverley 1882, 400.
11. For the horned figure on the Market cross at Kells: see H.M. Roe 1945, plate 2 no.3 and plate 3 no.2.
crucifixion stone from Jelling\textsuperscript{1}) have all been noted as having ornamental links with this carving. Yet, whilst the Kirkby Stephen man has the substantial body of the Mammen style\textsuperscript{2}, this could be a reflex of a long tradition of Anglian figures and there is none of the characteristic Mammen pelleting. Nor, unless the volute/horns are so interpreted, is there any of the incipient vegetable ornament which marks this Viking art-style. An association with either the Jellinge or Mammen styles is thus far from certain.

The lack of a clear date for the Kirkby Stephen stone obviously has some bearing on the relationship between this shaft and the crucifixion depiction on the Jelling stone. The Danish carving is firmly dated to the period 965-85 and has been seen as inspired by English work like the "bound devil" stone.\textsuperscript{3} Without even an approximate dating for the Westmorland shaft it is difficult to establish this but certainly the relationship between surviving Cumbrian sculptures and the Jelling stone cannot be a direct one\textsuperscript{4} for none of them show crucifixions. There is a tradition of bound crucifixions in Anglian England\textsuperscript{5} which could have inspired Scandinavian representations\textsuperscript{6} but the only apparent example from Viking England survives at Kirkdale in Yorkshire\textsuperscript{7} and not in north-western England. It would, moreover, be wrong to dismiss the pre-Christian Scandinavian depictions of bound men\textsuperscript{8} as irrelevant to an understanding of the Jelling crucifixion

3. W. Holmqvist 1951, and see above p.172.
5. St. Andrew Auckland: see G. Baldwin Brown 1937, plate LXI.
7. W.G. Collingwood 1907, 345, fig.a, though the detail is not clear in the drawing.
8. See above p.172.
just as it would be dangerous to limit the search for an insular prototype to England.¹ Without a closer dating of English sculpture like the Brigham cross-head, the Great Clifton shaft and the Kirkby Stephen stone it is idle to speculate on the nature of the link between bound figures in Cumbria and Gorm's stone.

II

Like Kirkby Stephen I, Burton in Kendal III carries figure ornament. The spring of the cross-head survives and, by analogy with such Yorkshire carvings as Burnsall and Kildwick in Craven² it is possible to reconstruct this as a free-headed cross.

The main face carries figure sculpture - apparently nimbed or haired - and this is set within a frame which is itself set within an arris border. This type of double border, without any architectural embellishment, has already been identified as one which was limited to the north-west of England in the Viking period.³ Interestingly it is found on the large shaft from the same site.

The narrow edge is ornamented with incised diamonds and triangles, some of the triangles carrying an additional decoration of incised dots. This is not a type of decoration found again in the immediate area but it is found in the Galloway area,⁴ in Yorkshire⁵ and Northumberland⁶ whilst at Whalley,⁷ in Cheshire, there is a relief version of the same type of pattern. The incised dots also occur in both Galloway⁸ and in Yorkshire⁹ in the tenth and eleventh centuries. This type of decoration is not particularly

¹. What, for example, is the background of the bound man on the Lismore crosier?: see F. Henry 1967, 98 and plate 26.
². W.G. Collingwood 1915, 149 figs. s-v and 198 figs. g-j.
³. See above p. 157 and p. 220.
⁴. See W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig. 11 and 226a and R.S.G. Anderson 1930, 295.
⁵. Burnsall: see W.G. Collingwood 1915, 149 fig.v.
⁷. G. Baldwin Brown 1937, plate CIII no.2.
sophisticated and could be employed at any date, but the examples quoted above all seem to be of the Viking period. In view of the wide spread of the motif it would be dangerous to argue for any particular significance in the occurrences across the Solway.

III

One of the least interesting of the shafts treated in this section is Kirkby Stephen IV which is now a garden ornament at Hartley and had earlier served as part of a pigstye in nineteenth-century Kirkby Stephen. Decoration remains on all four faces of what, to judge from the relative lack of taper over the surviving length, must have been a large cross. There is very little weathering on the stone and the detail of carving technique—triangular marks of chisel hacking at the edge contrasted with round pick-marks in the sunk ground— are quite clear.

The two narrow edges carry step-pattern, with the false cutting still preserved. One broad face has a simple twist with double ring encircling the crossing; this is Romilly Allen's knot no. 575. This is treated with the same incompetence that marks the other faces: the pattern terminates in an angular curve half way down the panel and then two strands strike out from this curve to commence a fresh knot. On the other face is a very ragged, and apparently bifurcating, piece of knotwork made up of flat abutting strands. One strand appears to terminate in a volute.

The dating to the Viking period is clear from the association of step-pattern, loose rings and bifurcation. It is also clear from the irregular knotwork. This can best be paralleled at Barwick in Elmet where there is a similar off-curling volute and

1. e.g., (a) an early slab from Glendalough: see F. Massi 1947, plate LXI; (b) the decoration of an arch of uncertain (but pre-Norman) date at Corbridge: see G. W. D. Briggs et al., 1961, plate XXXIII; D. Parsons 1962; H. M. and J. Taylor 1965, s.n. Corbridge.
2. W. G. Collingwood 1912.
4. W. G. Collingwood 1912, 30, fig. a shows this: it is not quite so convincing on the stone.
5. W. G. Collingwood 1913, 138, fig. f.
at Otley\(^1\) where there is the same type of bifurcation. Other Yorkshire sculptures, similarly dateable to the Viking period, provide further parallels.\(^2\)

The double ring-encircled twist was associated by Collingwood with work in the Tees valley at Gainford,\(^3\) Stainton in Cleveland and Wycliffe.\(^4\) There seems no need to limit the parallels to this area for, though it does not seem to appear in either Wales or Scotland, the knot is widely used in Viking-period Yorkshire.\(^5\)

The main interest of this incompetent piece of work lies in the fact that, like the shaft from Great Clifton, it has been cut across beds of differently coloured sandstone. To Collingwood this was an indication that this stone was not painted since the colour differentiation would not then be obscured. It could equally be argued that, if such a geological difference had been prized then there would have been, if not some sculptural exploitation of it, then at least the employment of a sculptor who could square his stone and decorate it with something approaching competence. With so many false cuts a coat of paint would have been a welcome embellishment.

IV

The rapidly tapering fragment from Hutton in the Forest must come from the top of a shaft. Though Calverley\(^6\) referred to the pattern as being composed of "rings and bands interlacing" it cannot be assumed with certainty that there was a loose ring at

1. W.G. Collingwood 1915, 228, figs. aa and bb.
2. e.g., Lythe and Burnsall: see W.G. Collingwood 1911, 292 and W.G. Collingwood 1915, 149, figs. g and i.
3. I have been unable to trace the stone to which Collingwood referred.
4. W.G. Collingwood 1907, 390 fig. a and 412 fig. g.
5. (a) Crathorne, Forcett, Gilling, Kirklevington in the North Riding: see W.G. Collingwood 1907, 304, fig.d; 320 fig.a; 323 fig.e; 353 fig.u.
   (b) Kildwick in Craven: see W.G. Collingwood 1915, 200 p and r.
   See also J.R. Allen 1895, 152 for St. John's, Chester.
6. W.S. Calverley 1899, 204.
the narrow end: it would restore just as plausibly as a repeat of the knot no. 568 which can be seen at the centre of the surviving fragment.

This pattern is a common one in both the Viking and Anglian periods. A dating to the Viking period seems likely on the basis of the drilled emphasis given to the knotwork since this seems to be a fashion in this area at that date. Collingwood's association of this carving with Gilcrux, Glassonby and Wabertonwaite is no more illuminating than his earlier parallel with the Giant's Grave at Penrith.

The nadir of sculptural competence and archaeological interest in this chapter is reached with the fragment from Burton in Kendal (no. II). On three of its sides is a pseudo-interlace formed by short straps placed parallel to each other; on the other face is another variety of pseudo-interlace. The best local parallels for this type of decoration are the cross-heads at Walton and Millom (no. II) and all exhibit a taste which Collingwood called "rusticated" and Kendrick dignified with the description "village vernacular". This tendency towards pseudo-interlace is not, however, limited to Cumbria for Yorkshire, Northumberland, Derbyshire, Wales and southern Scotland all exhibit similar inclinations. Typologically this is a late development and the associations of such examples as those from Minnigaff and Kirkclaugh

2. See the Beckermet school discussion above p. 85. Note also the large cross at Gosforth and, more relevantly, the Giant's Thumb narrow edge where it is employed on the same 568 knot.
4. In W.S. Calverley 1899, 205.
5. W.G. Collingwood 1927, 179.
7. W.G. Collingwood 1907, 320, figs. c-e.
8. F.J. Haverfield and W. Greenwell 1899, no. 11.
10. V.E. Nash-Williams 1950, no. 263.
would tend to confirm that what is typologically late was also chronologically late. But incompetence and artistic laziness are not necessarily limited to any century.

VI

With the shaft fragment Millom I we may seem to have remained in an equally uninteresting world but the decoration on this stone is in fact, of some importance. It was discovered after Collingwood's death and given only a summary publication in 1931. The eleventh- or twelfth-century date there ascribed to it relies upon alleged parallels at Adel in Yorkshire and the work at Minnigaff and Kirkdaugh in south-west Scotland. Whilst these parallels are certainly relevant for the head-fragment from this site they have no bearing on the date of the shaft, for they are unlikely to have belonged to the same monument.

Though the sculpture is now cemented into a wall there is no record of any decoration having survived other than that now visible on the face. Apart from traces of a rope arris the ornament consists of a repeated run of Romilly Allen's knot no. 601, with a diamond-shaped tie linking each crossing. The basic 601 pattern is, as Romilly Allen noted, "the commonest of all the patterns used in Hiberno-Saxon interlace ornament": there is thus little point in documenting its frequent occurrences in insular sculpture. In Northumbrian work it is found in both Anglian and Viking-period work. Millom I, however, does furnish

5. Note the traces of a second diamond tie at the bottom of the fragment.
7. e.g., (a) Ilkley and Kirkheaton: see W.G. Collingwood 1915, 194 figs. e and h and 208, fig. g. (b) Yarm: see F.J. Haverfield and W. Greenwell 1899, no. L. (c) Jedburgh: see C.A.R. Radford 1956.
8. e.g., (a) North Otterington, Osmotherley and Sinnington: see W.G. Collingwood 1907, 376, fig. h, 378 fig. c and 387 fig. k. (b) Durham Chapter House: see F.J. Haverfield and W. Greenwell 1899, no. XXIII.
the only occurrence of the pattern in Cumbria and is apparently the only example in insular sculpture of this knot with any type of encircled crossing.

There is a very close parallel for this carving across the Solway at Craiglemine.\textsuperscript{1} Here the knot is the same, though without the diamond-shaped tie, and there is the same incised technique, the same amount of ground between the strands and something of the same uncertainty of drawing. On the reverse of Craiglemine is knotwork treated in the typical stopped-plait fashion of the Whithorn tenth-century school. Whithorn itself provides another analogous treatment\textsuperscript{2} for the open ground, uncertain drawing and general size but here the knot pattern, though related, is different and the strands are in low relief.

Given that the Craiglemine slab and the Millom stone are the only carvings in the whole of the Solway area which employ this particular form of knot and, moreover, treat it in the same idiosyncratic way, it is tempting to infer a direct relationship between them and, if the Whithorn stone is also taken into account, to suggest that this is a Solway style.

In an article published several years ago,\textsuperscript{3} the diamond or lozenge-shaped tie at Millom was closely linked with Manx usage. In as far as this led to conclusions about an exclusive Manx-Cumbrian link it is now clear that the argument was not a valid one: the diamond tie, as has been seen,\textsuperscript{4} is not so limited in its distribution as was then envisaged. The possibility of a Manx link remains, nevertheless, and the earlier discussion of the diamond offers welcome confirmation of the Viking-period dating of the Millom stone - a dating which is also indicated by the parallels at Craiglemine and Whithorn.

VII

The two fragments which together make up Aspatria VI are

\textsuperscript{1} J.R. Allen 1903, III, fig. 512.
\textsuperscript{2} J.R. Allen 1903, III, fig. 525.
\textsuperscript{3} R.N. Bailey 1960b.
\textsuperscript{4} See above p. 96.
parts of a grave slab, a fact which is indicated by the survival of one corner of the stone.¹

The presence of an incised swastica is a useful indication that the stone can be placed within the Viking period since this motif is only found in stone within the Solway area, and all of the other examples can be assigned to the tenth or eleventh centuries.² This dating is strengthened by the very close relationship between the Aspatria stone and another slab, from Craignarget, across the Solway.³ This also uses the otherwise unique combination of motifs found at Aspatria: the swastica, the crosslet within a circle or semi-circle and a border marked by more semicircles. The dating of this Scottish stone to the Viking period can be established by its links to other material in south-west Scotland⁴ and the Aspatria slab, which is so closely related, must be of the same date.

Beyond this point conclusions are much less certain. This is particularly the case in any attempt to trace the origins of the border of semi-circles. There is no other example of this type of border in Scotland⁵ or in Cumbria but there are crosses which use it in western Yorkshire at Cawthorne and Penistone.⁶

1. W.S. Calverley 1899, 22 drew the two fragments separately. W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig. 18 no. 46 provided a convincing restoration. The original ornament is much less clear than either artist indicates.
2. See above p. 13.
3. W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig. 18. This link was noticed before 1899 by Robert Blair (W.S. Calverley 1899, 25) and was further elaborated in W.G. Collingwood 1925a, 229-230 where it is suggested that both carvings are by the same hand.
5. An apparent example from Cassendeoch (J.R. Allen 1903, III, fig. 540) can be attributed to the fragmentary survival of the stone: see description in W.G. Collingwood 1925a, 228.
6. For Cawthorne see W.G. Collingwood 1915, 153; for Penistone see W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig. 112.
Collingwood placed all of these carvings in the late pre-Norman period but, whilst this is supported by the crude interlace on the Cawthorne shaft, the presence of a not-disreputable piece of vine-scroll on one of the heads from this site with apparent semi-circles prevents complete certainty. These Yorkshire carvings therefore show the motif in use elsewhere in the Viking period in what had once been Northumbria but they may also provide evidence for its existence in the pre-Viking period.

The only other insular sculptural use of this motif is on a group of slabs from an area to the south of Dublin. When O’Rahill published these he drew attention to the parallel with the slabs at Craigmargaret and Aspatria but, influenced by Curle’s dating, he saw both the Solway and the Irish carvings as works of the “early Christian period”. By contrast Stevenson has suggested that the motifs on the Irish group should be interpreted as degenerate renderings of ring-crosses and interlace and would place them into the same Viking-period context as most writers now assign to the Solway pair. This view is obviously attractive since the motif could then be taken as one which was shared between Viking colonies on both sides of the Irish Sea. Yet, as Lionard has rightly noted, there are analogies for this type of decoration on Merovingian sculpture, especially in the Poitiers and Nîmes regions of France, which could have provided a direct source for Irish sculptures in the sixth or seventh centuries. This would open the

2. Note that the semi-circles are not used in the same way on the scroll-decorated head. The motif on the top of a hogback at Hexham (W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig.213) is irrelevant to the dating of the Cawthorne sculptures despite W.G. Collingwood 1927,178.
3. P. O’Rahill 1957. The relevant examples are Rathmichael no.1, Dalkey no. 17 and Killegar no. 12.
5. R.B.K. Stevenson 1961,50-1. It is perhaps significant that F. Henry 1965 does not mention this group in her discussion of early sculpture.
6. P. Lionard 1961, 143-4. For illustrations of this material see L. Coutil 1930, figs. facing 56 and 62; E. Salin 1952, figs. 80, 106-110a.
possibility that the motif was used early on sculpture in Ireland and then passed by the Vikings to the Solway and Yorkshire areas. Equally, however, if an early, pre-tenth century, date is admitted for the scroll-head at Cawthorne the motif may have been present in the sculptural art of both Northumbria and Ireland before the Viking period.

This inconclusive discussion is not helped by considering similar borders in other media. In the pre-Viking period in England there is an example on the Gandersheim casket and, from a more northern area in Britain, something vaguely analogous on a mount from Stromness in Orkney. Earlier in date a bird-brooch from Finglesham provides another occurrence. In Scandinavian metalwork of the late eighth and early ninth centuries these borders are quite common but, though the type persists through into the Viking-period proper in Scandinavia, there is little to link these with sculptural art in the Solway basin in the tenth or eleventh centuries.

Indeed, faced with the material reviewed already, and remembering other occurrences as various as early Scandinavian metalwork, Frankish and Irish illumination one can only echo Cinthio's exhausted statement that "such motifs...are so simple and easy to shape from different models and patterns that similar designs may very well appear under different circumstances and with an interval of several centuries".

3. S.E. Chadwick 1959, plate 2.
4. E. Cinthio 1947, 115 ff..
5. See D.M. Wilson and O. Klindt-Jensen 1966, plate XXII (a and g); J. Petersen 1928, fig.37 no.10; M. Stenberger 1947, fig. 54. In Scandinavian sculpture it occurs on an undateable sculpture from Södermanland: see S. Lindqvist 1941, 31, fig.211.
6. J.E. Forssander 1937, fig.7.
7. J. Brøndsted 1924, fig.90.
8. F. Henry 1967, plate M.
Whilst this non-sculptural material does nothing to clarify the ultimate origins of this type of border on the Aspatria and Craignarget slabs it must throw doubt on Calverley's interpretation of the semi-circles as the Holy Bread. Some of the examples are so clearly purely decorative (e.g., the Gandersheim casket\textsuperscript{1}) or imitative of pelleted borders that it would need a strong case to establish a significance behind these slab occurrences.

Yet one point does emerge from all this speculation: the Aspatria and Craignarget stones, both work of the Viking period, are closely linked in the exclusive combination of motifs, if not indeed in their sculptor. In addition, much of their decorative system falls outside the main streams of sculptural art in the Solway in the tenth and eleventh centuries.

VIII

Like Lowther X its companion piece, Lowther IX is probably a recumbant grave cover. In the only publication of the stone the Royal Commission\textsuperscript{2} described it as "probably a tomb-slab but possibly a cross-shaft". The latter possibility can be ruled out since there is virtually no taper on the stone and, more important, there has never been any carving on the reverse. This can be inferred from the fact that the arris between the narrow sides and the reverse is very broad - the reverse ornament has thus clearly never been cut away - and has not been smoothly finished. Theoretically the stone could be a fragment of architectural decoration, the blank face set against a wall\textsuperscript{3}, but it seems much more likely that it was a recumbant stone, the non-finished and very broad arris lying on or slightly below ground level. The type was known in the Anglian period.\textsuperscript{4}

---

1. And see the body decoration of many of the Broa mounts in D.M. Wilson and O. Klindt-Jensen 1966, plates XXI and XXII.
2. RCHM. 1936, 160 and plate 5. This stone is labelled "a" in the photograph but "b" in the text.
3. The existence of architectural sculpture in the pre-Conquest period has been underestimated: see above p. 29.
4. Melsonby: see W.G. Collingwood 1907, 368.
Two of the decorative motifs can be summarily dealt with. The T-pattern firmly establishes this as work of the Viking period and the ring-twist with contoured strands is also a treatment typical of that date. The strands terminate in an animal's head: though the details are worn the beast appears to have a lip lappet and curled snout typical of Viking art in the Jellinge and post-Jellinge phases. The closest parallels lie among the unpublished material from York Minster.

It is the decoration on the remaining face which is the most important. At the top of the stone is what the Commissioners describe as volutes but the decoration could equally be interpreted as a mask with open mouth as seen in some Borre-style work: unfortunately the stone is too worn to justify any faith in such a restoration. Below this is an asymmetrical motif which Kermode called a tendril pattern: in this, one of the crossing bands in a simple twist throws off a side-shoot which encircles the intersection and terminates in a scroll-like curl (see fig. 27).

Fig. 27
Interlace motif from Lowther IX

This is, of course, the pattern employed by Gaut on the Kirk Michael cross on Man and it is found on eleven other cross-slabs from the island. The only other occurrence in stone sculpture

---

1. See above p. 61, p. 100 and p. 195.
3. e.g., H. Shetelig 1920, figs. 304 and 310. Compare Sockburn (W.H. Knowles 1907, 115).
5. P.M.C. Kermode 1907, 40, 43 et passim.
6. P.M.C. Kermode 1907, nos. 74, 77, 78, 84, 85, 92, 93, 98, 99, 100 and 103. Both Romilly Allen and Kermode thought that the type was peculiar to the Isle of Man: see J.R. Allen 1887a, 250 and P.M.C. Kermode 1907, 150.
in exactly this Manx form is at Lowther; clearly this is evidence for some kind of contact between Cumbria and Man.

There are, however, three other English sculptures which need discussion in this context. The first is a shaft from Spofforth in western Yorkshire\(^1\) which uses the Manx/Lowther pattern but with animal's heads in place of the curled terminal. Across the Wharfe valley from Spofforth is Barwick-in-Elmet where a shaft\(^2\) has one occurrence of the pattern in a run of otherwise conventional knotwork: this has a leafy zoomorphic terminal. Less relevant, perhaps, is the so-called "Weland shaft" from Leeds\(^3\) which employs the tendril offshoot as part of the binding for the human figure. The relationship of these carvings to Man and Lowther will be discussed below but it should be noted that they come from the same area of western Yorkshire which uses the Manx crossing on the cross-head.\(^4\)

In other media the pattern is only found once, on the Shrine of St. Mura's Bell\(^5\) where the presence of other band patterns seem to indicate that there has been a direct borrowing from the Isle of Man onto this Irish work.

There are, admittedly, a large number of other occurrences of curl-terminated, binding offshoots which have varying degrees of relevance to the Manx/Lowther pattern. Most of them have been listed by Holmqvist\(^6\) in his paper on the origins of the Ringerike style. None, however, have exactly the type of run of the pattern seen on Man and at Lowther and (with terminal variations) in West Yorkshire. They are better seen as parallel developments (perhaps with some degree of intra-influence) from a taste for binding offshoots which has its roots in pre-Viking styles in Scandinavia\(^7\).

---

1. W.G. Collingwood 1915, 240, fig.d.
2. W.G. Collingwood 1915, 156, fig.a.
4. See below p.265.
5. H. Shetelig 1954, fig.44. and discussion 129-30. See also M. MacDermott 1955, 97 and 99 and M. MacDermott 1957, 195.
7. D.M. Wilson and O. Klindt-Jensen 1966, 109 rightly refer back to such Scandinavian work as the Sellested horse collar but one can press the type back through (a) Oseberg and Gokstad: see D.M. Wilson and O. Klindt-Jensen 1966, figs.19 and 20; H. Shetelig 1920, fig.208. (b) the Broa mounts: see D.M. Wilson and O. Klindt-Jensen 1966, figs.33 and 37. (c) Style E: see D.M. Wilson and O. Klindt-Jensen 1966, fig.7 and J. Petersen 1928, fig.3.
and which recurs throughout the Viking period.\(^1\) The essential point remains that there is an exclusive link between Man and Lowther.\(^2\)

Inevitably, in view of the lack of fixed points in sculptural chronology of both Man and in Cumbria it is impossible to demonstrate convincingly the direction of influence between the two areas. Within the English series, however, Lowther is an erratic and it should also be remembered that the Manx carvers displayed a much greater interest in patterns made up of splitting bands than those to the east of the Irish Sea. It seems more likely, therefore, that the influences are running from west to east. This granted, it is clear that they continued to run yet further east into Yorkshire where the derivative nature of the examples seems to be indicated by the addition of animals heads in place of the scrolled terminals which had such a long history in Scandinavian offshoots.

The other recumbant slab at the site, Lowther X, is less interesting: a recumbant position is probably the only suitable one for such a poorly squared stone. The step-pattern establishes the Viking-period dating but there is insufficient remaining of the associated knotwork to identify its type: one of the series of knots numbered 653-6 in Romilly Allen's corpus\(^3\) seems the most likely.

**IX**

Cross Canonby V was probably also a recumbant slab. It is extremely difficult to date because, whilst its crude figure carving resembles nothing produced within the Anglian period, a case could be made for a very early date on the strength of analogies among Merovingian carvings both in figures and in chevron ornament.\(^4\) It is, however, more likely that this stone

---

1. See W. Holmqvist 1951.
2. P.M.C. Kermode 1907, 43, note 2 refers to a slab from Rosemarkie as the only example known to him (apart from the St. Mura bell shrine) outside the Isle of Man. The type of split band used here is not directly relevant to the Manx form: see J.R. Allen 1902, III, fig. 65.
4. See, for example, the material reviewed in E. Salin 1952, 73-172 and E. Salin 1959, 257ff.
is a late development and that its cruciform decoration can be compared with that on slabs from across the Solway. The chevron decoration is probably an attempt at suggesting interlace analogous to that on Burton in Kendal II.

The small stone, Cross Canonby VI, is presumably a grave-marker. Like the slab from the same site which has just been discussed it is very difficult to date and there is no convincing reason for placing it in the Viking-period section of this thesis. It would not be out of place in a Merovingian cemetery. The figure on the dexter side has feet set in profile, like those on Cross Canonby V, and may have been carrying a crosier. The motif on the sinister edge may be a simplified version of a motif seen at Dearham on a post-Conquest carving or a misunderstanding of a cruciform pattern. There are similar problems with the arrow-like shapes above the cross-arms on the face: are these, for example, stylised versions of the birds which are often found in this position? If Cross Canonby V can be placed in a late context then it is possible that this stone can be similarly assigned. There is certainly no need to follow Collingwood in referring to it as a trial piece.

The other fragments of cross-shaft from Cumbria are too fragmentary or worn for discussion. Though there has been a great variety in the monuments reviewed in this chapter the discussion has been useful in identifying further links to Galloway and Man and in demonstrating the incompetence and lack of sophistication of some of the sculptors working in the region.

1. e.g., Kirkcualagh and Anwoth: see W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig. 226. Note the preservation of the circle of bosses at the junction of the cross-arms: was this imitative of those seen on standing stone crosses or on a processional cross?
2. See E. Salin 1952, 73ff.
6. See above p. 41.
7. Lowther IV and Lowther V. Neither are necessarily of the Viking period.
CHAPTER TEN

Miscellaneous Cross-heads of the Viking Period.

Four of the seven cross-heads examined in this chapter are free-armed. Though this is a lower proportion than that for the whole of Cumbria's Viking-age sculpture, it is a useful reminder of the strength of the traditional Anglian form of cross-head.

The cross-head from Stanwix is the most interesting of the free-armed heads. Its tall upper arm is in a tradition which could be Anglian.\(^1\) Though it is unexpectedly difficult to prove it is probable that there was a similar Anglian background for the triquetra in the arms and for a central boss surrounded by knotwork.\(^2\) But all of these features, particularly the triquetra in the arms, can be found on sculpture of the Viking period\(^3\) and a dating of this piece to the tenth, rather than the ninth, century is suggested by the relatively square armpit - a type which elsewhere does not appear to be Anglian.\(^4\)

The interlace type confirms this dating for, though pointed interlace is found in the late Anglian period, knotwork built up of broad, flat, adjacent units of strapwork is, as has been seen,\(^5\) wholly Viking in type. The loose ring which binds the crossing on the face adds yet another indication.


2. Hexham may provide an example: see W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig. 42. The decoration on the central boss of the Northallerton cross-head (W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig.30) has some relevance though it has the appearance of an isolated loan from a metalwork source such as the Ormside bowl: see E.Bakka 1963, fig.3.

3. Triquetrae and the central boss are ubiquitous. For the arm proportions on Viking-period work see W.G. Collingwood 1915, 147 for Burnsall.

4. Examples from the Viking period are Forcett, Gilling and Sinnington: see W.G. Collingwood 1907, 320 fig.a, 323 fig.a and 387 fig.d. For examples with ring at Gilling, Stanwick and Thornton Steward: see W.G. Collingwood 1907, 320 figs. c-e, 395 and 403.

5. See above p. 55 and p. 133.
The pattern on the face has the interlace strands running across the centre of the cross-head into the opposite arms, thus crossing at right angles, rather than into the adjacent arms in the usual way (see fig. 29). This type of right-angled crossing, surrounded by a ring, only occurs at Stanwix and on seven of the Manx crosses.\(^1\) Surrounded by a double ring the right-angled crossing is found at Barochan on the west coast of Scotland\(^2\) – a site which falls within the same West-British, Norwegian, orbit as Man and Cumbria. The important fact remains that Stanwix is the only cross-head outside the Isle of Man to carry a ringed right-angled crossing.

If the discussion is now enlarged to include occurrences of the right-angled crossing without the ring-binding one point emerges clearly: all Manx crosses with knotwork-decorated heads fall into either this\(^3\) or the preceding group – only twice\(^4\) on Man does the interlace run into an adjacent arm and even on these

---

1. P.M.C. Kermode 1907, nos. 73, 74, 88, 101, 105 and 107. No. 93 can probably be added.
3. The non-encircled examples on Man are P.M.C. Kermode 1907, nos. 77, 86, 99, 108 and 110.
4. P.M.C. Kermode 1907, nos. 89 and 105.
examples the reverse face uses the normal Manx crossing. There are, however, more examples of the non-ringed crossing outside Man than there were of the ringed type: occurrences have been noted at Nevern in Pembrokeshire,\(^1\) Penzance in Cornwall\(^2\) and in a closely related group in the lower Wharfe valley in Yorkshire.\(^3\)

The chronological relationship between these various groups is difficult, if not impossible, to establish. All are of the Viking period but beyond that fact lies controversy. Collingwood implied that the motif passed from West Yorkshire to Man and Klindt-Jensen and Wilson\(^4\) hint at the same east-west movement of ideas. As far as the Stanwix head is concerned it seems marginally more likely that the influence flowed in the reverse direction since (a) the precise type of ringed crossing only occurs outside Man on this one stone and (b) the elongated pellet between the two strands on the upper arm recalls a detail of the Borre-derived Manx arm-ending.\(^5\)

The immediate source of the Stanwix pattern therefore probably lies on the Isle of Man. Speculation concerning the ultimate background for this type of decoration seems to point to a Celtic area and to the preliminary development of the motif on cross-slabs. In both Ireland\(^6\) and Wales\(^7\) there are slabs which are assigned to

---

1. V.E. Nash-Williams 1950, no. 360.
2. R.A.S. Macalister 1929, fig. 4 though here it is on a panel of the shaft of a late "lugged" cross.
3. Aberford, ? Collingham, Kirkby Wharfe and Saxton: see W.G. Collingwood 1915, 130 fig. b; 160, figs. i and j; 205, fig. a; 206, figs. e and k; 256, fig. a.
5. P.M.C. Kermode 1907, fig. 26, no. 1 shows the detail most clearly.
6. F. Henry 1951, plate X and W.F. Wakeman 1893, fig. 47 for examples from Inishkea North and Inismurray. For seventh-century date see F. Henry 1951, 69. For another possible example at Clonmacnois see P. Lionard 1961, fig. 21 no. 4 with dating on p. 131.
7. V.E. Nash-Williams 1950, nos. 125 and 211.
the pre-Viking period and which carry this type of crossing. Both areas also supply examples of Viking-period slabs using the same motif\(^1\) whilst, all round the Irish Sea area, there are other occurrences on slabs which cannot be firmly dated.\(^2\) The inference might follow from this evidence that the right-angled crossing was a slab-based Celtic motif developed in pre-Viking western Britain, adopted by the Viking sculptors on Man, and then imitated in Viking areas further east.

Unfortunately there are three flaws in this argument. The first is the minor problem that no such slab is known from Man: this objection can clearly be overcome by suggesting that the evidence has now disappeared or that the motif was brought to Man by Vikings from one of the other Celtic areas. The second is that there is one English example on a slab from Lindisfarne whose date and relationship to Irish and English material is far from clear.\(^3\) Thirdly there is the evidence that is preserved in paint on one of the Oseberg bed-heads\(^4\), that this pattern was already being employed in Scandinavia by the early ninth century: if ultimately Celtic, therefore, it had been employed in the Viking artistic repertoire nearly a century before the settlement of either England or Man.

1. For Wales see V.E.Nash-Williams 1950, no.49 (and see the twelfth font no.4) and, for Ireland see P.Lionard 1961, fig.26 no.5 with dating in G.Petrie 1872, 43.

2. Scotland: (a)Papil: see P.Moar and J.Stewart 1944, plate V; (b) St.Blane's, Bute: see J.R.Allen 1903, III, fig.427; (c) Millport, Bute: see J.J.Waddell 1932, fig.2; Islay: see R.C.Graham 1895, no. 80. (a) and (c) are probably of the Viking period. Ireland: Knockmore Cave, Co.Fermanagh: see W.F.Wakeman 1893, 29 and 32. The various references given in P.Maor and J.Stewart 1944,96 and V.E. Nash-Williams 1950,100 refer to slabs whose ribbons run into adjacent arms.

3. C.R.Peers 1925, plate LV with dating discussion on 265 and 270. Peers was unwilling to date this early but felt bound to assign it to a period before the desertion of the monastery in 875. This dating has been widely (e.g., P.Lionard 1961,117) accepted. It could thus belong with the pre-Viking Irish group but outside the general English tradition. On the other hand the presence of the loose ring might argue a later dating.

4. H. Shetelig 1920, fig.245.
On balance, it would appear that the cross-head usage of this pattern is exclusively of the Viking period and that there is a marked concentration on the Isle of Man. That Stanwix borrowed the pattern from Man is marginally more likely than imitation in the reverse direction.

II

Brigham VII now exists in two fragments (and was, indeed, broken even in Calverley's day)\(^1\); these assemble to give the characteristic shape of the hammerhead. Examination of this shape in the chapter on the spiral-scroll group\(^2\) showed that heads of this type, where they had associated dateable ornament, were of the Viking period and that their distribution seemed to coincide generally with that of Norwegian settlement. Its boss and ring motif is a widespread type though it had a particular local popularity in the spiral-scroll school. More important are the two other features of this head - the so-called "elephant ear" motif and the incised crosslet - which, besides offering welcome corroboration of the Viking-period dating of the head, also provide yet more evidence of links across the Solway in this period.

The arris-marking on the lateral arms is unusual in that it does not run from adjacent arm to adjacent arm, skirting the central circle and boss, but narrows in from each arm to meet the circle. This arrangement is very rare in Northumbrian sculpture: its closest parallel lies across the Solway on the Netherton cross\(^3\) where Stevenson\(^4\) has aptly christened it "elephant ears". In the Solway area the Drummore slab\(^5\) shows a similar development.

Closer to home the vicarage cross-head, Brigham V, completes the list of examples. Typologically the Brigham heads seem to be earlier than those from the northern side of the Solway because their panel is less markedly elephantine: this suggests that the influence in

\(^{1}\) See W.S. Calverley 1899, 78 drawing.
\(^{2}\) See p. 59 above.
\(^{3}\) R.B.K. Stevenson 1961, plate X.
\(^{5}\) W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig. 18.
this case may have spread from south to north. Certainly "elephant ears" are a Solway idiosyncracy.  

The incised crosslet on the upper arm, with its barred arm ends, is found again on Aspatria VI and at Drummore. 1 Together with these examples it is part of a notable concentration of this type of ornament around the Solway estuary in the Viking period. 2 Whilst it must be admitted that an incised crosslet on the upper arm of a cross-head is found outside this region at Middlesmoor in Yorkshire 3 it occurs there on a shaft which has links to the Solway area in its shape. The overall distribution of this form of decoration shows that it is a local, Solway, motif. 4 What little ornament there is on this stone, therefore, marks it as a product of the Solway Basin.

III

The two heads, Millom II and Walton, can be grouped together since they share the same type of interlace decoration. They were both discovered after Collingwood's death and have thus not previously been treated in relation to the local material. 5

The Walton head has the hammer-head shape which has a marked concentration in the north-west and which we have seen as securely dated to the Viking period. 6 Its interlace decoration makes no attempt to suggest the crossings of the knotwork: on the reverse side the strands are arranged so as to follow the outline of the

1. W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig. 18.
2. Addingham I provides an example from Cumbria. For examples at Kilmorie and Whithorn (2) see J.R. Allen 1903, III, figs. 514, 523 and 528. For Kirkmadrine see RCHM 1912, fig. 97. For Ardwell Isle see A.C. Thomas 1968, fig. 30B. To this list can be added the incised swasticas noted on p. 63 above. Relief examples of crosslets have been omitted: see W.G. Collingwood 1915, 151 fig. w and 168 fig. o for examples from the West Yorkshire sites of Burnsall and Dewsbury.
4. It is useful to remember that there is no absolute geographical or cultural limitation on its use. For an example from St. Cecile de Portejoie see L. Coutil 1930, fig. facing 46.
5. Millom was published in F. Warriner 1931 and Walton in R. Hogg 1951.

* More strictly, a Solway and Clyde valley idiosyncracy.
head whilst on the face there is a rather different scheme in which each arm is divided into two with the strands following the arm shape within each half. This scheme seems to break down on the dexter arm. The Millom decoration is made up of a series of adjacent flat rectangles, clearly deriving from the more coherent arrangements of work like the Stanwix head.

The type of decoration seen on these two heads is the same as that on Burton in Kendal II\(^1\) – the "rusticated" of Collingwood\(^2\) and the "village vernacular" of Kendrick.\(^3\) Such terms are certainly preferable to "primitive" and these carvers can certainly not be accused of incompetence: the head shape of Walton is far from incompetent. What these cross-heads show is the evolvement of a new decorative type.

The Walton form of parallel-strand ornament has already been encountered on Burton in Kendal II\(^4\) and is closely paralleled on a head from Finghall in Yorkshire\(^5\) and on another from Wooler in Northumberland.\(^6\) The geographical spread covered by these three sites demonstrates again the fact that this type of decoration was occurring all over Northumbria and represents a new impressionistic approach to knotwork.

The Millom ornament, made up of adjacent flat rectangles, is also paralleled widely. The type can be found in Wales.\(^7\) Across the Solway at Kirkcudbright and Minnigaff it can be seen associated with the characteristically late swollen shaft.\(^8\) Yorkshire carvings

---

1. See above p.252.
4. See p. 252 above.
5. W.G. Collingwood 1907, 320, figs. c and e.
6. F.J. Haverfield and W. Greenwell 1899, no. 11.
7. V.E. Nash-Williams 1950, no. 263.
8. For illustrations see W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig. 226. For treatment see W.G. Collingwood 1925a, 229 and W.G. Collingwood 1927, 180. Note also the example from Anwoth Old Kirk illustrated in A.C. Thomas 1968, fig. 30c and his discussion on p. 152.
at Kirby Hill, Kirkdale, Wath, Adel and Cawthorne use a similar kind of decoration made up of adjacent rectangular shapes.

The immediate derivation of all of this work, both the parallel-strand type of Walton and the adjacent-rectangles type of Millom, lies in the shallow carving of the Viking period. Millom develops the type of knotwork seen at Stanwix whilst Walton simplifies the incoherence of work like Lythe. It is clear that such developments are likely not only to be of the Viking period (and the parallels offer independant evidence of this) but late within that period. Such a late date is supported by the apparent twelfth-century associations of the swollen shafts across the Solway.

Though late in date it is salutary to remind oneself of the Anglian traditionalism seen in the continued use of free-armed heads. Similar traditionalism perhaps also accounts for the St. Andrew's cross incised on the arm end of Walton. Similar crosses are incised on the heads from Finghall and Wath which have already been noted as carrying this "village vernacular" type of decoration. There may be a direct link here but it is more probable that all are drawing upon a long established motif seen in the Anglian period at Northallerton.

IV

With Brigham VI we reach the ring-heads, in which the arms of the cross are joined by a ring whose face is either on the same plane, or set behind, that of the arms. Calverley's drawing of this fragment, the only published illustration, is surprisingly inaccurate since it shows the knotwork side as identical in shape to the head-type seen in the Whithorn stopped-plait school. The relationship of ring to head is, in fact, identical on both sides and not of the Whithorn form.

1. W.G. Collingwood 1907, 339 fig.c, 345 fig.b, 406 fig.c; W.G. Collingwood 1911, 286 figs. k and n.
5. W.G. Collingwood 1907, 373 fig.b.
6. W.S. Calverley 1899, 78. The face marked 'c' is inaccurately drawn.
The face is plain except for an incised circle forming a boss and the incised lines which form a double arris. This type of plain face with double outline has a long history in Anglian sculpture and seems initially to have functioned as a monastic memorial. Within the Anglian period a development can be traced in which the plain face is combined with a reverse which carries scroll-work but the type seen here (combined with knotwork) seems to be a development of the Viking period. It is, in fact, only found on three crosses, all ring-heads and all closely interrelated. The most important of these in the present context is a cross-head from Hoddom. This differs in certain respects from the Brigham head (its knotwork type differs, its ring and boss are on the plain face and it continues to use the rosette frequently found in Anglian versions of the type) but, when the two are compared against the rest of Northumbrian sculpture the likenesses are so striking as to raise suspicions that they are the work of the same hand. The arm shape is identical, the relationship of arms and ring is identical, the knotwork strands are identical and only these two heads in the whole of Northumbria have an incised double arris combined with a ring head.

The third head which completes this group is one from Kirkby Wharfe in Yorkshire. It can be classed with the other two by the fact that it combines a plain face and one decorated with knotwork on a ring-head but it is clearly slightly apart from the other two in its arm shape, the relationship of ring and arm and in the use of a single raised arris. It would be tempting to see this as an independent parallel development from the same Anglian forbears.

2. The type seen on Carlisle II.
4. e.g., Carlisle IV and Hexham: see W.G. Collingwood 1925d, figs 5, 12.
5. W.G. Collingwood 1915, 206 figs. k and l.
6. If the apparent traces of an inscription are genuine (which is doubtful) it could be a development of the Anglian tradition of inscribing the plain face.
as yielded the Brigham/Hoddom pair¹ were it not for the fact that it uses, as already noted,² a very rare type of knotwork arrangement in which the strands run into opposite (not adjoining) arms—an arrangement half attempted at Hoddom.

The Brigham head is thus an example of a rare type, exhibiting once more continuity from an Anglian tradition and links across the Solway in the Viking period.

V

The ring-head, Burton in Kendal IV, has wedge-shaped arms and a very acute-angled armpit. This is not a common type though it is paralleled locally at Gosforth and on a small headstone from Hoddom which Radford has attributed to the late pre-Norman period.³ The sharp angle at the armpit is known from a number of sites in Yorkshire in combination with some form of ring-head.⁴ Collingwood⁵ argued that this type of head was a late development and quoted as supporting evidence an eleventh-century lead cross from Canterbury.⁶ But the relevance of this parallel from another medium and from a distant area is suspect and is further weakened by another metalwork cross from Bath which uses this shape at a much earlier (tenth-century) date.⁷ Admittedly in Northumbrian sculpture this type of head does not seem to have existed in non-ringed form in the Anglian period. All of the free-armed examples

1. It could, of course, be argued that these two are independent developments because Hoddom (certainly) and Brigham (possibly, if it were a monastery) would have the Anglian monastic memorial types available for copying. The close and exclusive relationship of the two seems to rule out this possibility.
2. See above p. 265.
4. (a) Finghall, Stanwick and Thornton Steward: see W.G. Collingwood 1907, 320 fig.e, 395 figs. g-h and 403 fig.b. (b) Bilton: see W.G. Collingwood 1915, 140 fig.b (c) Lythe: see W.G. Collingwood 1911, 287 fig.d, 288 figs. f-h.
5. W.G. Collingwood 1927, 142.
7. C.E. Davis (n.d) and D. Talbot-Rice 1952, 235.
belong to either the tenth, or eleventh centuries. Theoretically it follows that the type was not available for ringed treatment in the immediately post-Anglian phase. But this is an argument based upon a chain of unproven suppositions and would not, in any case, rule out a tenth-century dating for the Burton form of head. The so-called panelled cartwheel crosses of Wales use this type of head in the eleventh century but there is no need to assume that this dating applies to all insular occurrences: Gosforth V for example seems to share a stylistic identity with the large tenth-century shaft from the site. "Viking-period" is the narrowest dating possible for Burton in Kendal IV.

The ring at Burton shares with Kirkby Stephen VIII the peculiarity of being of double depth, the thinner ring overlying the broader one (see fig. 28). This is a type which we have

![Burton in Kendal cross-head](image)

Fig. 28: Burton in Kendal cross-head

1. Brigham V. For Forcett, Gilling, Kirkby Hill and Sinnington: see W.G. Collingwood 1907, 320 fig.a, 323 fig.a, 339 fig.a and 387 fig.d.

2. It assumes, for example, that there is evidence for the dating of the material in note 1 to the tenth rather than the eleventh century. In view of the primitive iconography of Brigham this assumption seems questionable.

3. V.E. Nash-Williams 1950, nos. 196, 208, 236, 237, 241, 242, 251, 262 and 270. No. 200 could be of tenth century date. In another class no. 240, which is relevant to the Burton type, is assigned to the eleventh century on no clear grounds.

4. See below p. 357.
already noted on the circle-head Irton II\(^1\) and is also a distinct Rydale treatment, appearing at Middleton\(^2\) and on unpublished material from Sinnington and Kirkby Moorside. There seems little to link the Yorkshire and Cumbrian carvings in any other details and the two may well reflect separate developments.

There is little comment that can be made on Kirkby Stephen VIII since any decoration which it may have had has long since disappeared. The basic arm-shape is, as Collingwood noted,\(^3\) one which is frequent in Cumbria but is also encountered all over Northumbria.\(^4\) The lack of full piercing of the spandrils occurs locally in the circle-head school at Bromfield but this may be indicative of nothing but a shared inertia. Outside Cumbria there are good parallels for this treatment at Gilling, Topcliffe and Hovingham.\(^5\) Typologically the type post-dates those with full piercing but chronologically they could be contemporary with the more usual form.

With this chapter on the miscellaneous cross-heads all of Cumbria's pre-Norman sculpture has been examined\(^6\) with the exception of the hogbacks and the material from Gosforth. The following two chapters deal with these important groups.

1. See above p. 134.
2. A.L. Binns 1956, fig.7. See above p.
4. e.g., (a) Brompton: see W.G. Collingwood 1907, 301 fig.j; (b) Gargrave and Leeds: see W.G. Collingwood 1915, 174 figs. c-f and 210 fig.1.
5. Gilling and Topcliffe; see W.G. Collingwood 1907, 323 fig.f and 403; Hovingham; see W.G. Collingwood 1915, 255 fig.c.
6. Brigham VIII, a cross-head, has not been given an extended discussion since neither its shape nor its surviving decoration offer grounds for analysis or dating.
CHAPTER ELEVEN

Hogbacks

A hogback may be defined as a type of recumbant monument whose form reproduces the shape of a building. The name points to the distinctive curve of the ridge-line whilst a second, less universal, characteristic is that the stone, when seen in plan, has the bowed outline of the so-called boat building. No complete corpus of these monuments has been published and they have not been as fully illustrated in local studies of pre-Norman sculpture as have the crosses. As a result there are problems in examining this group which do not arise with the rest of the sculpture: this accounts for the comparative length of the general discussion in this chapter. Previous studies are few, Collingwood's discussions are summary in form and more attention seems to have been paid to the monument's relevance to house reconstructions than to a study of hogbacks as such. It is particularly regrettable that Baldwin Brown's chapter on recumbant tombstones was left unfinished.

I

It is not possible, on the present evidence, to suggest a derivation for the hogback type which would carry complete conviction. Any attempt must, however, take account of a range of material

1. It should be noted that there is little direct evidence for the use of these monuments as grave-markers though one possible case was noted at Heysham in J.H. Nicholson 1891, 30. For the confused evidence relating to the Giant's Grave at Penrith see W.S. Calverley 1892, 240ff.
2. The earliest use of the term seems to be in W. Black 1895.
3. The misleading nature of this label is discussed in B. Hope-Taylor 1961.
5. The fullest are in W.G. Collingwood 1915, 284-5 and W.G. Collingwood 1927, 164-73.
of material which has the form of a building. These groups will now be briefly reviewed before analysing the probable lines of hogback development.

The first group are the shrines or chrismals in metalwork, ivory or wood. Most of the surviving insular examples seem to be of Irish manufacture and are relatively small and easily transported. The most plausible interpretation of the bronze fragments from Saint-Germain Museum would suggest, however, that there were also large, non-portable, metalwork shrines in Britain.


2. (a) With a hipped roof.
   To this group can be added the two fragmentary shrines, one unprovenenced and the other from Co. Roscommon illustrated in E.C.R. Armstrong 1922, plate IX. Of British, but probably non-Gaelic, manufacture are three other shrines which belong to this group: (i) the Gandersheim casket: see D.M. Wilson 1964, plate I; (ii) British Museum shrine fragments: see D.M. Wilson 1956; (iii) the Mortain chrismal: see E. Salin 1959, plate IX. Note also the Andenne shrine: see J. Baum 1937, plate XXXV.

which had a similar building-like shape.¹

All of the examples listed above have a straight ridge. To this group must be added two house-shaped objects whose ridges, like those of hogbacks, are curved though discussion of their significance will be postponed until all the building-shaped material has been passed under review. The first is the Gammin casket, one of the finest examples of Mammen art and presumably a Danish product² whilst the second is the very large shrine on which Harold is shown swearing in the Bayeux tapestry.³

A second group is formed by the building-shaped caps to certain Irish crosses. The origins of this type are not clear⁴ but the majority of the nine known examples have a perpendicular gable rather than hipped roof.⁵

1. J. Hunt 1956. See also F. Henry 1938 and E. Bakka 1965, 39-40 and plates 4-5. F. Henry 1965, 100 notes evidence for a type intermediate in size between the known small portable types and those of the size inferred from the Saint-Germain fragments. It should be noted that building-shaped shrines of varying sizes are known from the Continent, from north Africa and from further east: see W.M. Conway 1919; F. Henry 1965, 100 (note1); F. van der Meer and C. Mohrmann 1959, plate 509; W.H.C. Frend 1972, 222.


3. F. Stenton 1957, 178 and no. 29.

4. It could have been suggested by such simple caps as that used at Ahenny: see F. Henry 1965, plate 76. The form is clearly that of a church - whether directly reproduced or as a double skeuomorph of a reliquary-shrine - see A.C. Thomas 1971, 76-7 and H.M. Roe 1965.

5. For examples at Kinitty and Donaghmore see F. Henry 1933, plates 92 and 95. For Arboe see F. Henry 1964, plate 59. For Killamery see F. Henry 1965, plate 67 though it seems doubtful whether this cap belongs with the cross to which it is now affixed because the stone is much paler and the dimensions do not match well with the cross. For Monasterboice (2 examples), Clonmacnois, Durrow and Termonfechin see F. Henry 1967, plates 76, 87, 90, 98, 108.
More relevant in size to the hogbacks are the third group, the shrine-tombs. These can be divided into two types, the hollow and the solid, and both have been the subject of much recent discussion. From this it is clear that there is both literary and archaeological evidence for the existence of hollow, building-shaped, shrines of both stone and wood on the continent and in the British Isles in the period before c.900. The evidence

1. For general discussion of enshrinement and shrines see E. Dyggeve 1951, J. Braas, 1952, IX, 545ff.
3. For the continent the literary evidence is quoted in C. A. R. Radford 1956, 56ff. and especially footnote 4. For some gabled sarcophagi in Merovingian France see E. le Blant 1886, plates XIII and XXXIV or E. Salin 1952, plate IV, no. 3. For hipped examples see E. le Blant 1886, plates XXVIII, XXXII, XXXIII, XXXVI and XLVI. See also E. Salin 1952, 131ff. (and especially 140ff. for material from St. Dizier) and L. Coutil 1930, 57-40. For wooden house-shaped covers see also H. Dammheimer 1967, 33ff. 
For grave no. 764 and the reconstruction in A. C. Thomas 1971, fig. 66. The insular material is capable of several sub-divisions:

(i) The group, one of which seems to be of the twelfth century, from Ireland discussed in D. M. Waterman 1961. These are much larger than the other groups and are not really relevant.

(ii) The slab-shrines which seem to be an Irish type. Most have a tent-like shape but for the possibility of side-walls on an example from Illanloghan see F. Henry 1957, 98. The type is mapped in A. C. Thomas 1971, fig. 68. For discussions and lists see A. C. Thomas 1966, 100; A. C. Thomas 1968, 168; A. C. Thomas 1971, 141-2. To lists add examples noted by F. Henry 1957, 100 and 160.

(iii) The composite corner-post type discussed in A. C. Thomas 1968, 172-4 and A. C. Thomas 1971, 150-163 with early examples mapped in fig. 68. These show a north British distribution but it is worth noting the existence of Irish examples at (a) Kildrenagh (F. Henry 1957, 90); (b) Church Island (M. J. O'Kelly 1958, 87-90); (c) Kileen Cormac, (R. A. S. Macalister and R. L. Praeger 1929, 254) despite the dating given these in A. C. Thomas 1971, 150. Few of these survive in any form which will allow reconstruction of the lid: A. C. Thomas 1968, 172 and A. C. Thomas 1971, 150 argues that this was flat. There is thus some doubt about the form of the most developed example of this type—that of the St. Andrew's shrine— which was reconstructed by C. A. R. Radford 1955 with a hipped roof, a view which is challenged in A. C. Thomas 1968, 174, footnote 85 and A. C. Thomas 1971, 156.
from Anglo-Saxon areas for this hollow type is rather stronger in
the literary sources than in the surviving archaeological material
since the physical remains of possible shrines are so fragmentary.\textsuperscript{1}
The reconstruction of the Jedburgh tomb by Radford does, however,
seem convincing.\textsuperscript{2}

It is the second type of shrine-tomb which is the most
relevant for an understanding of the hogback. This is the solid
building-shaped monument which was placed over the saint's body
or relics. For this type also there is literary and archaeological
evidence from the continent,\textsuperscript{3} examples from Celtic areas of the
British Isles\textsuperscript{4} and (most fortunately) at least two examples from

\textsuperscript{1} All the claimants seem to be of the corner-post type. Fragments
have been noted from Whitby: see C.R. Peers and C.A.R. Radford
1943, 34 where a similar identification is made for other
stones at Hovingham (W.G. Collingwood 1907, 337) and Breedon
(A.W. Clapham 1928, plate XXXIX). The important evidence for
a wooden shrine, shaped like a building, associated with the
relics of St. Chad is found in B. Colgrave and R.A.B. Mynors
1962, IV, 3 for a discussion of this and other literary
evidence see C.A. Radford 1956, 56-7 and A.C. Thomas 1971, 147.
\textsuperscript{2} C.A.R. Radford 1956, 44-5 and comments of A.C. Thomas 1971, 149.
\textsuperscript{3} C.A.R. Radford 1956, 57 footnote 5 and E. Salin 1952, 145 (for
cenotaph of St. Theodechilde at Jouarre) and 70-1. Such
evidence would suggest that an insular development from hollow
to monolith types, suggested by A.C. Thomas 1971, 150, need
not be necessary.
\textsuperscript{4} Though all are subject to reservations. The St. Andrew's School
shrine illustrated in C.A.R. Radford 1956, 59ff. seems to
have a slightly curved roof line and is more likely to be
linked to a variety of Scottish hogback. Another possibility
from St. Vigeans (W. Duke 1888 and J.R. Allen 1903, III, 280
no. 29) has an outward-facing beast's head on the ridge and a
slight curve to the roof line. It too is better grouped
with the hogbacks. One Irish example at Clones is more
convincing but this stone has a peculiar history and may owe
much of its present form to hearty restoration in relatively
modern times: see J. Hunt 1956 and W.F. Wakeman 1876, 335-7.
With these various groups of material in mind it is now possible to suggest the probable development of the hogback type. Given that the monument belongs to the Viking period (a dating which is established below) there are several possibilities.

The first is that this is a kind of monument which the Vikings introduced into Britain from their homeland. Whilst there is certainly no evidence for the existence of stone examples in Scandinavia it is theoretically possible that wooden ones did exist which have left no trace. But this would not explain why the distribution of hogbacks, recently mapped by Lang, is largely limited to certain areas of northern England and excludes most of the other Viking colonies.

The distribution points to the fact that the hogback must be a form of monument which was developed in Britain, and specifically (an issue which is dealt with below) in Norwegian areas of northern England. It is likely therefore to represent a version of one of the numerous building- (church-) like objects which the raiders and settlers encountered in Britain. The most relevant amongst the material assembled above would be the solid shrine-tombs of the kind surviving in Hedda's tomb, but with its

1. (a) Hedda’s tomb: see A.W. Clapham 1930, plate 30; (b)Bakewell: see R.E. Routh 1938, plate V (A and B).

Both of these are pre-Viking. Another example from Oswaldkirk in Yorkshire, is not easily dated: see W.G. Collingwood 1907, 378, fig. a. This may have the curved roof of a hogback but, in its present setting, it is impossible to be certain of this.

2. For prehistoric mortuary houses see A.C. Thomas 1971, 148. The mid-twelfth century coped chest from Norway (M. Olsen 1941, 218), a Swedish grave cover (S. Gardell 1937, I,122) and the literary description of a ? shrine in the Saga of Magnus the Good (S. Laing 1844,II, 369) are all irrelevant to the present argument since they could all reflect post-conversion practices in Scandinavia rather than the continuity of a pagan-form of memorial.


4. Whether this is ultimately thought of as the Holy Sepulcre (H. Roe 1965,223) or a contemporary building is not relevant to the argument.
church-like shape adapted so that it conformed to the appearance of a Viking house. ¹ A similar adaptation of other building-like objects would yield the Cammin casket and the Bayeux tapestry shrine; the one a version of a portable shrine, the other an adaptation of the larger type of shrine whose existence is suggested by the Saint-Germain fragments.

There are two objections to this suggested development. The first is that this development does not seem to have taken place in either Ireland or Scotland where there is at least some evidence of the pre-Viking existence of hollow shrines, if not convincing instances of the solid type. In part this may be explained by a general lack of Scandinavian impact on, or adoption of, sculpture in the ninth and tenth centuries in Ireland - a situation to which northern England presents such a contrast. ² Perhaps more important is the objection that the main hogback area of northern England has yet to yield a clear example of a solid shrine-tomb of the Hedda type. They can, of course, never have been common objects - it might be suggested that it was their prestige rather than their numbers which impressed the Vikings - and this lack is probably the accident of survival. It seems very likely that the same continental practices which are reflected in Hedda's tomb would also be copied in Christian Northumbria in the eighth and ninth centuries and Jedburgh provides one example of the related hollow type from the northern kingdom. The hogback is, then, probably a Viking adoption, made in northern England, of a type of solid shrine-tomb which the settlers encountered in the area: no other explanation seems to fit the date, distribution and form of the monument. The numbers of hogbacks which survive, and the apparent pagan ornament of several of them, suggest that the monument is not restricted to saints or those with claims or aspirations to sanctity. The monolithic monument, shaped like a building, is now clearly secular.

1. See especially: H. Schmidt 1970; O. Olsen 1965; P.G. Foote and D.M. Wilson 1971, 150-3. In claiming the shrine-tomb as the source of inspiration for the hogbacks I would not wish to deny the possibility of influence from other building-shaped objects, notably the portable shrines.

2. F. Henry 1962, 65 and see below p. 364.
II

The origins of the hogback are inevitably inferential: so also are the origins of the zoomorphic form frequently placed at the ends of the ridge on this type of monument. Several explanations for this end-beast can, however, be suggested.

The first set of suggestions involve the assumption that the sculptors were imitating or developing a type of ornament which they knew on buildings or had seen on the range of building-like material which was reviewed above. Here it is possible to distinguish several types. There is, first, the likelihood that the crossing upper terminals of gable-poles were decorated with animal heads facing across (not along) the ridge. This is suggested by the illumination showing the Temple in the Book of Kells\(^1\) which contains a conventionalised representation of what is either an actual church\(^2\) or, less likely, a house-shaped shrine. This type of decoration need not have been limited to Celtic Britain for it is still a feature of barns in Sweden and Swedish Finland. This would yield one possible source for end-beasts though it is perhaps only relevant as a possible explanation for the cross-ridge facing animals of, for example, one of the Govan hogbacks.\(^3\)

A second possible source is provided by buildings, or material imitative of buildings, with a beast's head placed on the ridge. It would be difficult to prove that there were actual examples of these amongst the houses of pagan Scandinavia but there are fine examples on twelfth-century churches which may, like stave building, reflect an earlier tradition.\(^4\) Many of the Irish shrines also have ridges with zoomorphic terminals but, like the beasts

---

1. F. Henry 1965, fig.9 and F. Henry 1967, plate B.
4. See the stave church at Borgund and Lom, H.R. Ellis-Davidson 1969, 118-9 or the church shown on the Skog tapestry.
on the ridge of the Cammin casket, continental examples like the Enger reliquary and the Scandinavian churches just listed, the animal's head usually faces outwards. This outward-facing animal on shrines might be thought relevant for those few hogbacks with outward-facing end-beasts (a rare and apparently Scottish predilection) but has less bearing on the origin of the more usual inward-facing hogback animal.

There are however, both in Ireland and on the continent, some shrines on which the animal is inward-facing. A reliquary now in the Cathedral treasury at Monza has inward-facing animals on the ridge, though placed some distance from the gable-end, whilst another from the Upper Rhine area, has the heads of inward-facing animals actually at the gable-end. From Celtic Britain there are three (possibly four) complete shrines, and the fragments of two others, with inward-facing beasts. Together with the animals which face from corner to corner of the Cammin and Bamberg caskets, these shrines must raise the possibility that this class of object, or the large buildings they might be reproducing, could have inspired the hogback end-beast.

Another possible source for the end-beasts of the hogback are the inward-facing animal heads which appear at the junction of cross-arms and arris-edges on a series of slabs at York. Since

5. W. M. Conway 1919, fig. 10.
6. (a) Monymusk reliquary: see F.C. Eeles 1934; (b) Lough Erne shrine: see F. Henry 1965, plate 20; (c) Emly and Melhus shrines: see A. Mahr 1932, plates 10 and 17.
7. One from Co. Roscommon, the other unprovenanced, illustrated in E.C.R. Armstrong 1922, plate IX, fig. 2.
some of these, particularly amongst the unpublished material from the Minster, show a very sophisticated version of the Jellinge style it is possible that they could precede the hogbacks. Such a derivation has the advantages of presenting analogues within the same medium from a prestigious centre within the area producing hogbacks. Moreover it presents beasts in which some form of muzzle is as persistent an element as it is amongst the hogback animals. But it must be recognised that chronological deductions, dependant upon what little diagnostic ornament survives on the hogbacks, does not allow us to establish a relative chronology between the York slabs and the hogbacks. It could well be that the York arrangement represents an adoption of elements of hogback decoration onto a slab type.

All of the possible sources of inspiration for the hogback end-beast which have been considered so far imply that it was suggested by a bodiless head, whether on a shrine or on a recumbant slab. 1 This would further imply that the clasping animal, complete with body, such as is seen at Brompton and Sockburn is the later development. It is, however, possible to point to another potential source for a bodied end-beast which would allow the Brompton/Sockburn animals to be placed at the head of a stylistic evolution.

This source is one to which Collingwood alluded: 2 the upright slab with three-dimensional animals crawling over the upper corners. The now-lost Knells slab showed that the type existed in Anglian Cumbria and it is one which is familiar on Scottish slabs of pre-

1. Nothing like the Monza modelled animals have appeared on any of the known insular shrines: the nearest to a complete insular animal on a shrine is the head and shoulders on the unprovenanced Irish shrine-fragment, illustrated in E.C.R. Armstrong 1922, plate IX, fig.2.
Viking date. It is a short step from this type of decoration to that seen at Bressay and York where, at dates in the Viking period, the inward-looking animal completely dominates the stone - in much the same manner as do the end-beasts of Brompton.

It is, then, possible to suggest various backgrounds for the end-beast, whether the earliest hogback versions are bodiless or with appendages. Perhaps one further possibility should not be neglected - that this is a three-dimensional rendering of an irrecoverable myth, created by an individual artist in Allertonshire, in which the idea of muzzling (which is very persistent, even in ultimate derivatives) was an important factor. But the evidence does not allow any final conclusion.

Nor does the evidence permit any certainty about the original centre of the hogback idea. There has been a tendency to look to the Allertonshire area because this is the centre of the known distribution and a district where there are sufficient monuments to trace through a hypothetical evolution of large-bodied end-beasts to simple inward-facing heads. But this does not establish Allertonshire as the original centre of hogback production. Again, the necessary evidence does not exist.

Rather more certain is the fact that Collingwood was probably wrong to suggest that the hogback without end-beasts preceded those

1. (a) Examples where the animal's body breaks the outline of the stone at its upper corners are the slabs from Aberlemno (no.2), Glamis (no.2), St. Madoes and Meigle (no.4): see J.R. Allen 1903, III, figs.227B,234A,309 and 313.
(b) Examples where the beast merely frames the face of the stone are the slabs at Cossins, Farnell, Monifieth (no.2) and Dunfallandy: see J.R. Allen 1903,III,figs.230B,232B,242B and 305B.
2. J.R. Allen 1903, III, figs.4 and 4a.
5. e.g., the Lythe mask: see W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig. 203 f.f.
6. W.G. Collingwood 1927, 166, though he admits that the beastless type continues right through the series.
with ridge-animals. If the presence of possible pagan and Scandinavian motifs is any guide to an early date then the hogbacks at Heysham, Lowther and Sockburn (all with beasts) ought to be as early as any in the country.

But in all this typological confusion one fact does emerge. There are regional varieties of hogbacks, varieties which will be further identified below, which include an Allertonshire taste for large end-beasts, an east-coast taste for a dragonesque animal, a north-western taste for figural decoration and high slim monuments and a Scottish taste for outward-facing end-beasts. Most of these could have co-existed.

One other conclusion seems clear: there is no reason to suggest that the sculptors of hogbacks were men other than those who produced the crosses. Where material survives in sufficient quantities from the same site (as at Gosforth, Sockburn, Aspatria, Brompton and Dewsbury) it is apparent that the same motifs, iconographic tendencies and even techniques of carving are common to the crosses and to these recumbant monuments.

III

Dating is also difficult. It has usually been assumed - and as a recent example one can cite Radford - that the hogback type began in the late Anglian period, though it is generally agreed that the main floruit falls within the ensuing Viking period. An initial development within the Anglian period was first proposed by Collingwood and it is largely on his authority that it has since been accepted. Collingwood's arguments, as the earlier sections of this chapter have already implied, are not convincing.

In 1915 Collingwood listed six Yorkshire stones (from Dewsbury, Crathorne, St. Mary Bishophill Jnr. York, Ingleby Arncliffe together with another possible example from Leeds) as

4. For Crathorne see W.G.Collingwood 1907, 304 fig.a and F.J. Haverfield and W.Greenwell 1892, 115. For St.Mary...York and Ingleby Arncliffe see W.G.Collingwood 1909, 171 and 190 figs. a-c. For Dewsbury see W.G.Collingwood 1915, 171 figs.x-&, For Leeds see W.G.Collingwood 1915b, 289 with a restoration drawing: cont. over page
evidence for Anglian development, arguing that they were intermediate in form between "Anglo-Saxon shrine-tombs" and the hogbacks of the Viking period and that they carried debased scrolls of "late AB type". Two other Yorkshire stones, from Bedale and Oswaldkirk\(^1\), were presented as supplementary evidence since "they had figures less grotesque than usual in the tenth and eleventh centuries". By 1927 Ingleby Arncliffe had been dropped from the list and the Anglian dating of the five stones remaining seemed now to depend less on form than on ornament.\(^2\)

Collingwood's dating from the form of the monument is one which is difficult to refute because he never identified those elements which were closer to shrine-tombs than hogbacks in this intermediary series. If, for example, a distinction is made on the basis of the straight ridge-line then it is difficult to see why the Crathorne stones are classified as intermediary. Even if it were possible to point to features which are derived from shrine-tombs this would not indicate an early date for the appearance of these features on any particular hogback. It would first have to be demonstrated that there were no shrine-tombs in the Viking period and, whilst no clear example can be produced, it is possible that the plain, straight-ridged, house-shaped stones at Lythe and Sinnington are of this later date.\(^3\) Links in form between the two types need not carry chronological implications - particularly if the shrines of an earlier period (which, the writer believes, lie behind the hogback development) were still visible.

It is perhaps more fruitful to turn to the second of Collingwood's arguments - the one which he eventually seems to have seen as the more crucial to his case - dating by ornament.

(4. note continued from previous page)

note the caution with which he identified this as a hogback in both W.G. Collingwood 1915, 211 and W.G.Collingwood 1915b, 291.)

1. For Bedale see W.H, Longstaffe 1847, 258 which shows more of the ornament than W.G.Collingwood 1907, 296 fig.b. For Oswaldkirk see W.G. Collingwood 1907, 378 fig.k.

2. W.G. Collingwood 1927, 164-5: "At Dewsbury...and York...with good Anglian ornament of the third quarter of the ninth century... Crathorne...with scrolls which might be of the end of the ninth century".

3. Sinnington is unpublished. For Lythe see W.G.Collingwood 1911, 297.
The Anglian dating given to the Bedale stone is relatively easy to refute. Collingwood only illustrated the figural ornament on the gable-end but on one of the long sides (of which only one inaccurate nineteenth-century drawing has been published\textsuperscript{1}) there is a bound figure, set amidst bifurcating and lobate bands of characteristic Viking appearance.\textsuperscript{2} Unfortunately the carving of the Virgin and Child from Oswaldkirk has no associated ornament by which it can be dated but, in the light of the ornamental context of the Bedale figure sculpture, it is clear that this hogback\textsuperscript{3} similarly need not pre-date the tenth century.

This leaves the vine-scrolls at Dewsbury, Crathorne and York.\textsuperscript{4} In each case the scroll runs along the full length of the side of the monument: similar ornamental schemes, using scrolls, are known on hogbacks at Penrith and Brigham in the north-west, York,\textsuperscript{5} Crathorne\textsuperscript{6}, Gainford\textsuperscript{7}, Oswaldkirk\textsuperscript{8}, Kirkdale\textsuperscript{9}, Sockburn\textsuperscript{10}, Bedale\textsuperscript{11} and Repton\textsuperscript{12} on the east of the Pennines. It would not be difficult to demonstrate that these latter hogbacks can be assigned to the Viking period but that would be merely to point to a later

---

2. Compare the figure at Leeds (W.G. Collingwood 1915, 217, fig.w) where there is the same combination of anthropomorphism, bifurcating bands and lobate interlace.
3. If such it be: there is not sufficient length of roof visible to determine if this had a curved ridge.
4. The example from Leeds has been omitted from this discussion since Collingwood only included it as a hogback with great reservations.
5. W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig. 196.
6. Two examples: W.G. Collingwood 1907, 304 fig.a and F.J. Haverfield and W. Greenwell 1899, no.LI.
7. F.J. Haverfield and W. Greenwell 1899, no. XLVII. The scroll is on the reverse of the side illustrated on p. 109.
8. W.G. Collingwood 1907, 378, fig.b.
9. W.G. Collingwood 1907, 345, fig.c.
12. E.L. Cutts 1849, 73, plate 33.
continuity of what Collingwood's arguments would suggest was a decorative scheme of Anglian innovation. The individual scrolls therefore require examination.

On both of the Crathorne examples¹ the scroll is a fleshy, grapeless series of spirals which do not significantly differ from the reversing spirals of the hogback at Sockburn² nor, indeed, those on the hogback Penrith V, the northern face of the Penrith III or of one of the Middleton shafts³. All of these are firmly fixed within the Viking period - the Sockburn example is particularly striking as an analogue since it comes from the same Tees valley area, occurs on a hogback and is associated with figural decoration which shows a female with a trailing Viking dress. As additional evidence that the two Crathorne pieces are of Viking date there is the fact that both use a loose ring in their plait.

The scrolls from York and Dewsbury⁴ differ from those at Crathorne in having leaves and grape pellets. Yet these are not details which, on their own, are necessarily indicative of pre-Viking date since they are found at Leeds⁵ associated with what Wilson has called "an example of the late tendril style".⁶ Nearer still is the scroll from Brompton⁷ which is relatively naturalistic and yet of the Viking period.⁸

---

1. W.G. Collingwood 1907, 304, fig.a and F.J. Haverfield and W. Greenwell 1899, no. LI.
3. A.L. Binns 1956, fig.2.
4. They are conveniently figured together in W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig. 196.
7. W.G. Collingwood 1907, 301, fig.i.
8. It shares with the Viking-period material at Kirklevington, Northallerton, Wycliffe and Sockburn a peculiar motif which can be labelled the ringed arris: see W.G.Collingwood 1907, 353 fig.y, 373 fig.p/q, 412 fig.f/g and W.H. Knowles 1907, 171. In general on such "Anglian revival art "see T.D. Kendrick 1949, 65.
The case, on grounds of ornament, for an Anglian origin of the hogback is not, then, entirely convincing. Thanks to the nature of the evidence it is not possible to dismiss Collingwood’s case entirely. At very least however there is no compelling reason to assign any hogback to a pre-Viking context. The difference between the view put forward above and that held by Collingwood is, in any case, perhaps only one of emphasis for in 1915 he wrote of the Dewsbury stone that "it cannot be said that the A character of this stone...means earlier than the Danish period".¹

That this is a Viking-inspired type of monument seems to be further indicated by two factors. The first is the actual shaping of the monuments. Their links with a type of Viking house have often been noticed² but it is perhaps equally important to stress that the bombé type of house-plan, on current evidence, does not reach this country until the Viking invasions of the later part of the ninth century though it has, of course, a long history in Scandinavia.³

The second argument for a Viking date depends upon the distribution of this type of monument. From Lang’s map⁴ it is clear that there is a marked concentration in northern Yorkshire and north-west England, areas of Viking and, more specifically, Norwegian-Irish settlement. The absence of this type from Anglian areas north of the Tees or the more Danish areas of southern Yorkshire and Lincolnshire is well marked. The more eccentric monuments, like Hickling⁵ or many of the Scottish stones,⁶ are

---

1. W.G. Collingwood 1915, 171. A further indication of the late date of the Dewsbury stone is the use of the cross on the gable-end since this was a frequent motif in this position on Norman and post-Norman recumbant stones.


4. See H. Schmidt 1970, fig.3.

5. A. de Boulay Hill 1916, fig.5.

6. e.g., Brechin and Meigle: see J.R. Allen 1903, III, figs.262b and 352.
well distanced geographically from the north Yorkshire focus. The map would suggest that this was a type of monument popular among, and probably developed by, Norwegian settlers in northern England who (on the argument given above) adapted the concept of a shrine-tomb and gave it the shape of a familiar Scandinavian type of building. But, with only a few exceptions, it was not a type of monument found in other Viking colonies in Britain.¹

Even if it is accepted that the hogback is a product of the Viking period it is still difficult to be sure of chronological limitations within the tenth and eleventh centuries. The idiosyncratic example from Brechin² with its Ringerike ornament, shows that the type was still being used in the area in the late tenth or early eleventh centuries whilst the stones at Luss³ and Hexham⁴ have ornament which seems to date to a period after the Norman Conquest. But all three of these late monuments are on the geographic fringe of the main area of hogback production. Whilst they show a continued persistence of hogbacks into the eleventh century such persistence may not have been universal nor need their chronological indications be relevant for the Viking-settled areas of Yorkshire or Cumbria. Since there is a unity of motifs and forms across the Pennines some of the hogbacks should, by implication, post-date the settlement of Cumbria by Norwegian Vikings in the second decade of the tenth century. The majority of the evidence points to the tenth century as the main period of these stones: this would be the best chronological setting for the Jellinge ornament of Bedale,⁵ Pickhill⁶, Brompton,⁷ Derby,⁸ Hickling,⁹ Plumbland II and probably Aspatria VII. It would be

1. For Cornwall see A.G. Langdon 1896, 46; for Ireland see J.T. Lang 1971; for Wales see V.E. Nash-Williams 1950, no. 114. It is interesting to note that the related Scandinavian monuments are usually straight-ridged: see G. Baldwin Brown 1937, plate CXVI and P.G. Foote and D.M. Wilson 1970, 414 but note the two examples with curved ridges illustrated in S. Gardell 1937, 97 and 118.
2. J.R. Allen 1903, III, fig. 262 and J.R. Walker 1885, fig. 9.
3. J.R. Walker 1885, fig. 9.
4. W.G. Collingwood 1925d, fig. 19 and 90-1 (a dating which also applies to Luss).
5. W.H. Longstaffe 1847, 258.
6. W.G. Collingwood 1907, 381, fig. b.
7. F.J. Haverfield and W. Greenwell 1899, no. LXIII.
8. St. Alkmunds: see R.E. Routh 1938, plate XII.
9. F. de Boulay Hill 1916, fig. 5.
the most likely date for the depiction of Scandinavian myths and gods at Sockburn,\(^1\) Lowther, Gosforth and Heysham.\(^2\) A concentrated burst of production between c. 920 and the middle of the tenth century, when the Norwegian element in Yorkshire went into decline, would account for the ornament of most of the stones and for the lack of a wider spread of the type.

IV

The first of Cumbria's hogbacks to be discussed here, Addingham V, was discovered in 1912 on the site of a church which was overwhelmed by a change in the course of the River Eden.\(^3\) It has not figured in any previous discussion of the hogback type.

The stone has very low walls which continue the slope of the roof pitch. The ridge is not central and the side now placed against the porch wall has a much greater convex curve than the other. The roof is represented by three rows of tegulation which varies in shape between triangles and trapeziums. At each gable-end is the head of an inward-facing end-beast with round, hollowed, ears, the top of its jaw marked by three chevrons. The animal lacks both body and paws but the head forms the upper edge of a sub-triangular panel, flanked on its other sides by the raised arris moulding and by a further moulding which curves up from the lower corner of the hogback to join the lower jaw of the animal (see fig. 30)

![Fig. 30: Addingham V end-beast](image)

1. W.H. Knowles 1907, 116 no. 11 and fig. on 117.
2. G. Baldwin Brown 1937, plate CXVII.
Most of the details are easily paralleled within the rest of the hogback series; thus the tegulation type is geographically widespread,\(^1\) the ears have exact analogies across Stainmore at Brompton\(^2\) and, further up the Tees, Wycliffe\(^3\) provides a close analogy for the gable end with its raised arris borders. The jaw chevrons are also found elsewhere.\(^4\)

The exact treatment of the end-beast is not found elsewhere though it can be grouped with a small set of hogbacks which all show the same development in which the animal's body is replaced by the arris moulding. One of the Sockburn stones\(^5\) and the Cross Canonby hogback both show this treatment and with them can be classed the stone from Easington in Yorkshire\(^6\) in which the artist has extended the arris moulding onto the ridge line to form a snake's body. Whilst associating the Addingham beast with this group it should, of course, be noted that their animal-heads are much smaller - in comparative size the Addingham beast is nearer the proportions of the heads at Wycliffe\(^7\) and Gosforth VII where the head is placed above a panel of decoration.

But the Addingham beast has not entirely lost contact with the bodied and legged beast of the type seen in such dominating

---

1. It occurs locally on the Lowther and Penrith hogbacks. In Scotland it is used at Deerness and Inchcolm: see W.Kirkness 1921, fig.2 and J.R.Allen 1903, III, fig. 385. For Repton see E.L. Cutts 1849, plate XXXIII. For Bolton le Sands see VCH. 1906, 266. For Sockburn and Wycliffe see H.Schmidt 1970, fig.7. The others are all Yorkshire examples at Crathorne, Easington and Lythe: see F.J.Haverfield and W.Greenwell 1899, no. LI; W.G. Collingwood 1907, 317 fig.h; W.G.Collingwood 1911, 294 figs.ff,gg,ii and 295 figs. jj and 11. Many of these illustrations, particularly those of the Lythe material, are inaccurate.

2. H. Schmidt 1970, fig.6 and F.J. Haverfield and W. Greenwell 1899, no. LXI.


4. e.g., Meigle and Sinnington: see J.R. Allen 1903, III, fig.352 and W.G. Collingwood 1907, 386 (the Yorkshire example is not illustrated).

5. H. Schmidt 1970, fig.7 (lower).

6. W.G. Collingwood 1907, 316, fig.h.

7. H. Schmidt 1970, fig. 7 (upper).
form at Brompton: the curved moulding which runs from the lower corner of the stone up to the beast's muzzle is probably a stylised version of the Brompton clasping paw. Stylistically, therefore, the Addingham hogback belongs to a phase after the majority of the Brompton pieces but it would be dangerous to make chronological inferences from developments which may owe more to distance and individuality than to time.

What is most striking is that there seems to be no trace of regionalism in the particular treatment of the details of this hogback. Indeed, the Addingham stone stands apart from the majority of the north-western examples of this monument-type in its avoidance of two north-western tendencies - figural decoration of the "wall" and high slender proportions. Where specific links can be made they seem to lie eastwards to the Teesdale sites of Wycliffe and Sockburn.

The hogback which, at first sight, is closest to Addingham is the one from Cross Canonby which has something of the same low, squat proportions. However, the presence of a hitherto unnoticed coil of a snake on the side now placed against the church wall implies that the walls were at least eight centimetres higher than they now appear: the original form would therefore be more slender than seems now suggested.

The end-beast, now greatly worn, is of the small snake-like type seen at Sockburn and Easington but, unlike those examples, lacks any of the semi-realistic linking to an arris serving as the body of the animal. The Cross Canonby treatment is best paralleled

---

1. H. Schmidt 1970, fig. 1 for examples still at Brompton. See also F.J. Haverfield and W. Greenwell 1899, nos. LVIII, LI, LXII and LXIV.
2. Most immediately the type in which the paw clasps the muzzle (F.J. Haverfield and W. Greenwell 1899, no. LVIII) or comes very close to the jaw (e.g., W.H. Knowles 1907, 118 no.13).
3. First published by W.S. Calverley 1888, 464 with a drawing facing 461. For its present squat appearance see the section drawing in H. Schmidt 1970, fig. 2.
4. H. Schmidt 1970, fig. 7 (lower).
5. W.G. Collingwood 1907, 317, fig.h.
on Gosforth VII, where there is a similar placing of the head on the ridge, away from the gable-end, in combination with a narrow decorated side panel.¹ This combination may well reflect a local development.

In practically every other facet of its decoration the carving certainly reflects local tastes. The roof decoration, composed of a closely meshed ring-chain is only found elsewhere in insular art at Gosforth and Dearham.² Similarly the curling snake (of which the upper parts of two volutes survive) on the present western side can be grouped with the serpents which undulate along the lower parts of Lowther VI and VII and Penrith VI. One further local link (though not one which reflects so exclusively a north-western taste) is the presence of a trace of human figural ornament on the western side.³ This appears to show an orans figure set within a double arris panel: the closest parallel for this panelled figure comes from Inchcolm in Fifeshire⁴ but in general the distribution of those hogbacks whose walls carry human ornament shows a heavy concentration of the type in north-western England.⁵ Only the fact that the figure is panelled⁶ sets it apart from this north-western group.

VI

Neither Aspatria nor Cross Canonby carry decoration of a type which is directly indicative of date, though the links of Cross Canonby to the Dearham circle-head would imply the tenth-century period. The interest of Plumbland II lies in the fact that it is

1. The side panel on Cross Canonby is not well shown in early drawings but is clear from photographs.
2. This is the only occasion when any type of knotwork is used as a form of tegulation on a hogback. Dearham is only 2 miles distant.
3. W.G. Collingwood refers to "figures" on this face but only one is now visible in favourable lighting. His suggestion that the scene was the Raising of Lazarus carries little conviction: see W.S. Calverley 1899, 104.
5. Examples at Gosforth (2), Lowther (2), Heysham, Bolton le Sands and (the only example to the east of the Pennines) Sockburn (several).
6. The double arris is very suggestive of the so-called "pilaster" divisions of walls on hogbacks like that from Brompton: see H. Schmidt 1970, fig. 1.
one of the few monuments of this type carrying zoomorphic decoration of a kind which can be identified with a Viking art-style. In so far as those art-styles have any chronological limitations this hogback gives more direct evidence of date than most.

The stone is now split into two large fragments but fortunately its post-Norman re-use as building material has not only given it an elegant Early English impost but has preserved the decoration on both of the cruck-shaped gable-ends, the shape of the tegulation and the upper sections of the zoomorphic decoration on the walls.

It is this zoomorphic decoration which is the most interesting feature of the stone. Unfortunately its restoration is disputed: Collingwood\(^1\) preferred to interpret the original scheme as one of a simple contoured plait with animal-head terminal whilst Brøndsted\(^2\) suggested that a scheme of two crossing animals was more likely. Brøndsted's restoration, which received the support of Shetelig,\(^3\) seems the more plausible, particularly since the strands do seem to swell and narrow in a zoomorphic fashion. Animal ornament of this type is not common on hogbacks and the only parallels for such ribbon beasts on this class of carving are those from Brompton\(^4\) and Derby\(^5\) - and in neither case is the resemblance particularly close.\(^6\)

The animals are clearly Jellinge beasts with the contoured body and the bird-like head\(^7\) of the style. The composition of...

---

1. W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig. 141.
2. J. Brøndsted 1924, 205.
4. F.J. Haverfield and W. Greenwell 1899, no. LXIII.
5. R.E. Routh 1938, plate XII shows one face with an animal-head terminal to line-incised knotwork but the other side, of which no photograph has been published, is decorated with a contoured ribbon-animal.
6. Other zoomorphic walls are even more remote in their lay-out: see W.G. Collingwood 1907, 381 fig.b and T.D. Kendrick 1949, plate LIII for Pickhill in Yorkshire and Hickling in Nottinghamshire.
7. The unpublished material from York Minster shows the best examples of this latter detail in northern sculpture though it is well known in the classic piece referred to in note 1 below, p. 297.
crossing bodies is, in fact, very close to the classic example of the Jellinge style on the Mammen horse collar\(^1\) and has already been examined in the discussion of Great Clifton.\(^2\)

The ornament on the gable-ends is similarly Jellinge in type. The contouring of the triquetrae shows the extension of a detail from zoomorphic to knotwork ornament: an analogous spread to human representations can be seen on a shaft from the Minster at York.\(^3\) The semi-circular nick in the outline of the interlace-strand on the present east gable is a feature which has already been discussed and shown to be characteristic of Viking art.\(^4\)

This identification of the animal style as Jellinge carries the chronological implication that the stone is of tenth-century date.\(^5\) It is, of course, possible that the artist was working in an old style but this seems unlikely when other features about the carving are taken into account. The tegulation, for instance, is of a type unparalleled in the rest of the hogback series\(^6\) whilst the double cable arris (unparalleled in that position though occurring infrequently elsewhere on hogbacks\(^7\)) is symptomatic of an ambitiousness about the whole monument. Both would argue for the animal style being up to date.

In its general shape and proportions, and in its lack of an end-beast, the Plumland hogback shows no particular regional characteristics:-- the closest parallels are from Dewsbury\(^8\) and Lythe\(^9\), in Yorkshire.

---

2. See above p.167 and note also the discussion of Workington III on p.120.
3. B. Hope-Taylor 1971, plate 8 (a). For discussion of contoured interlace see p.87 above.
4. See p.118.
5. For this chronological horizon see D.M. Wilson and O. Klindt-Jensen 1966, 118.
6. W.S. Calverley 1888c, 465 noted Roman occurrences. It is a type found on the lower roof of Borgund church: see H.R. Ellis Davidson 1969, 119.
7. Other examples are on the roof of Gosforth VII and at Wycliffe: for the latter see H. Schmidt 1970, fig.7.
VII

The hogbacks at Bromfield (no.IV) and Appleby (Bongate) have survived in a changed role as lintels of post-Norman churches. As a result it is impossible to distinguish any details of the shaping of their gable-ends. The stone at Bromfield is also so worn that only a small fragment of tegulation now survives of any of the ornament which this hogback once carried.

At Appleby more has been preserved. On the side which is now visible within the church both the tegulation and a part of the wall decoration can be seen, whilst the nineteenth-century drawings of Calverley and Collingwood have recorded something of the ornament which has now flaked largely away from the outer face.¹

The Appleby tegulation is of a type identical to that at Bromfield (see fig. 31) and is one which is found elsewhere in

![Fig. 31: Appleby (Bongate) hogback tegulation](image)

the north on both sides of the Pennines.² The decoration immediately below the shingling (on the church interior) is formed of abutting strips of plait, a treatment which is typical of carving in the Viking period and which is well represented elsewhere in Cumbria.³ Little comment can be made on the form of the scroll since it is clear that, even in Collingwood's day, the details had been weathered into obscurity.

---

1. W.S. Calverley 1899, 59 has Collingwood's drawing of both sides. Calverley's drawings are in W.S. Calverley 1888a, facing 119.
2. The other Cumbrian example is Gosforth VI. To the east of the Pennines are Burnsall in Yorkshire and Gainford in south Durham: see W.G.Collingwood 1915, 152 and F.J. Haverfield and W. Greenwell 1899, no. XLVII. (Note that the published drawing of Gainford does not show this detail accurately).
3. See p. 55 above, and p. 133.
The system of decoration is unparalleled. There is no difficulty in finding ornamental schemes in which a single line of plait occupied the whole of the wall area below the tegulation or was placed immediately below and parallel to the ridge. Equally there is no problem in assembling several examples of a type in which there are two rows of ornament below the tegulation. But the Appleby system of a single row set immediately below the tegulation, with the rest of the wall left blank, does not occur elsewhere. Nor does the single row of scroll, with a similar blank wall area, which is now on the exterior face. Both could perhaps be seen as variants on the system used by the scroll-hogbacks examined in the next section.

If the decorative scheme is unique then one feature of the Appleby stone, by contrast, is entirely characteristic of hogbacks in the north-western area: in plan its proportions are very narrow. The slender, relatively tall, hogback type has a distribution which is concentrated in Cumbria. All of the stones at Penrith, both of those at Gosforth, the two figured stones at Lowther and the one at Aspatria all share these characteristic proportions. The only example outside this area is one from Govan, which is best seen as a connected outlier of this north-western group.

This seems an appropriate point at which to discuss three of the Penrith hogbacks which are of this north-western shape. All three are decorated with a system of ornament which places them in the scroll-hogback series. In this group the area below the tegulation is decorated with two strips of ornament which are placed one below the other and run the entire length of the wall. One of these strips is made up of scroll-work. This type is frequently encountered on the eastern side of the Pennines and seems to have been a widespread form of hogback decoration.

1. e.g., Lythe: see W.G. Collingwood 1911, 294, fig. gg.
2. e.g., York: see J.T. Lang 1965; Brompton: see F.J.Haverfield and W. Greenwell 1899, no. LVIII.
3. The scroll-hogback type discussed below p.299 with lists on p.288 note 5-12.
4. Unless Brigham X can be so reconstructed.
5. J.R. Allen 1903, III, fig.484. Gross Canonby may also be added to this list in view of its incomplete state.
6. For list see above p.288.
All of the Penrith stones have survived in a battered condition and it is clear from the seventeenth-century drawings executed by Dugdale that their condition is not a recent development. Three of the stones have been sectioned laterally and one ornamented side is now lost. As a result of this treatment many of the details of the ornament are now obscure but sufficient survives to fit them, with varying degrees of conviction, into recognisable groupings.

Only one side of the south-eastern hogback, Penrith V, remains and even that is mutilated with two iron binding-strips. Its tegulation, wrongly rendered by Collingwood, is of the same type as the rest of the Penrith stones and identical with that noted in the Addingham discussion where it was seen to be of widespread occurrence. A plain moulding between the lines of tegulation is paralleled within the area at Aspatria. The wall decoration consists of a run of ring-twist set over a scroll (with pellets above) which has an exact parallel in the same churchyard on the shaft of the Giant's Thumb. This combination of scroll and knotwork places the stone as a scroll-hogback though it should be noted that this is the only example in which the scroll is placed in the lower position. The lack of a clear panel edge for the scroll seems to be a local characteristic since the same handling of the junction of wall decoration and the undecorated surround is found on Penrith VI and Penrith VIII, on the two figured hogbacks Lowther VI and VII and is even present on Gosforth VII where a small foot protrudes beyond a well-marked panel.

Penrith VIII is now placed at the south-western corner of the group and is the only one to have ornament preserved on both

1. The fullest treatment is in W.G. Collingwood 1923.
4. The plate in W.S. Calverley 1899, facing 240 shows this as Stafford knots; this has evidently been doctored, for the modern photographs confirm both Collingwood's drawing and Clayton's photographs (in the possession of the Society of Antiquaries) which show the run as a simple ring-twist.
5. Adding further evidence of the links between the two types of monument.
sides. Its tegulation has already been noted.\(^1\) Collingwood\(^2\) correctly rendered the decoration on the north wall as a four-strand plait set below a two-strand plait interwoven with figures of eight - the latter being a knot which is repeated at Penrith on the south side of the cross Penrith II. On the south side of this hogback there is a five-strand plait but the run of ornament above this seems to be scroll-work rather than the ring-twist drawn by Collingwood.\(^3\) There is an exact parallel for this total ornamental scheme of scroll and plait on one side, combined with a double row of plait on the other, at Gainford.\(^4\)

In 1923 Collingwood\(^5\) claimed that he could distinguish a small human figure on the western gable-end. This figure would obviously provide a local parallel for the figural decoration on the ends of the Gosforth stones as well as those in Yorkshire at Bedale and Oswaldkirk.\(^6\) But it should be remarked that no mention is made of this figure in Collingwood's earlier amplification of the description given by Calverley.\(^7\) Viewed from the south side it seems clear that a large flake has been cut off the western gable-end and there is certainly no trace of a figure there now: Collingwood's suggestion may well have been based on Dugdale's interpretations.

So little now remains of the north-western hogback, Penrith VII, and even less of its decoration that it would seem dangerous to suggest that it too could be grouped with the scroll types. It is, in fact, only tentatively so assigned on the basis of Collingwood's note that it has traces of decoration "more like the lines of large scrolls than plaits".\(^8\) Examination of the stone makes the case no more convincing than this.

---

1. It is shown inaccurately in W.G.Collingwood 1923, 125 and W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig. 199.
2. See references to his drawing in note 1 above.
3. J.T. Lang informs me that he has independently reached the same conclusion.
4. F.J. Haverfield and W. Greenwell 1899, no. XLVII.
5. W.G. Collingwood 1923, 125.
6. W.G. Collingwood 1907, 296 fig.b and 378 fig.a.
7. W.S. Calverley 1899, 249.
The small fragment of a hogback from Brigham is a more certain north-western member of this group. Neither its proportions, nor indeed, its general shape can be reconstructed from what survives but the commencement of the upper scroll is clear. The tegulation is of a square type which seems to belong to the northern fringes of the hogback distribution.

Calverley's illustration of the hogback from Kirkby Stephen might give the impression that it, too, can be classified with these Penrith, Appleby and Brigham stones. The spiral scroll at which he hints does not, in fact, exist and there is no difficulty in grouping it with hogbacks at Ingleby Arncliffe and Lythe which share its relatively short and tubby proportions and its lack of decoration. The form of tegulation shows no regional limitations.

IX

The fourth hogback at Penrith (no. VI), now the north-west component of the group, shows the same type of tegulation as the rest but in its decoration it belongs with another set of hogbacks

2. Though the roof seems to have been hipped and the wide panel at the gable-end resembles the Lythe material.
3. The other known examples are: Govan: see J.R. Allen 1903, III, fig. 485; Kirknewton: see T. Ross 1904, fig. 5; Lempitlaw: see RCHM 1956, II, 433.
4. W.S. Calverley 1899, 220 fig. A.
5. There is little likelihood of the ornament having been weathered away since the stones have remained within the church since Calverley's day.
8. It is found in Yorkshire at Dewsbury and Lythe: see W.G. Collingwood 1915, 170, fig. y and W.G. Collingwood 1911, 294, fig. hh. For Heysham see G. Baldwin Brown 1937, plate CXVII. In Scotland there are examples at Govan and Logie: see J.R. Allen 1903, III, fig. 484 and A.D. Lacaille 1928, fig. 8.
9. The drawing in W.G. Collingwood 1923, 123 (repeated in W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig. 198) is misleading.
whose type of ornament seems to be limited to the north-west of England. This is the type in which the walls of the hogback are filled with human figural ornament. The finest examples of the type are those at Gosforth but there are a further two at Lowther (nos. VI and VII) and others at Heysham and Bolton le Sands. Only at Sockburn does the type appear to the east of the Pennines.

The one surviving side of Penrith VI has a wall panel which is now, and long has been, badly worn. At the sinister end, however, it is possible to trace a convoluted snake with a human figure standing on its head. The ethnonic struggle has already been seen as a favourite theme of the north-western carvers and the two examples of it elsewhere on hogbacks at Gosforth VII and Bolton le Sands provide good parallels for the human figure. Apart from the figural panel, and the theme depicted thereon, there are other links to the north-western material: the lack of a firm edge to the lower frame, for example, has already been noted on the other Penrith stone and at Lowther and Gosforth. Similarly the tightly woven bundle of serpentine convolutions in front of the man and snake is exactly paralleled on Gosforth VI.

The struggle with the snake, when viewed in the light of the Burton in Kendal and Great Clifton carvings, is capable of a Christian interpretation. Yet it is intriguing to notice that there is no overt Christian element on this stone - not even a cross in the hands of the figure or a halo for his head - and the possibility of its being a pagan monument (perhaps Thor and the World Serpent) cannot be discounted. Such an interpretation certainly cannot be easily dismissed for the next two representations of this figural class - the two stones from Lowther, nos. VI and VII.

1. For Heysham see G. Baldwin Brown 1937, plate CXVII. For Bolton le Sands see WH 1906, 266, Cross-Canonby III, as was pointed out above, provides a further (though panelled) parallel.
2. W.H. Knowles 1907, 117 no. 11 (There are other unpublished examples at this site).
3. See above p.172. The closest parallels to a man clambering on a snake are those at Great Clifton and Gosforth VII but the hogback at Bolton le Sands is also very relevant.
4. For this theme on Gosforth II see p.338 below.
The two Lowther stones are so closely interlinked that they are best treated together. Unfortunately the carving on both is worn, some aspects of the early illustrations are not very satisfactory, and they are now placed in the darkest corner of the church porch.

The larger stone, no. VI, was first mentioned in 1866\(^1\) when only its ridge was visible above the churchyard turf. It was not until 1906 that it was excavated and Collingwood\(^2\) was able to prepare drawings of its decoration; since then only one minute photograph of one side has been published.\(^3\)

There is both less and more visible than Collingwood's illustrations show. Tegulation for example, can be seen and appears to be of the same shape as recurs frequently in the hogback series.\(^4\) On one side Collingwood showed a boat with shields and warriors, set over a small fish, confronting a row of warriors, apparently on land and also armed with shields. Between them is a larger figure and below the whole scene is a long snake. Both the land-based warriors and the central figure are not as clear as Collingwood shows them and there must also be some doubt about the symbols which are drawn as flanking the large figure. Conversely there is more of the serpent than Collingwood shows: a snake's head can be seen at the dexter end. The six, half-length, figures on the other side are much less clear on the stone than on Collingwood's drawing though the serpent below them seems to be correctly rendered.

The other hogback, Lowther VII, only survives as a fragment. Drawings of both sides were produced by Calverley in 1888\(^5\) and re-touched photographs appeared in his 1899 corpus\(^6\) and in Collingwood's discussion of the Lowther stones which appeared seven years later.\(^7\) The tegulation has been wrongly restored on

---

1. J. Simpson 1874, 11.
2. W.G. Collingwood 1907a, 160-3 with drawings on 161 which were reprinted in W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig. 210.
3. RCHM 1936, plate 8.
4. See the discussions of Addingham and Penrith above p. 293.
5. W.S. Calverley 1888c, facing 466, figs. X and XI.
6. W.S. Calverley 1899, facing 231.
7. W.G. Collingwood 1907a, facing 152.
Calverley's photograph - his drawing is better in this detail - but is of a rare type with flanged sides (see fig. 32). This seems to be associated with ambitious work: it appears locally again at Aspatria as well as across the Pennines at Sockburn\(^1\) and in Scotland.\(^2\) It is not without interest that it is the type found on the roof of the Temple in the Book of Kells\(^3\) though not, it would appear, on any of the shrine-shaped caps to Irish high crosses.

The two sides each contain four long-haired and half-length figures, the central one on Calverley's side B flanked by two pieces of fret-pattern. Though some seem to have arms bent across their chests (as shown by Calverley), and one appears to hold a ring, the details are not as clear as Calverley would suggest: the so-called ring could be the terminal curl of hair. It is certainly impossible to distinguish the alleged praying figure at the dexter end of side B whilst the "eastern look"\(^4\) of the figure on the sinister end of that side is a product more of the nineteenth century photographer than the original sculptor. The curling snake which appears below the scenes on both sides seems to be accurately shown.

2. For examples at Meigle and Govan see J.R. Allen 1903, III, figs. 352 A and B and 484. For another example from Govan and one at St. Vigeans see J. Stuart 1856, I, plate 134, no. I and W. Duke 1888, fig. I.
3. F. Henry 1967, plate B.
4. W.S. Calverley 1888c, 468.
The side showing the warriors on the complete hogback, no. VI, is probably the best starting point for a discussion of the ornament and interpretation of these two stones. There is, of course, something in common between this carving and elements of the Gosforth sculptures. In Northumbrian sculpture it is only here and on the Gosforth "Warrior's tomb" that a procession of warriors with overlapping shields are depicted. Only here and on the "Fishing stone", Gosforth II, is there in Northumbria a typical demi-lunate Viking vessel and these two carvings are also linked by the manner in which fish are used to indicate the presence of water in the absence of any line representing the surface of the sea.

But there is much here that is unique. This is the only insular example of a Viking ship with shields mounted on display and the only one on which a clear animal's head stem-post can be observed. Such boats, with shields displayed and with zoomorphic stem-posts, are, however, frequently found among the stones of Gotland and, to judge from an example on Skåne, were widespread in Viking art in Scandinavia, probably in more perishable media.

Two of these Gotland stones are particularly relevant to an understanding of the Lowther scene since they show precisely the combination of ship, land-based army and intervening figure which Collingwood believed to be unique. The first is from Lärbo St. Hammars where there is an identical composition with boated warriors to dexter, other warriors on land to sinister (though only three in this case) and a large female figure between them. The same combination, but with the vessel on the sinister side,

1. The motif is found on one of the coins from Birka.
2. Though, of course there are other depictions of Viking-period vessels - see list in discussion of Gosforth II below p.340.
3. No mast or rudder is shown.
4. S. Lindqvist 1941, passim.
5. From Tullstorps Kyrka, Skåne: see S. Lindqvist 1931, 154,fig.8.
7. no. 1. S. Lindqvist 1941, fig.82 on plate 28 and fig.81 on plate 27.
The interpretation of these Gotland stones is disputed but there seems no reason to question the fact that they depict Scandinavian myth and belief. The iconographic comparison is suggestive of a non-Christian interpretation for the Lowther scene. More precise identification is not possible.

The same snake which coils along the bottom of this scene recurs on the other side of this stone and both sides of Lowther VII. It has something in common with the snakes on the northwestern hogback at Penrith and at Cross Canonby in the manner in which it is depicted. In view of the apparent non-Christian interpretation of the warrior scene it is tempting to interpret it as representing the world serpent—an interpretation which would be consonant with the manner in which it encompasses the whole monument.

The six half-length figures on the other side of Lowther VI are identical to those on both faces of the smaller fragment and Collingwood was surely right to assert that "any explanation of the one series ought to serve for the other". Collingwood assumed that all of these figures were females but this need not be so: long hair, with curled terminals, is worn by male saints at Leeds and Ilkley. There is nothing in the implied sex of the characters involved which would militate against Lee's suggestion, accepted by Calverley and (with slightly less

1. S. Lindqvist 1941, figs. 97-102, and ibid., figs. 521-3.
2. J. Baum 1937, plate LI and the accompanying commentary suggested that the Stenkyrka example showed Gudrum defended by the vessels of Atli imploring her brothers to return to their country. It seems more likely that the scene shows a Valkyrie welcoming dead heroes to Hell. Another possibility is that the vessel is Naglfar and that the setting is Ragnarök.
3. For this serpent see below p. 338.
4. W.G. Collingwood 1907a, 163.
5. W.G. Collingwood 1915, 212, fig. 11.
7. W.S. Calverley 1888c, 470-1.
8. W.S. Calverley 1899, 233-4 where he accepts the notion that these are the dead.
enthusiasm) by Collingwood\(^1\) that these are the Fathers in Hell. Equally they could plausibly be interpreted as Apostles, for the hand stretched across the chest is a typical pose of such saintly figures in the sculpture. Other possibilities, such as an adoration scene on the larger hogback,\(^2\) seem unlikely since they would not be valid for the figures on the smaller stone.

It is, however, very tempting to suggest that a non-Christian interpretation is also possible for these figures. There is no doubt that they could be female\(^3\) and thus represent Valkyries. Even if this unacceptable, a non-Christian interpretation (or at any rate a non-Christian iconographic background) is supported by the possibility that one figure appears to hold a ring like the figures on the Lärbro Tängelgårda stone\(^4\) and by the fact that there are fret-patterns flanking the main figure on one side of the smaller stone,\(^5\) which strongly recall the key patterns which accompany the figures on the Gotland stones and on the Oseberg tapestry.\(^6\)

---

1. W.G. Collingwood 1907a, 153. His reluctance seems to depend upon his identification of the figures as female.
2. Taking Mary (holding something which might be Christ) on the dexter end with others being figures of adoration. Compare D. Talbot Rice 1952, plate 38b for an adoration scene with multiple figures.
3. Though W.G. Collingwood 1907a, 160 referred to Sigun on the Gosforth cross for similar long hair, this is not really relevant since she has a pigtail. The Lowther tresses (where they do not fall on both sides of a full-face portrait) are likely to have one curl hidden by the three-quarter stance of the figures.
4. S. Lindqvist 1941, fig. 86, plate 31 (the third register from the top).
5. These are clear on side B of the fragment on Calverley's photograph, possibly also on the lower sinister of side A. W.G. Collingwood 1907a, 161 hinted at more flanking the main figure on the warriors' face of the main stone.
6. e.g., Stora Hammar, Lärbro and Lärbro Tängelgårda no.1: see S. Lindqvist 1941, fig. 81 and plate 27 and fig. 86 and plate 31. For the Oseberg tapestry see S. Krafft 1956.
There can be no conclusiveness about this discussion of the interpretation of the Lowther carvings for the fragmentary nature both of our knowledge of Scandinavian belief and of the carvings themselves alike forbid it. But it does seem that these two carvings have the strongest claim of all those in Cumbria to be pagan monuments.

X

The third hogback at Lowther, no VIII, belongs to yet another group of which the Aspatria stone is the most elaborate example. The group is a small one, the only other occurrences being at Brompton¹, Wycliffe² and Inchcolm,³ and can conveniently be labelled as the "pilaster type" since the wall area is divided into vertical strips, alternate ones raised like pilasters, each having its own panel of decoration.

It seems unlikely that the origin of the type lies in imitation of actual pilasters since these are much thinner and therefore it is perhaps not irrelevant to note that early Christian sarcophagi employ this method of wall division.⁴ If this is not its ultimate source then a plausible alternative lies in the system of decoration in parallel vertical strips (not distinguished in depth) found at Brompton.⁵

The stone was first published in 1907 with drawings by W.G. Collingwood⁶. Contrary to the impression given by his drawing the tegulation can be traced and appears to be of the same widespread type discussed under Addingham and Penrith. The end-beasts⁷ are of the rare class which show both front and rear legs - a type found

5. e.g., E.le Blant 1886, plates XXXIV (no.143), XXXVIII (i) and LI.
6. A source intermediate between this material and the hogbacks would presumably be the adoption of this form of "wall" decoration onto insular shrine-tombs.
7. W.G. Collingwood 1907, 299, fig.b.
8. W.G. Collingwood 1907a, 156-9 and drawings on 157 which were repeated in W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig.208.
9. W.G. Collingwood 1907a saw these as the first examples of the end-beast in Cumbria - ignoring Gosforth and Aspatria.
across the Pennines at Sockburn\textsuperscript{1} and twice at Brompton\textsuperscript{2} where the animals are similarly of a large size. To the west of the Pennines there is one other example at Heysham.\textsuperscript{3}

There is little that can usefully be discussed about the common duplex knot or the possible attempt at parallel strips of key pattern:\textsuperscript{4} neither show much ambition or ability. The cock and the (apparent) tree are of much greater interest for both are well-known Christian symbols – appearing, for instance, on the early sarcophogi of Gaul.\textsuperscript{5} Among the hogbacks there is an analogous tree at Heysham,\textsuperscript{6} flanked by birds who are presumably meant to be peacocks,\textsuperscript{7} and there are similar birds on two of the Lythe stones.\textsuperscript{8} The closest parallels for the walking bird set in its own frame, however, come from Brompton and Kirklevington in northern Yorkshire on cross-shafts\textsuperscript{9} whose date has been disputed. To Collingwood the Brompton shaft was of the Anglian period\textsuperscript{10} and Saxl\textsuperscript{11} placed it very early within that phase. Yet, when placed in its local context, there can be no doubt that it is of Viking date for it employs a peculiar type of ringed-arris which is found on other tenth-century material from the area\textsuperscript{12} and, in addition, shares a Tees valley taste for placing free-style animals in separate

\begin{enumerate}
\item W.H. Knowles 1907, 118 (nos. 15 and 16).
\item W.G. Collingwood 1907, 298, fig.a and F.J. Haverfield and W. Greenwell 1899, no. LIX.
\item G. Baldwin Brown 1937, plate CXVII.
\item Compare Nunnington (W.G.Collingwood 1911, 298 fig.f).
\item For the tree see E. Le Blant 1886, 118 (commenting on frequency).
\item For some stylised examples see E. Le Blant 1886, plate XXXVI, fig.1 and plate XLVI, fig.1.
\item W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig. 207. shows the relevant side.
\item The symbols of immortality flanking the tree of life.
\item W.G. Collingwood 1911, 294, fig.dd. The other is unpublished.
\item See W.G. Collingwood 1907, 301 fig.f and 353 fig.aa.
\item W.G. Collingwood 1907, 300.
\item F. Saxl and R. Wittkower 1948, W. Oakeshott 1959, 117.
\item See discussion above p. 289, note 8.
\end{enumerate}
The Lowther bird seems to be linked across the Pennines to this material yet, since the bird and the tree also occur in the Isle of Man, it would be dangerous to be over-dogmatic about a motif which is shared by three areas which have much else in common.

The Aspatria hogback, no VII, is a much more elaborate carving than the Lowther pilaster stone. Indeed it rivals the "Saint's tomb", Gosforth VII, in the magnificence of its decoration. Unfortunately appreciation of its ornament has suffered both from mutilation of the stone and from published mis-representation and, as a result, it has not received the attention which is its due.

In many ways the decoration is unique. The high ridge, for example, is a rarity and only Meigle provides another example on which the sides of the ridge are ornamented. The tegulation is

1. Sockburn: see W.H. Knowles 1907, 112-3, no.2; Brompton: see F.J. Haverfield and W. Greenwell 1899, nos. LVI and LVII; Wycliffe: see W.G. Collingwood 1907, 412, fig. g.
2. F.M.C. Kermode 1907, 101, 103 and 105.
3. W.S. Calverley 1899, plates facing 15 provide the best record but the plates seem to have been re-touched. W.S. Calverley 1888c, facing 467, figs. VIII and IX give drawings of both faces but omit the animal ornament and do not render the other decoration satisfactorily. Both of the two other published drawings show only the better preserved face: W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig. 209 shows a heavily restored version and H. Schmidt 1970, fig. 7 draws less than is visible, notably omitting the triquetrae decoration on the shingles.
4. On a much smaller scale, and without decoration, there are such ridges at Easington and Osmotherley: see W.G. Collingwood 1907, 317, fig. h and 378, fig. e.
5. J.R. Allen 1903, III, fig. 352 A/B.
of the rare type noticed at Lowther but is here given the additional distinction of a triquetra decoration. Even the rope-moulding between the tiles is unparalleled and so too is the line of decoration at the junction of eaves and roof. Against this background of ornateness it is no surprise to find the pilasters marked by a triple arch or to find the end-beast (whose bodiless head can be grouped with those at Wycliffe and on the Gosforth Saint's Tomb) is given fangs. Some of these details may have been hinted at on other stones but it is only at Aspatria that they are combined and magnificently elaborated.

Analysis of the rest of the ornament reveals two points of importance: the amount of evidence for a Viking-age date and the strong indications of a close link between the hogback and the circle-head cross no. I from the same site - a link which can also be demonstrated amongst the sculptural groups at Brompton, Sockburn, Penrith and Gosforth.

The local link is best seen in the worn knotwork on the worn reverse. Calverley rightly recognised that this knotwork was identical to that on the present west face of the Aspatria I: discussion of this showed that this knot only occurred in

1. See discussion above p. 385.
2. At Crathorne and on Penrith there is a plain moulding between the lines of shingle. Rope-mouldings are found on the ridge and eave lines of several hogbacks e.g., Wycliffe and Brompton; see W.G. Collingwood 1907, 298 fig.c and 412 fig.e.
3. Though see Gosforth VII where there is a line as part of a decorative frame. This, like the high decorated ridge, may be related to metalwork shrines; see the Lough Erne reliquary in E. Henry 1965, plate 20.
4. The relevance of this pilaster detail to a type seen at Brompton should be noted: at Brompton (W.G.Collingwood 1907, 298,fig.b) the vertical panels are divided by two raised mouldings which flank a sunken panel.
5. They are similar in relative size and in the lack of supporting body.
6. For list of fangs see below p.346. Note that W.G.Collingwood 1907a, 155 denied that Aspatria had end-beasts.
7. W.S. Calverley 1899, 12.
8. See above p. 112 The knot is J.R.Allen 1903, II, 256, no.657.
Northumbrian sculpture outside Aspatria on two of the closely-linked examples of circle-headed crosses at Bromfield and Lancaster. The wearing has left problems of pattern restoration on this side of the hogback but it is fortunate that this fragment of knotwork has survived. On the other side of the stone the knot on the dexter pilaster is also one which occurs on the large shaft though its frequency elsewhere removes something of its value as evidence of local copying or pattern preferences.

The remainder of the ornament on this face has an importance for chronology though it might be noted that Calverley's drawing of the traces of knotwork at the extreme dexter end of the stone suggests that he could distinguish loose volutes of a type analagous to those on the east face of the large cross.

The ring-knot on the sinister pilaster has already been shown to be a characteristic of Viking (and particularly Norwegian Viking) sculpture in northern England. The step-pattern on the line of the eaves falls into the same chronological horizon for this pattern only occurs in Northumbrian sculpture in combination with ornament which, when it can be dated, is of the Viking period.

The animal-ornament presents problems but there can be no doubt that it is similarly a product of insular Viking art. What is certain is that the beast is a backward-turned quadruped, with a contoured body and a small head tucked into the curl of the neck. The lower lip is lappeted. The irregular knotwork which surrounds the animal at least one clear band crossing the neck and another apparently issuing from the jaw. All of these features are characteristics of the Jellinge and Mammen treatments of beasts and the material which has been assembled for the discussion

1. It seems likely that the knotwork ran the full length of the stone and that this face was not divided into vertical strips of ornament as on the better preserved side.
2. J.R. Allen 1903, II, 258, no. 661. See discussion above p. 114. Note that this knot is inaccurately shown in W.G.Collingwood 1927, fig.209.
3. W.S. Calverley 1888, fig. VIII.
4. See above p. 92. Note that an elaborate example of the ring-knot occurs on the east face of the Aspatria circle-head.
5. See above p.100.
of the substantial animals at Glassonby, Waberthwaite II and even the crouching quadruped of Aspatria I\textsuperscript{1} is equally relevant here\textsuperscript{2}.

1. The leaf-shaped ear might be noted as relevant to the Trewhiddle-derived element on the shaft.

2. The quadrupeds on the Cammin and Bamberg caskets provide the best parallels for an animal whose head is set completely within the curve of the neck: see D.M. Wilson and O.Klindt-Jensen 1966, plates LIV and LV.

This discussion, then, closes with a hogback which reflects much which has been seen in the earlier parts of the chapter. This is a stone whose slim proportions are characteristic of the northwest and which is closely linked to other sculpture from the same site. In its elaborate ornament it serves as a fitting prelude to the material from Gosforth.
CHAPTER TWELVE
The Gosforth Sculptures

There have been numerous treatments of the individual sculptures at Gosforth though it is surprising that they have never been accorded the type of detailed study which has been lavished upon the Bewcastle cross. In part this may be due to the lack of a thorough study of the iconography of Scandinavian mythology\(^1\) yet, even so, it is remarkable that little real advance has been made on the pioneer work of Calverley on these stones. One approach which has been particularly neglected is the relationship of the stones to each other. It is to stress this inter-relationship that the Gosforth carvings have been isolated in a separate chapter rather than being placed in the seemingly more appropriate sections on round-shafts and hogbacks. One of the most important results of this site-study is to show the unlikelihood of the eleventh-century dating given to the "Fishing stone" (Gosforth II) by Kendrick\(^2\) and to the "Saint's tomb" (Gosforth VII) by Brøndsted.\(^3\)

The exceptional character of these carvings is emphasised when they are placed against the general run of local Viking-period material. It is clear that at Gosforth we are faced with the work of a sculptor or sculptors of great originality and competence: the quality of work, and presumably the taste and wealth of the patron(s) is of a very different kind, for example, to that of the Beckermet and Spiral-scroll schools. It is, indeed, of a very different kind to most insular sculpture produced in the tenth and eleventh centuries.

1. Though this is not to deny the existence of such work as P.M.G. Kermode 1892-6, P.M.G. Kermode 1904, P.M.G. Kermode 1907, 170ff, H.R. Ellis 1942, H.R. Ellis Davidson 1969.
2. T.D. Kendrick 1949, 125.
3. J. Brøndsted 1924, 227. It should be noted that Brøndsted had not seen the stone.
The main cross, Gosforth I, is unique in several ways. Among the round-shafts it stands alone in its size and its slender proportions. It stands alone in the way in which the junction of round and square sections of shaft is marked: no other round-shaft of any type (decorated or undecorated) marks this transition by a simple swag (see appendix 3). The cross-head is also unusual: unlike the majority of round-shafts it has a ring-head but even more distinctive is its decoration for there is no parallel in insular sculpture for strands striking off from the arris edge to form sub-triangular compartments (see fig. 33).

Fig. 33: Gosforth I cross-head

Since a full description of the decoration on the shaft at Gosforth I has been given by Collingwood and Parker there is no need for repetition here and the few discrepancies noted will be discussed in the course of the treatment which follows.

There are three main problems involved in any discussion of the ornament of this cross. The first is to establish the extent to which apparently ornamental details are part of the total meaning. Thus Calverley interpreted the ring-chain on the east face as a headless (and thus slain) monster whilst Collingwood and Parker saw it as purely ornamental. A second and even more important problem revolves round the fact that the literary sources which give details of the stories apparently portrayed on the Gosforth cross are far distanced both geographically and chronologically from Viking-period Cumbria. A third problem is

2. C.A. Parker and W.G. Collingwood 1917.
3. W.S. Calverley 1883b, 392.
5. This is a problem which has frequently been noted: see H.R. Ellis 1942, 216 and 236; H.R. Ellis Davidson 1950, 130ff.; K. Berg 1958, 34.
that the lack of panelling on the cross makes it difficult to decide which figures are related to which.¹

It seems best to begin with those scenes which are most certain in their interpretation before proceeding to those where there is infinite room for controversy. Consequently the starting point is with what Berg has called "the only explicitly Christian scene on the cross"² - the crucifixion on the east face.

The crucifixion scene shows Christ standing upon, and touching with outstretched arms, the cabled panel in which he is set.³ He wears a short belted kirtle and a single stream of blood pours from his right side between the armpit and belt.⁴ Beneath the frame on the dexter side is Longinus, his spear passing under the frame to terminate at the corner of Christ's kirtle. Typical of the careful attention to detail in the carving is Parker's discovery that earlobe, hair and (?) helmet are reproduced. Facing the spearbearer is a female figure with long trailing dress and a plaited pigtail: she holds an object which Parker insistently rendered as bulbous in shape with a long tapering neck.⁵ Below these two figures is knotwork which terminates in two beasts' heads, each with a single ear and a contoured jaw.

The total composition is unique in medieval British art and seems, indeed, to be equally idiosyncratic when viewed against

1. Thus the reversed figure on the west face may or may not belong with the scene placed above him: contrast the views of W.S. Calverley 1883b, 383 and K. Berg 1958, 36.
3. This description draws heavily upon the detailed examination of C.A. Parker and W.G. Collingwood 1917, 105 and fig. 5. For cabled panel see p. 157 above.
4. The single stream, drawn by Parker (see note 3 above) can be checked in the accompanying photographs and in K. Berg 1958, plate 3a. An earlier rendering as a triple stream is seen in W.S. Calverley 1883b, 391 and is presumably what lies behind J.R. Allen 1887, 158. A corrected drawing appeared in C.A. Parker 1896, plate facing p. 6.
5. The object is more flask-shaped in C.A. Parker and W.G. Collingwood 1917, fig. 5 than in earlier drawings.
the whole range of early Christian representations of the crucifixion. Yet certain elements are familiar enough as parts of such scenes elsewhere.

Longinus is one such element. Paired by the sponge bearer he is part of a crucifixion composition which ultimately stems back to an eastern (Syrio-Optic) tradition. This type reached western Europe at an early date and became the dominant form throughout the pre-Norman period in Ireland. It was also known in pre-Viking England and remained in use there during the subsequent period, though usually on more provincial pieces.\footnote{A fuller treatment and listing of this material will be found in the discussion of Penrith III on p. 157 above.}

The Gosforth positioning of Longinus under Christ's right side is one which is found on the continent between the fourth and seventh centuries\footnote{e.g., a relic box in the Vatican and the Rabula Gospels: see F. van der Meer and C. Mohrmann 1959, plates 321 and 477; for a pendant from Monza see F.W. Reader 1910, 100 (no. 3).} where it co-existed with one in which he appears on the more naturalistic heart-side of the crucified figure.\footnote{See C.R. Morey 1953, 136; V. Gurewich 1957.}

It is the latter arrangement which became the dominant form in Ireland on the high crosses of the ninth and tenth centuries\footnote{See F. Henry 1967, 159 and 160-2. It is difficult to see why J. Baum 1937, 72 refers to the rarity of this type.} but there is a strong persistence of the other type throughout the period in Irish art.\footnote{See the evidence of liturgical commentary in the Stowe Missal quoted by F. Henry 1967, 161 and the patristic commentaries discussed in V. Gurewich 1957, 359. For examples on the Inishkea and Duvillaun slabs see F. Henry 1965, fig.14a and plate 51. For examples on the Arboe and Duleek crosses see F. Henry 1933, plates 82 (no.6) and 93 (no.1). For Termonfechin see A.K. Porter 1931, plate 98. For Moone, Clonmacnois and Castledermot see F. Henry 1964, plate 16; F. Henry 1965, plate 84; F. Henry 1967, plate 66. For metalwork examples see A. Mahr 1932, plate 29 and 50; F. Henry 1967, plates 53 and 54.} Similar continuity can also
be seen on the continent as late as the tenth and eleventh centuries. In England there is both literary and art-historical evidence for the use of the dexter-Longinus in the pre-Viking period and ample evidence of its employment in both northern and southern England in the tenth and eleventh centuries. The Gosforth positioning is thus not an isolated eccentric in English, insular or western European art.

Two other details are more difficult to parallel. The first is the stream of blood which issues from Christ's side. This does not apparently figure elsewhere in English pre-Norman sculpture though it can be found, very occasionally, in manuscript representations of the scene in late southern English art. Elsewhere in the British Isles there seems to be only one occurrence in sculpture, at Maghera in Ireland. The other use of a rare detail involves the knotted snakes at the bottom of the panel. If they belong with the crucifixion scene then this is both a rare sculptural depiction of the defeated devil at the foot of the cross and unique in its doubling of the serpent.

1. L.Coutil 1930, fig. facing 84; M.Burg 1922, plates 9, 10, 15, 16, 26, 37, 40, 53; H.Jantzen 1949, plates 52, 69, 146; A Goldschmidt 1928, II, plate 106.
2. For Bede's commentary see J.P. Migne 1862a, 753 and see also M. Swanton 1970a, 109 and line 20 of his edition of the Dream of the Rood. For the Lindisfarne manuscript Durham A II 17 see R.A.B. Mynors 1939, plate 3. For the shaft from Bradbourne see A.W. Clapham 1930, plate 18.
3. With other figures it occurs on the Romsey crucifixion and the Alnmouth cross: see T.D. Kendrick 1949, plate XL no. 3 and W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig. 79. Without such accompaniment there are sculptural occurrences at Aycliffe in Co. Durham and Daglingworth in Gloucestershire: see T.D. Kendrick 1949, plate XLI and D. Talbot Rice 1952, plate 14A. See also the pectoral cross illustrated in D. Talbot Rice 1952, plate 36B. There is an unpublished fragment of sculpture from Hart in Co. Durham with a dexter-Longinus but this may belong to a pre-tenth century period.
4. e.g., F. Wormald 1952, plate XLI.
5. A.K. Porter 1931, 58. (Eleventh/twelfth century.)
6. There are two sculptural examples of this snake in England at Bitton and Kirkdale: see H.M. and J. Taylor 1965, fig. 33 and W.G. Collingwood 1907, 345 fig. a (though the latter drawing does not show this detail). It is, of course, frequent on the continent in the Carolingian and later periods: see J. Beckwith 1964, plates 56, 89, 126; B. de Montesquieu-Fezensac 1954, plate V; A. Goldschmidt 1928, I, plates 82 and 84 and II, plate 106; J. Hubert et al. 1970, plate 144. For significance see S. Ferber 1966, 324.
But it is the female character and her identification which pose the main problems. The balancing figure for Longinus is usually (though not without exception\(^1\)) Stephaton carrying a sponge – an object which takes a variety of forms ranging from a cross\(^2\) to a cup on a pole.\(^3\) Yet the Gosforth figure is clearly female and cannot therefore be Stephaton.

Berg has offered a very attractive interpretation of this figure as that of Ecclesia,\(^4\) the Church receiving the flowing blood of Christ as she does in so many Carolingian and post-Carolingian representations of the crucifixion.\(^5\) This would represent a very novel selection from the range of figures which normally accompany the crucified Christ, a selection of Longinus and Ecclesia who represent the establishment of the Church and the institution of the Holy Sacrament. Berg further hinted that the usual balancing figure for Ecclesia, Synagogue, is present by inference in the pagan iconography of the cross. Yet there are problems in accepting this identification of Ecclesia. The first is one which Berg recognised – that Ecclesia is on the wrong side to collect Christ's blood. This could only be explained by the desire for symmetry outweighing a need for doctrinal impact. More important is the issue which Berg did not raise when he asserted that "the object Ecclesia holds in her hands must be a chalice."\(^6\)

---

1. Thus there is no balancing figure in the Codex Egberti: see W. Oakshott 1959, plate 86a.
2. The form found on the Codex Aureus book-cover: see J. Beckwith 1964, plate 120.
3. The type which is almost universal in Ireland: see L. Goupoul 1921 and A.K. Porter 1931, 56-7. There is an unpublished example from Hart in Co. Durham.
5. Representative examples are the book covers illustrated in J. Beckwith 1964, plates 57 and 89. An interesting depiction showing Ecclesia on her own beside the crucified and bleeding Christ occurs in a Gospel book from the Meuse region illustrated in J. Hubert et al. 1970, plate 144.
for all early drawings and rubbings seem to indicate that the object is some form of phial with a tapering neck and bulbous base. As drawn by Parker,\(^1\) and confirmed by both Calverley\(^2\) and Bishop Browne\(^3\) the object most closely resembles an alabastron, conventionally the symbol of Mary Magdelene. It therefore seems worth exploring other possible interpretations in the light of this identification,\(^4\) and to suggest that the female figure is in no way connected with the collection of blood.

The significance of Mary Magdelene to commentators like Bede\(^5\) varies: she is best known as the symbol of the contemplative life\(^6\) but is also used as a symbol of individual believer, of the Church itself and of the converted heathen.\(^7\) Though any of these interpretations would be satisfactory at Gosforth the last would be the most attractive in view of the "heathen" elements on the rest of the cross. As an alternative to Berg's suggestion, therefore, it is proposed that in Longinus we have either the Church itself,\(^8\) or its establishment\(^9\) balanced by another figure symbolising the converted heathen. The female figure embodies, as it were, the pagan elements in the rest of the cross.

Although this scene is one of the commonest in Christian art, therefore, its iconography is quite unique. If there was a direct source in insular art then nothing like it has survived: it is probable that the eclectic Gosforth master has taken elements

---

1. C.A. Parker and W.G. Collingwood 1917, fig.5.
2. W.S. Calverley 1883b, 397.
4. An identification which was also suggested by R. Reitzenstein 1924. J.R. Allen 1887, 159 drew attention to the Boulogne Psalter where one of the three Marys has a similar horn-shaped vessel.
5. See, particularly, J.P. Migne 1862b, 423ff.
6. For this aspect see particularly the study of M. Schapiro 1944, 5.
7. "quem peccatris mulier, sed ad vestigia Domini veniens et plorans, nisi conversam gentilitatem designat?" J.P. Migne 1862b, 425.
8. A function suggested by E. Mâle 1913, 187-8, 190.
from continental crucifixions and re-arranged them in a novel combination. There is certainly nothing in the iconography which would suggest that there is an Irish background for this section of the cross's ornament.¹

Nor does the figure drawing in this scene support an Irish derivation. In fact the one figure which has a clear stylistic ancestry is demonstrably of Scandinavian descent. This is the female figure which has just been discussed. Her knotted pigtail and trailing dress are persistent elements in what little figural art survives from pre-Viking and Viking Scandinavia.² This female type is also found on the Manx crosses³ but the excessive stylisation of the known examples from the island (when compared with the known English examples at Gosforth and Sockburn⁴) seem to rule out the possibility of direct influence from Man to Cumbria; it seems more likely that both areas show independent reflexes of a Scandinavian-based stylisation.⁵

The other scenes on the cross have long been identified with pagan myth. Two on the west face seem particularly convincing: the Loki scene at the bottom and the Heimdall figure half way up the same face.

The details of the drawing of the Loki panel are remarkably clear: Parker's final drawing of this scene,⁶ correcting certain

---

2. Representative examples:
   (a) Figures stamped on gold foil: see W. Holmqvist 1960¹ and H.E. Lidén 1969.
   (b) Oseberg tapestry: see S. Krafft 1956, 30-9.
   (c) Metalwork figures from Klinta, Birka and Sibble: see D.M. Wilson and O. Klindt-Jensen 1966, plate XXIV.
   (d) Gotland stones: see S. Lindqvist 1941, plate 44 fig.12; plate 56 fig. 135; fig. 83.
4. The Sockburn figure is, as yet, unpublished.
5. Many of the figures listed in note 2 above carry horns. One might speculate whether the "alabastron" is not deliberately echoic of this tradition of welcoming Valkyries.
6. C.A. Parker and W.G. Collingwood 1917, fig.4 and description on 102.
minor points in earlier renderings,\(^1\) matches up well with what
can be seen on the cross today.\(^2\) The bound figure lies on its
back in relation to the bottom of the panel with arms and legs
separately bound. A binding chain passes round his neck and his
pigtails is shown plaited like those at Lowther. One end of this
chain passes over the snake's head whilst the other forms a twist
with the snake's body and then passes through a binding ring. The
snake's head is placed over the man's forehead and its body,
after twisting with the binding chain, passes through the ring
and forms an arch over the scene. A pigtailed female, holding
a bowl, kneels before the bound figure.

There seems no reason to question the identification first
proposed by Calverley that this is the bound Loki, the poison
dripping upon his head whilst the faithful Sigyn pours away the
poison from her bowl - the moment of agony which Snorri describes
as causing earthquakes.\(^3\) The only other example of this particular
episode from the Loki story is found on the stone from Ardre\(^4\)
where a bound figure is attacked by several snakes within a
rectangular frame (? prison/pit) whilst a female figure stands
alongside with a container in each hand. This Gotland stone
appears to date to the beginning of the Viking period.\(^5\) Stephens
claimed to have found an example in Denmark but that bound figure

1. In W.S. Calverley 1883b, 380 and C.A. Parker 1896, facing 41.
2. See photograph in K. Berg 1958, plate 3b and H.R. Ellis
   Davidson 1969, 121.
3. For studies of the literary evidence and the evolution of the
   Loki figure see: J. de Vries 1933; J. de Vries 1958, 155-67;
   G. Dumézil 1959; G. Dumezil 1959, 94ff.; H.R. Ellis Davidson
   1950, 130; H.R. Ellis Davidson 1964, 176-82; E.O.G. Turville-
   Petre 1964, 126ff. For a survey of writings see A. Holtsmark
   1962. For male figures with pigtails-like hair, as at Gosforth,
   see the figures illustrated in S. Lindqvist 1941, plate 31,
   fig. 86 and B. Hougen 1941, 162. For an English example see the
   horseman from Gainford in F.J. Haverfield and W. Greenwell 1899,
   no. XII.
   example is Klinte Hunninge I: see S. Lindqvist 1941, plate 52,
   fig. 128 - though this scene could equally show Gunnar.
lacks any companions who could lead to certain identification. Similar problems of identification arise with many other snake-assailed figures for it is equally possible that they could be interpreted as Gunnar. Apart from these the only other certain representation of a Loki incident in an insular context is on a stone from Ramsey, Maughold, where Kermode plausibly identified the killing of the otter.

Higher up on the same west face of Gosforth I stands a man, wearing a belted kirtle, who holds a horn in one hand whilst the staff in the other hand holds back two beasts whose bodies are formed of three-strand plait. Inevitably there must be some doubt as to how far apparently ornamental animals can reasonably be invoked as a meaningful part of this scene: that this is at least theoretically possible is clear from the Manx crosses where Sigurd's dragon is a pure Jellinge beast.

The credit for the currently accepted identification of this figure as Heimdall belongs to Parker. The presence of the horn, so important an attribute of a figure whose primary function was

1. A claim quoted in W.S. Calverley 1883b, 400.
2. See the material from Scandinavian churches illustrated in P.B. du Chaillu 1889, I, 186 and ibid., II, 244, 256, 257, 266: these all have harps. There are problems, however, with figures like those on the Oseberg wagon: see D.M. Wilson and O. Klindt-Jensen 1966, plate X and comments on p. 53. Note the similar problem faced by Kermode in identifying a figure on a stone from Andreas (P.M.C. Kermode 1907, no. 95) which he finally decided was Gunnar though earlier in P.M.C. Kermode 1892-6, 354-6 he had envisaged Loki. H.R. Ellis Davidson 1967, 128 has suggested that some of these representations may show sacrificial deaths. See also H.R. Ellis Davidson 1950, 126-7.
3. P.M.C. Kermode 1907, no. 96. See H.R. Ellis Davidson 1950, 126. Loki figured among the painted scenes on a shield and on decorative panels in a tenth-century Icelandic house: these are the paintings which lie behind the poems Haustlong and Húsdrápa.
5. C.A. Parker 1896, 49. For discussions of this god see: B. Perring 1941; J. de Vries 1957, 238-44; H.R. Ellis Davidson 1964, 172-6; E.O.G. Turville-Petre 1964, esp. 147-55.
that of sentry, is strong support for this identification. Though depictions of this god were known in Iceland¹ this is the only certain occurrence in an insular context: horn-bearing figures at Jurby on Man and at Staveley in Yorkshire are not accompanied by associated decoration which allow confirmation of their identity.² The figure at Gosforth is apparently shown attacked by two monsters though none of the surviving literary sources refer to Heimdall's involvement with monsters. Snorri, however, saw him as engaged with Loki in the final battle of Ragnarok³—the last stage in what may have been a long-standing enmity⁴—and the two monsters may represent a part of this battle, which Heimdall heralded with his horn. At very least, the presence of Heimdall and Loki on the same side of the cross suggests, in the light of Snorri's evidence for their traditional enmity, that there is a scheme to the decorative system of the sculpture.

One other scene on the cross can be identified with some conviction. This is the one on the upper part of the eastern face where a man, wearing a belted kirtle and holding a spear, has one foot placed on the lower jaw of a gaping beast. This foot passes through the forked tongue of an animal whilst his hand forces up the beast's upper jaw.⁵ This exactly matches the manner in which Viðar avenged the death of his father on the day of Ragnarok as it is described both in Snorri and in Vafþrúðnismál, one of the best sources we have for the story of the end of the gods' world.⁶

---

1. If we accept Snorri's interpretation of a passage in Húsdrápa: see F. Jónsson 1907, 133-4, 135-6.
2. For Jurby see P.M.C. Kermode 1907, no. 99. For Staveley see G. Baldwin Brown 1937, plate LXXXI and p. 234.
4. see note 1 above.
5. These details draw heavily upon the examination of the cross described in C.A. Parker and W.G. Collingwood 1917, 102-5.
Admittedly other versions of Viðar's fight have a more conventional method of slaughter but the rending of the wolf's jaw clearly has a claim to some antiquity. The Gosforth carving is the only convincing depiction of this scene in insular carving and, in the light of the literary evidence that Viðar survived his encounter, it is perhaps important to remark that both scenes on the east face of this cross therefore show struggles with evil forces to which there was an eventual triumphant outcome. Again this suggests that there is a scheme to the ornament.

The interpretation of the other human and zoomorphic decoration on the cross is much more difficult and uncertain. Thus on the lower part of the south face is a beardless horseman set above a three-strand plait which ends in a snake-like tail and a damaged head. Below this is an animal with a round eye and a knotted body. To Calverley all of these scenes belonged together: the rider is Öðinn set above the serpent which separated the land of the living from that of the corpses, whilst the figure below is that of Mímir. Parker followed this identification but Collingwood, perhaps significantly, ignored the entire group in his discussion. This identification poses certain problems even

1. e.g., Voluspa stanza 55; see G. Neckel 1962, 13.
2. There are possible examples on Man at both Andreas and Bride. For the Andreas stone see P.M.C. Kermode 1892-6, 358 and P.M.C. Kermode 1907, 192: this may show Öðinn swallowed by the wolf. For Bride see P.M.C. Kermode 1907, no. 97 and H.R. Ellis Davidson 1950, 132. For an early discussion of this type of jaw-rending scene see H.C. March 1894; many of his examples show David rending the lion's jaw and are further discussed in H.M. Roe 1949.
4. C.A. Parker 1896, 49 and 51. This modifies Calverley's identification in suggesting that the knotted figure might be the dead Vala whom Öðinn is described as consulting.
5. C.A. Parker and W.G. Collingwood 1917, 99 describes the Figures but offers no interpretation.
though it is attractive as invoking another part of the Ragnarpk story. If the eye of the animal is Oðinn's eye then why is the rider shown as fully sighted and why is the eye no bigger and no more stressed than any other on the cross? Why is Mímir shown as a snake when the literary sources refer to him as a head? There are, of course, possible explanations for all of these issues: the cross may be illustrating a variant version of the story which has not survived in the literary sources or be presenting simultaneously two succeeding stages of the narrative. Even so, there are clearly difficulties in following Calverley.

There is also the problem of this horseman on the south face which has been raised by Berg. He appears to have been given a very short arm and this inevitably has caused speculation as to whether the figure is Tyr, the only god in known northern mythology who had such an incapacity. Such speculation is needless: Collingwood and Parker long ago showed that this rider is distinct from the others on the cross both in the fact that he has been given a bridle and in the high standard of figure drawing. The "short" arm is merely the product of an unsuccessful attempt to render an arm which is bent horizontally to hold the bridle. But even this rejection of Tyr does not assure the Oðinn and Mímir identification.

The other horsemen on the cross are less distinguished - perhaps deliberately so in order to separate them from the rider with the bridle-and are even more difficult to interpret. Like the rider on the south side they all carry their spears vertically, with the point thrusting down. It is once more a measure of the uniqueness of this cross that there is no parallel for such a position among the large number of armed horseman from Scandinavian and insular sources between the fifth and eleventh centuries A.D. Whatever iconographical significance this may have had is now lost.

3. A somewhat distant analogy might be cited in the reversed swords carried by figures in a funeral procession on two of the Gotland picture stones illustrated in S. Lindqvist 1941, I, plate 31 fig. 86 and plate 34 fig. 89. It may be noted that Snorri's account of Ragnarok lays great stress on both groups of combatants riding to the scene: see F. Jónsson 1907, 97ff. (Other horsemen on Northumbrian sculpture are all of the Viking period and their distribution seems to centre on the Tees valley.)
The two horsemen on the north face are set in mirror image to each other whilst the one on the west face is upside down. It is difficult to know what significance to attach to these reversals. It may be the result of thoughtless laying out (though this seems unlikely in this context), or an attempt to indicate association, opposition meeting or defeat. Or it may simply reflect a lack of awareness of the need for consistency which is often found in other carvings of the Viking (and pre-Viking) period.

Like some of the human figures the significance, if any, of the zoomorphic ornament also poses problems of interpretation. On the south face is a hart/stag placed over a wolf whose legs seem to have broken free from their bonds. If these two animals are linked then this could be a highly idiosyncratic version of the "hart and hound" motif - idiosyncratic because the hound/wolf does not leap onto the hart's back. One of the Middleton crosses provides a possible parallel for such a novel handling and the whole Gosforth group could thus be capable of a Christian interpretation. But, since scenes are not separated by panels

1. C.A. Parker and W.G. Collingwood 1917, 108-9 reconstruct the designer's method of working from this evidence.
2. Both C.A. Parker and W.G. Collingwood 1917, 109 and K. Berg 1958, 36 see this as the explanation of the figure on the west face who is thus drawn into relation with the Heimdall scene.
3. W.S. Calverley 1882, 399 saw the two opposed figures on the north face as the new God Baldr set against the old God Ösvinn whilst C.A. Parker and W.G. Collingwood 1917, 108 cited the Weland shafts at Leeds as examples of opposition represented by inversion of one of the figures. Their parallel does not seem very illuminating.
4. K. Berg 1958, 38 suggests this for the figures on the north face.
5. For a relevant and clear parallel see Goliath in the Southampton Psalter reproduced in F. Henry 1967, plate N.
6. For some relevant examples see C.A. Parker and W.G. Collingwood 1917, 107-8. Note also the animals placed in mirror image on the Govan sarcophagus: see C.A. Radford 1968, fig. 5.
7. See, for a careful drawing, C.A. Parker and W.G. Collingwood 1917, fig. 2 and their comments on p. 102.
8. See above p. 231.
9. A.L. Binns 1956, fig. 9. This Yorkshire scene, however, seems to show a hunt and is not, sensu strictu, an example of the hart and hound motif.
10. See above p. 238. C.A. Parker and W.G. Collingwood 1917, 110-111 suggested that the scene showed Fenrir and Viðar (as hart) but, since the Viðar encounter is so clearly present elsewhere on the cross this seems unlikely.
on the cross, the hart/stag and the hound/wolf could be two distinct elements, the one being Garm breaking loose from his bonds at the day of Ragnarök¹ and the other perhaps the sacred hart.²

The other animals on the cross could also be more than pure ornament. All could be the progeny of Fenrir, the one on the south side with the ring-binding in its jaw matching the literary description of the wolf Fenrir.³ The winged creature on the north face could be the fire-element Surt.⁴ There is no method of proving or disproving such interpretations. It is only a matter of personal credulity which prevents one from accepting the ring-chain on the east face and the plait on the northern side as respectively showing a headless (and thus slain) monster and the endless knot of Hell.⁵

It may be true that interpretation of Gosforth's iconography requires, in Kendrick's words, "some considerable exercise of the imagination"⁶ but, even allowing for the problems in identifying scenes, there seems to be more scheme to the cross than a "copious assembly of ornaments".⁷ It seems probable that Calverley, Collingwood, Parker and Berg have all been correct in seeing the non-crucifixion scenes as concerned in some way with the events narrated in Völuspá and particularly with the concept of Ragnarok.⁸ Such a representation of events from this final battle of the Scandinavian gods would not stand alone amongst the monuments of the Norwegian settlements around the Irish Sea. On the Isle of Man there are at least two cross-slabs⁹ carrying this type of scene

1. See Völuspá stanza 44: see G. Neckel 1962, 10.
2. K. Berg 1958, 36-7 and 40-1.
3. It is doubtful if the sword-pommel, (seen by W.S. Calverley 1883b, 389 as jammed in the animal's lower jaw) actually exists: see C.A.Parker and W.G.Collingwood 1917, 106.
5. See W.S. Calverley 1883b, 392 and 399.
7. T.D.Kendrick 1949, 68.
8. For the fullest study of this concept see A. Olrik 1922: The Loki scene does not fit easily into a Ragnarök setting based on the literary sources though he was certainly one of the leaders of the gods' enemies. For an attempt to explain his presence see K. Berg 1958, 35.
9. P.M.C.Kermode 1907, nos. 97 and 102. See also H.R.Ellis Davidson 1950, 132.
whilst the most plausible of the explanations of the decoration on the Heysham hogback points to a similar interpretation. Mrs Davidson has rightly commented on the appropriateness of this notion to a memorial stone and supported her argument by quoting the use on a Swedish stone of lines from a poem referring to this subject.

No detailed analysis of the choice of Ragnarök scenes and their relationship to the Gosforth crucifixion has been wholly convincing. In part this is due to the difficulty in certainly identifying more than four scenes, in part it is probably due to the impossibility of equating a carving from Viking-age Cumbria and the literary accounts surviving from later centuries in Iceland. That the choice is not wholly haphazard has already been hinted by the juxtaposition on the same face of Heimdall and his enemy Loki and of the triumphant Vidar with Christ. It seems most likely that the basic iconographic scheme is one which united the crucifixion, the end of one world, with scenes showing the end of another world. This scheme could exploit the potential parallels between Christian and pagan concepts about the end of the world and between individual elements of the two religions. The unlikely choice of Mary Magdelene, if such she be, would be singularly appropriate in a setting of heathendom and its conversion.

1. H.C. March 1892,68ff.still provides the most convincing interpretation in these terms. March's work may have its eccentric elements but they are less numerous than those present in the Christian interpretation put forward in T. Lees 1892. I can find little evidence for the claim in D. Talbot Rice 1952,133 that such scenes are often found in England.

2. H.R. Ellis Davidson 1964, 205 and 208.

3. See E. Brate and E. Wessen 1924-36,117. Note also a possible Ragnarök scene on a Swedish stone identified by E.O.G. Turville-Petre 1964, plate 29 and caption.

4. The final interpretation of W.G. Collingwood 1927,156 suggested that there were elements of creation and the three promises of the Voluspa contained in the selection of scenes on the cross. The freed wolf on the south face cannot be easily fitted to this pattern. If Heimdall's presence is caused by the need to hint at a promise then why is he attacked by monsters? If the Baldr promise is contained in the Loki scene why is it treated so allusively?

5. This is basically the scheme proposed by K. Berg 1958. The use made by the church of pagan elements in the conversion of the Anglo-Saxons is obviously relevant here: see H.R. Ellis Davidson 1950, 133-4.

Notes 6 and 7 over page.
The date of the shaft is not immediately obvious. It is not difficult to dismiss the seventh-century dating once proposed by Stephens and Parker. Nor is it, on purely historical grounds, difficult to refute the late-ninth century dating of Talbot Rice. Collingwood's dating to c. 1000 A.D. has more to recommend it in view of the sculpture's appropriateness to a date when the end of the world seemed imminent but unfortunately this belief existed both before and after the end of the millenium. More positive approaches are not, however, easy to find.

The reason for this is that the ornament of the shaft is, in large measure, sui generis and what parallels exist are largely drawn from the other sculptures at Gosforth itself. It does not partake of any of the sequence of types of Viking animal-art which could give some chronological pointers. It is thus as misleading to label it as Jellinge as it is dangerous to date it to the early Viking period because it has no late elements.

There are some chronological hints in the animal ornament. Admittedly there is little that is diagnostic about the free-style

Notes 6 and 7 continued from previous page.

6. One of the difficulties here is that the literary records of Ragnarök may have taken on Christian concepts. For these parallels see the study of A. Olrik 1922. See also S. Nordal 1971, 83-5 and 109-10.

7. e.g., Loki and the devil, Odin as rider and the horseman of the Apocalypse, Viðar taking victory in defeat like Christ, the symbolism of the hart, Baldr as re-born like Christ, Michael and Heimdall. For these parallels see A. B. Cook 1925, 305.

1. C. A. Parker 1896, 63-8. It is ironic to see that the views of E. H. Knowles, which Parker rejected, are now more acceptable than those of Stephens which he then followed.


3. C. A. Parker and W. G. Collingwood 1917, III. L. Stone 1955, 32 adopts a similar date for different reasons.

4. See D. Whitelock 1963, 47-8 with reference to a passage in Wulfstan's Sermo Lupi.

5. As does T. D. Kendrick 1949, 91. W. G. Collingwood 1928a, 408 commented "later than the Jellinge style".

drawing of the hart and wolf – they share similar characteristics with other Viking-age animals on Man and in England. But the jaw with its outline is interesting since this type of limited contouring appears elsewhere on two of the animals of the circle-head school; the other characteristics of the school seem to point to a tenth rather than eleventh-century date. Its occurrence among the Oseberg carvings might also be thought to be indicative of an earlier dating within the two-century time-bracket of Cumbria's Viking age.

A second argument for an early dating is based upon the ring-chain. It is another facet of the uniqueness of this monument that no other carving unites the single and multiple ring-chains on the one monument. More importantly in the present context no other sculptured ring-chain preserves so well a sense of hollowness within the triangle. Since this is an important element in the Borre-style motif from which the ring-chain has been plausibly derived this might be indicative of relatively early dating. Because the ring-chain occurs on a Borre-style strap-end from Norway, on a tenth-century sword from Heskett in Cumbria and on Viking-age cross-slabs in Man which show Jellinge characteristics it seems reasonable to suppose that Gosforth I is again placed within a tenth- rather than eleventh-century context.

But these are less arguments than hints. We are thus reduced to historical likelihood and, given the paucity of documentary sources, there must be some doubt about their validity. If it is accepted that we have figured here the pagan-derived concept

1. See above p. 200.
2. See above p. 128; the beast on Aspatria I also seems to share this feature.
3. H. Shetelig 1920, figs. 19 and 21-4. See also figs. 26-7.
6. J.D. Cowen 1924, fig. 2.
Ragnarpk which has been married to Christian ideas then it follows that such exploitation is more likely to occur in the period of conversion rather than later. Whether we take such a period to be that of the settlement or of the post-Brunanburgh phase this points to the first, rather than the second, half of the century. Yet it could be argued that such seemingly pagan scenes are only likely to occur when the power of their hold was felt to have weakened to a point where they presented no challenge to the Church. In support of the much later dating this would imply, the evidence of (apparently) eleventh-century carvings at Leeds, York and Winchester could be invoked since all carry depictions of Scandinavian myth. Such arguments are not as strong as they might appear: the apparent relevance of the Gosforth iconography would only be meaningful if the Ragnarpk episodes were still significant. As to the eleventh-century carvings, they are concerned with heroes rather than gods (not always an easy distinction to keep) and could reflect ancestry claims rather than having the religious implications which seem to be involved at Gosforth.

One final argument might be invoked for a dating to the first half of the tenth century. Analysis of the background for the organisation and figure style of the carving seems to point to a Scandinavian source. Such contacts are more likely in the tenth rather than the eleventh century. On balance a dating to the first half of the tenth century is the most acceptable.

"Narrative sculpture had not occurred in any quantity in Anglo-Saxon contexts since the early eighth century and the only possible derivation of this type of motif (at Gosforth) must be from Ireland". So wrote D.M. Wilson and O. Klindt-Jensen. This

1. D.M. Wilson 1968, The disastrous effects of Brunanburgh can be overstressed. It was a significant defeat but the events of 943 show that it was not a final catastrophe.
2. W.G. Collingwood 1915, 213. The tendril ornament would seem to indicate a late date.
5. H.R. Ellis Davidson 1950, 154-5 raises this interpretation. See also M. Biddle 1966, 331.
statement needs modification. It is certainly true that there
is little narrative sculpture in ninth-century Anglo-Saxon
England, though such carvings as those from Sandbach cannot
fall far short of this date. There are, however, traces of odd
panels of ninth-century figural carving\(^1\) which show that the
tradition did not die in Anglo-Saxon England: this source cannot
be summarily rejected. On the other hand there are several
reasons for rejecting Ireland as a source for the presence of
figural art on the cross. There is, first, no trace of any Irish
influence on the style of figural drawing (where this can be
traced, it is to Scandinavia) or in the iconography. More
important is the fact that the organisation of the figures is
relatively chaotic and without the discipline of panels. Since
the Anglian tradition was a panelled one and the Irish figures
are always in panels one would have expected any Irish influence
to have guaranteed the use of similar divisions at Gosforth.

It seems much more likely that the use and arrangement of
the figural ornament reflects the tradition of Scandinavia.
Admittedly little survives of Scandinavian figure drawing, apart
from the Gotland stones.\(^2\) But those stones exhibit an approach
to narrative depiction (and figural styles) which seems to have
been widespread in Scandinavia in other, now largely perished,
media. The Oseberg carvings show it in wood,\(^3\) the Oseberg
tapestries\(^4\) show it in fabric and there are also one or two
metalwork examples.\(^5\) All show a disregard for logical organisation
and panelling which is similarly a characteristic of the Gosforth
sculpture. Figural scenes on wood or fabric from Scandinavia seem

1. e.g., Sandbach and the group of ninth-century carvings which
reflect the taste for small-scale dramatic scenes: see
2. S. Lindqvist 1941.
3. H. Shetelig 1920, figs. 19,21,22 and plate VI.
see S. Krafft 1956, and (for literary references to figural
tapestries) see H.R. Ellis Davidson 1950, 126,135.
5. e.g., the Mammen horse collar: see D.M. Wilson and O. Klindt-
Jensen 1966, plate XXXVIA.
the most likely type of source for this extraordinary carving: the wooden appearance of the cross, so frequently commented upon, may thus be indicative of the models available.

In many ways therefore this is a unique monument, set apart from the rest of the sculpture produced in Cumbria during the Viking period. But it is not set apart from the other carvings at Gosforth: indeed it provides the key to them and an indication that the currently accepted chronology for the other sculpture from this site is seriously at fault.

III

Gosforth II, the "Fishing stone", was discovered in 1882. If it were once part of a cross-shaft then its proportions are far from those of the elegant Gosforth I in the churchyard. Parker records its depth as 5½ inches and this suggests it may have been a slab or perhaps a part of some architectural composition.

The scene in the upper panel is one of a combat between a snake and a quadruped, possibly equipped with a tail. The position of the animal's head is uncertain though, since there appears to be an ear rather than a jaw above the beast's back, it may have been upward-facing like the animals at Nunburnholme, Folkton and York. The snake seems to have ears lying back along its body similar to those on serpents at Lastingham, York and on Thorwald's cross at Andreas on the Isle of Man.

1. In this connection it is instructive to compare the twelfth-century depictions of the Sigurd story at Hylestad where there is a similar lack of panelling: see H.R. Ellis Davidson 1969,95.
2. C.A. Parker 1896, 74-5.
3. C.A. Parker 1896, 75.
4. W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig. 152.
5. W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig. 140.
6. Unpublished, from the excavations at the Minster.
7. W.G. Collingwood 1907, 356, fig.d.
8. Unpublished, from the excavations at the Minster.
9. P.M.C. Kermode 1907, no. 102. Note that it is possible that these are eyes of the type seen on the Thames bone carving, or on many of the runes' stones from Sweden: see D.M. Wilson and O. Klindt-Jensen 1966, plate XLI (f) and LXXII (a and b).
It was Kendrick who first identified this scene as having "an unmistakeable Urnes character in the lower part of the design". If this were true it would have important repercussions. The stone would belong to a period not earlier than the c.1025 date assigned to the emergence of the Urnes style in the Viking homeland; indeed it would be appreciably later since "in England it seems reasonable to suppose that the Urnes style flourished for a short period after the Norman Conquest of 1066". Such a dating would imply that at Gosforth there was a tradition of depicting Scandinavian deities on Christian monuments which lasted from the first half of the tenth century (the likely date of the large cross) right through to the second half of the eleventh century. Yet this long lived tradition, presumably guaranteed by a single family in the village, had no traceable effect on sculpture in the surrounding villages.

These implications of an Urnes-style identification do not seem to have been widely appreciated. They are so startling that the case for Urnes influence needs close examination.

The combat motif is not one which is specifically Urnes. Though it is certainly one which is characteristic of work in the style, it has a long history in Scandinavian art and in pre-Viking sculpture in England. The flat-chested animal at Gosforth is unlike any of the quadrupeds on work of recognisable Urnes style in the homelands - in shape he is very like the beasts from Lythe whose solid proportions can be traced back to the animals of the Northumbrian vine-scroll. To assert this is not, of course, to deny the Urnes case since the beast from Jevington in Sussex (a classic example of the Urnes in England) is similarly

1. T.D. Kendrick 1949, 125.
6. e.g., D.M. Wilson and O. Klindt-Jensen 1966, plate LXIX
7. W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig. 175 fig.e and 201 fig. ff.
non-typical of the usual beast in Scandinavian versions of the style.\(^1\)

It is the snake which must carry the case for an Urnes identification at Gosforth. Certainly it is thin and wiry in the Urnes tradition, with (apparently) a sharply defined edge to its body. Obviously it would have been more diagnostic if the Urnes almond-eye or a lip-lappet had been present but, even so, the snake-head seen in plan does occur within the Urnes corpus.\(^2\) It is also possible, though difficult, to find distant analogies for the ear types in this phase of Viking art.\(^3\)

But the case against associating this snake with the Urnes style seems much stronger. The Stafford knots into which the snake is twisted are very tight and angular and totally unlike the fluent curves of the wiry interlace which is found in Urnes work. Kendrick may have been misled to his Urnes identification by the very flat appearance of the snake below the rear part of the beast: this is due to wearing, for beneath the front paws the sectional profile is much more rounded. This thin (but rounded) angular and closely-knotted work finds an exact parallel on the south face of Gosforth I in the bands beneath the freed wolf. It seems very doubtful if these two works can be separated by over a century. This type of thin knotting is found again in the area on Waberthwaite II at a tenth-century date and there is another fine parallel on one of the Manx slabs from Andreas\(^4\) where it is associated with incipient Ringerike elements. In the light of these parallels, both from the same site and elsewhere, there seems no reason to place this carving within the Urnes period. On the contrary, there seems to be every reason for associating it with Gosforth I since not only is there a close parallel in the thin knotwork but also a further link between the fleshy three-strand plait in the lower panel of the fishing stone and that on the north face of the large cross. There is also a near identity

---

2. e.g., D.M. Wilson and 0. Klindt-Jensen 1966, plate LXXII.
4. P.M.C. Kermode 1907, no. 95 (see also no. 102)
in the treatment of the human beings with their flat faces and driled eyes. A dating to the first half of the tenth century, the date suggested for the main shaft, therefore seems much more likely than one in the middle or later years of the eleventh.

It is, of course, the lower scene which has captured the attention of students. Since Stephen's day it has been universally interpreted as a depiction of Thor's expedition for the world-serpent in the company of Hymir. This was an extremely popular tale among the Scandinavian peoples. The ninth-century scald Bragi, inspired by a picture of the incident on a shield, described the encounter in *Ragnarsdrápa*. Another lost depiction of the same incident on a tenth-century wall-panel from Iceland lies behind *Húsdrapa* and there are other versions in *Hymiskviða* and in *Snorri*.

The identification of the Gosforth scene is certain, though some reproductions have not accurately recorded the very worn nature of the panel. Unfortunately Thor's hammer is placed at a point where the stone has been cut back but it can be restored convincingly as the usual double-headed type. A carefully drawn ox's head at the end of the fishing line guarantees that this is Thor's fishing trip for this is a detail recorded in both *Hymiskviða* and *Snorri*. The world-serpent may, as Mrs. Davidson has suggested, have been portrayed below the fish (traces can perhaps be seen in the lower sinister area of the surviving section of the panel) or it may be present symbolically above the heads of the boatmen.

The scene is not found elsewhere in insular carvings though Kermode identified Thor striding to the beach with the bait on

1. C.A. Parker 1896, 76. See also Bishop Browne's comments quoted on the same page.
2. See F. Jónsson 1907, 124, 128, 130.
3. See F. Jónsson 1907, 130, 234.
6. E.g., B. Branston 1957, 119 fig.20. A more accurate impression is given in F. Johnstone 1964, plate XLVII (c).
the Thor cross at Bride. But it is found on two, or perhaps three, carvings in Scandinavia. The first is on a rock carving, not closely dateable, from Hørðum, Thisted in Denmark. Here the world-serpent is visible and the line is held by a hammerless Thor whose foot has gone through the bottom of the boat. The accompanying figure holds an axe which is identical to that gripped by the sinister figure on the Gosforth stone. At Altuna, in Sweden, Thor again has his foot through the bottom of the boat but here he is alone without the giant. He holds a double-headed hammer in his right hand similar to that which can be restored at Gosforth. As on the Cumbrian carving the left hand holds a line attached to the ox-head bait. A third representation of the scene has been claimed from Gotland on a picture-stone from Ardre where two figures can be seen fishing from a boat. It is some measure of the popularity of this episode in Scandinavian myth that representation can, therefore, be claimed from two countries in the Viking homeland as well as from the Icelandic and British colonies.

The boat from which the two Gosforth figures fish is of normal Viking type, semi-lunate in shape, double-ended and with a mast amidships. It can easily be paralleled in its general lines

5. It is interesting to see that this is the only surviving representation with a mast - does the Gosforth carving represent a tradition in which the two sailed out (rather than rowed as they are described as doing in the surviving literary accounts)
among the numerous boats found in Viking art. Not all of the vessel's elements are depicted: there is no rigging or steering oar but it has got a mast topped by a square-shaped object which is presumably the block (húnn) used for raising and lowering the sail. Except for the example at Lowther, which reflects a similar culture, there are no other vessels represented in Northumbrian art of the pre-Norman period.

It is, of course, difficult to interpret the sculptor's overall intention from these two partially surviving panels but it is possible to suggest that it had a similar plan to that on the large shaft: the marrying up and paralleling of pagan myth and Christian doctrine, perhaps in a set of wall panels with Christian symbol set above pagan. The beast attacked by a snake is a Christian symbol of long standing, carrying the symbolism seen in the bestiaries of the struggle between Christ and Satan. The struggle between Thor and his serpent is of the same order.

1. See the material listed in note 3 below and the Gotland stones illustrated in S. Lindqvist 1941–1942.

2. For information on this see the works listed in note 3 above and H. Shetelig and H. Falk 1937, 363. As parallels for this Gosforth block compare those on the Tjängride stone and the Dorestad coin: see H. Shetelig and H. Falk 1937, fig.19 and A.W. Brøgger and H. Shetelig 1951, 73.

3. For ships elsewhere in pre-Viking insular sculpture see F. Johnstone 1964, plates XLV and XLIX (a). From the Viking period are: (a) Kirk Maughold: see F. Johnstone 1964, plate XLVIII (a); (b) Jarlshof: see J.R.C. Hamilton 1956, plate XXI; (c) Iona: see W.G. Collingwood 1901–1903a, 305; (d) Killary: see F. Johnstone 1964, plate XLVIIb; (e) Monasterboice: see F. Henry 1967, plate III. Note also the vessels depicted on the decorative ironwork at Stillingfleet and Staplehurst and the sketches from Dublin: see D. Talbot Rice 1952, plate 91 and B. O'Reiordain 1972, fig. 27.

4. See: H. C. Puech 1949; C. A. Radford 1963, 209. The animal is not certainly either a lamb or a hart but (given the clear snake's head of the attacking serpent) he is certainly not the fettered wolf of H. R. Ellis Davidson 1967, 133. See above p. 175.

5. "...the struggle...in order to save the world from destruction", H. R. Ellis Davidson 1967, 134. This idyll is carried through to Ragnarök: see F. Jónsson 1907, 100. Note also the figure of Leviathan and the comments of R. Keitzenstein 1924, 158.
The parallel would thus be of the type suggested between Viśar and Christ on the east face of Gosforth I.

Given the close parallels between Gosforth II and Gosforth I in both the details of execution, and probably also in overall intention, there is no reason to assume that the Fishing stone is other than a product of the same historical and religious setting as the main shaft. There is no convincing reason why both carvings should not be the work of the same sculptor.

IV

The fragment, Gosforth III, was discovered in 1894¹ and first published by Parker with a rather inaccurate drawing.² It appears to be part of the edge of a cross shaft. On one face is the curled tail of a fleshy three-strand plaited snake which is an exact reproduction of the termination of the animal on the upper side of the south face of the main cross and also the ? world-serpent on the fishing stone and, as will be seen, the serpent on the 'Saint's Tomb.' On the other face the zoomorphic ornament is difficult to reconstruct but appears to have in it a beast with pointed hollowed ears exactly matching those on Gosforth I.

Whilst the fact of its close likeness to Gosforth I (and thus its likely contemporaneity) is relatively easy to establish, it is difficult to determine what lay below the snake's curled tail. One, not entirely plausible, possibility it that we have here a swag marking the junction of a round and square section of shaft - the type established in the Anglian period at Sandbach and continued in the Viking period at Bolton-le-Moors and Whalley³ on round-

1. C.A. Parker 1896, 80.
2. C.A. Parker 1896, 81. It is now covered by a radiator and a plaster board screen erected during the 1960s.
shaft derivatives in the north-west. This would yield a reconstruction as below:

![Fig. 34](https://example.com/fig34.png)

The other problem is the reconstruction of the side with the animal's head. Either this beast was double-headed (with an earless second head) or two heads cross each other. Unfortunately this side cannot be reconstructed on the basis of any known potential parallels.

Despite such difficulties the important fact of a close link to the other Gosforth sculptures and particularly to the main cross is clear. This too could have been the work of the same hand as produced Gosforth I and Gosforth II. It is tempting to identify this fragment as a part of the destroyed shaft which was noted in the Gentleman's Magazine in the late eighteenth century.¹

The discovery of the hogback Gosforth VII (the so-called Saint's tomb) under an apparent twelfth-century wall at Gosforth church has been frequently described.² Photographs of both sides and of the (present) west gable-end were published by Calverley³

---

1. Carbo 1799.
2. W.S. Calverley 1899a, 242ff. reprinted in W.S. Calverley 1899, 174ff.; W.G. Collingwood 1897-1900; J. Watson 1903, 399ff..
3. W.S. Calverley 1899a plates IV, V and VI reproduced as plates D, E and F in W.S. Calverley 1899. VCH 1901, I, plate facing 271 shows the present south side. The sides are described as they are now placed.
and, since the beginning of the century, drawings of various parts of the decoration have been produced by Collingwood,¹ Walton² and Schmidt.³ The photographs used by Calverley are not very useful for detailed examination and the present positioning of the stone does not now allow an ideal photographic record to be made.⁴ As a result scholars have tended to rely on Collingwood’s drawings⁵ and, sadly, these are uncharacteristically inaccurate. Detailed misrepresentations will be noted below but some indication of the seriousness of misdrawing can be judged by the fact that Collingwood omits both the inward-facing end-beasts⁶ and the animal’s head terminal to the plait on the ridge-panel, as well as misdrawing the tegulation.

Just as the large cross stands apart from other round-shafts so this monument is, in many ways, unique among hogbacks. Like the three sculptures from the site which have been examined so far, it is also closely linked to the other Gosforth carvings.

This is not to deny that it does have links with other north-western hogbacks. It shares with them a taste for ornamenting the walls of the hogback with human figures⁷ and, in its snake-combat theme, shares a motif with hogbacks at Penrith and Bolton le Sands.⁸

1. W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig. 212 shows the north side in restored state together with the west gable-end.
2. J. Walton 1954, figs. 3 f and 4 f show a section of the roof and the west gable. Since these repeat Collingwood’s errors they have no independent value.
3. H. Schmidt 1970, fig. 8 shows the south side and west end. Though more accurate than Collingwood in showing an end-beast he shows less decoration than is visible.
4. B.C. Clayton’s photographs are more useful but only one has been published: see H.R. Ellis Davidson 1967, plate 55.
5. e.g., T.D. Kendrick 1949, fig. 21 reproduces Collingwood’s drawing.
6. That this was not just a temporary aberration can be judged from his remarks in both W.G. Collingwood 1907, 276 and W.G. Collingwood 1907a, 155 where Gosforth (and Aspatria) are not listed as having end-beasts.
7. See above p. 303.
8. See above p. 303.
As at Penrith the wall decoration penetrates the base of the panel. Like so many north-western hogbacks it has, when seen in section, a tall and narrow shape: its distinction is that it exaggerates this tendency further than most.

But it also stands apart. It stands apart, first, in its general shape. There is no really close parallel for its combination of slightly curved ridge (a detail not shown by Collingwood) and the inclined, but not hipped, gable-end, together with distinct vertical side-walls and a steep-pitched roof. Admittedly there are hogbacks with a curved roof-line and flat, near-vertical, gable-ends of a non-cruck type but they are all much smaller and squatter than the Saint's tomb. In many ways the Gosforth stone seems closer to the house-shaped solid shrines of Anglian England (assuming Hedda's tomb to be a widespread type) or to the shrines on the top of some Irish crosses or, indeed, to metalwork shrines. But perhaps it is more important to remark that the closest parallel for Gosforth VII in shape (were it not for the cruck form of the gable-end) stands alongside it in the church - the so-called Warrior's tomb, Gosforth VI.

The ornamental scheme of the roof area is also unique. Most of the roof is occupied by the tegulation, represented by a series of incised parallel lines which cross each other diagonally to produce a set of adjoining diamond shapes. Each diamond is further subdivided into two L-shapes framing a rectangle/diamond. By contrast with the rest of the hogback's decoration this ornament is very carelessly and crudely set out - one section at the west end of the south side seems never to have been completed - and this prompts speculation that it might be the work of another.

1. See above p. 29a
2. A point which is well illustrated in H. Schmidt 1970, fig.11.
3. Representative examples are: St. Alkmunds, Derby and Repton: see R.E.Routh 1938, plate XII and E.C.Cutts 1849, 73; Ingleby Arncliffe, Yorkshire: see W.G.Collingwood 1909, 190; Dewsbury: see W.G.Collingwood 1915, 170, fig.2; Lythe, Yorkshire: see H. Schmidt 1970, fig.9 and 10. There are further unpublished examples at Gainford, Sinnington and Yarm.
4. I.W. Clapham 1930, plate 30; R.A.Smith 1925, fig.4.
5. For list see above p. 277.
6. For list see above p. 276. Note particularly the Breac Maodhog illustrated in F. Henry 1970, plate 34.
This tegulation is bounded, at the gable-ends, by lateral panels containing a run of fleshy, three-strand plait terminating in a tight spiral. Along the line of the ridge is another panel with a similar type of plait which terminates in an animal's head with long jaws, a marked ear and a round eye. At the west end (and probably also at the lost east end) this ridge-panel runs into a large animal's head - an end-beast whose upper jaw makes a distinct break in the ridge line. This end-beast lacks body, legs and neck but does have fangs.

Some of the elements in this roof decoration are paralleled elsewhere in the hogback series. Thus, though they are rare, it is possible to find end-beasts with fangs - their presence here is symptomatic of an attention to detail which is in such marked contrast to the treatment of the tegulation. The placing of the end-beast away from the gable is much less common - the only other occurrence seems to be at Cross-Canonby - and the apparent hooked tongue is only found once elsewhere. But Gosforth VII is unique in its combination of these rare elements with a system of framing panels and end-beasts. There is, admittedly, a type of hogback which uses lateral panels but these are usually quite broad and

1. It could be a development of the tegulation type seen at Dewsbury and Brompton: see W.G.Collingwood 1927, fig.196 and 205. Note also the grave slab from Birstall and the Oseberg wood-carving: see W.G.Collingwood 1915,145 fig.d and H. Shetelig 1920, fig.23.

2. The spiral at the north-western side is shown in reverse on the drawings of both Collingwood and Walton.

3. Aspatria VII provides a local example. From the Tees valley there are examples at Wycliffe and Osmotherley: see H.Schmidt 1970, fig.7 and W.G. Collingwood 1907,378, fig.e. In the West Riding is Burnsall: see W.G.Collingwood 1915,152. There are also unpublished examples at Darlington and Lythe.

4. At Easington, Yorkshire, the head is placed at some distance from the gable-end but is attached to a serpent-like body which links to the gable: see W.G.Collingwood 1907,317,fig.h.

5. On an unpublished hogback from Darlington.

6. Abercorn: see J.R. Allen 1903,III,fig.436; Bedale: see W.H. Longstaffe 1847,258; Dewsbury: see W.G.Collingwood 1915,170; Lythe: see W.G.Collingwood 1911,294 fig.dd and 295 figs.jj and 11; Shelton: see A.de B.Hill 1916, plate IV.

7. Cross Canonby is an exception to this rule.
are never combined with end-beasts or ridge-panels in England. Equally on Aspatria VII there is a ridge-panel combined with end-beast but this lacks lateral panels. The closest parallels come from Scotland: an example from Govan combines end-beasts with narrow, knotwork-decorated, lateral panels but there is no ridge-panel and the beast head is set above the lateral panel and not inside it as at Gosforth. Meigle provides another parallel in that it does have a ridge-panel, one lateral panel (the eccentric shape of the monument limits the number) and an end-beast. But this end-beast is outward-facing.

There are obviously several possible interpretations and deductions from the material which has been adduced in the last two paragraphs. It is clear, however, that the decorative layout bears the same stamp of individuality as does the shape of the monument. It also seems clear that the nearest parallels to this scheme come from the north-west and from areas well away from the main hogback centre of Allertonshire (the head placing of Cross-Canonby, the animal and ridge decoration of Aspatria, the beast-plus-lateral panels at Govan and the relative closeness to Meigle). It can be argued that all the parallels are stylistically quite late (witness the small head of the Cross-Canonby animal, the shape of Meigle or the curious misunderstanding of the end-beasts' bodies at Govan) but this appearance of lateness may be less indicative of time than of distance from an original centre of hogback production in northern Yorkshire. The most reasonable conclusion would be to see this Gosforth scheme as an individual, eccentric, type which shares certain features with other hogbacks in areas (particularly in the north-west) which were peripheral to the centre of original production.

1. C.A.K. Radford 1968, plate XIIIb (nearest the camera). Notice that the lateral panels are raised, unlike Gosforth VII.
2. J.R. Allen 1903, III, figs.352 A and B. The grave-cover illustrated in fig.346 should be noted for its ridge and eaves panelling.
3. An alternative suggestion would be that the Gosforth scheme of ridge and lateral panelling is derived from the decoration of shrines like the Gandersheim casket: see D.M. Wilson 1964, plate la.
Two issues emerge from a study of the details of the ornamental scheme. The first concerns the links to the other Gosforth stones, the second is concerned with dating. The more closely the roof decoration is examined the stronger appear its links to the decoration of other Gosforth sculpture. The fleshy, three-strand plait with a terminal curl (which flattens before turning) found on the lateral panels is identical with the plaits on the south side of Gosforth I and those on both Gosforth II and III. The use of a drill to pick out the crossing points can also be seen on Gosforth II and III and was noted by Collingwood on the north face of the main shaft\(^1\). Nowhere else in Cumbria can one find this combination of fleshy, tight-packed plait with terminal curl: it is a characteristic of the Gosforth sculptures. The same type of plait is used on the ridge-panel and, on a larger scale using four strands, on the walls - the latter type can be compared with the upper section of the east face of the main cross. The animal's head which terminates the ridge-panel plait may not, at first sight, seem to have Gosforth links because of its elongated jaws but (apart from that one feature) it is identical with the animal-heads on the main cross: they have the same basically circular shape, the same type of ear and the same method of joining strand and head without any widening at the neck or attempt at naturalising the junction.\(^2\)

These links in plait and animal types between Gosforth VII and the other Gosforth sculptures are supported by other parts of the ornament. The crucifixion figure at the eastern end has been much worn but a kirtled figure can still be discerned which is virtually identical with the crucified Christ on the main cross, using the same head shape, a similar kirtle and also lacking a cross on which the figure is hung. Unfortunately the accompanying details are not clear but there seems a strong possibility that there is a spear reaching to the corner of Christ's garment, just as on the main cross. The eye of faith can even discern a flow of blood from the right side of Christ.

2. Compare the beasts at the top of the south, west and east sides of Gosforth I.
The ornament on the western gable-end was restored by Collingwood as a crossless crucifixion beneath a triquetra, Christ wearing a loin cloth and flanked by a figure who holds what appears to be a short sword. The crucified Christ is certainly present but repeated examination of the stone in a variety of lights, together with an examination of a range of photographs, have not entirely convinced me of the presence of a second figure. The photographs which accompany this thesis could be interpreted as showing a nimbed figure below Christ's right arm and a beast-headed character below his left. Neither is certain and the line of the dexter figure's alleged weapon coincides so closely with the striation of the stone that it cannot be accepted. In view of this one can only comment that there is nothing surprising in the crucifixion iconography apart from the lack of a cross - a lack which the main shaft would suggest is characteristic of a Gosforth presentation of this scene. Characteristic of Gosforth also is the presence of figure sculpture on the gable-end for it only occurs in Northumbria on this hogback and the adjacent "Warrior's tomb", Gosforth VI.

The triquetra above the figural scene on this western gable-end is better preserved than the crucifixion below. Like the other decoration analysis shows that it is closely linked to other Gosforth sculpture. In its position at the gable-end it is paralleled among the hogbacks only at Plumbland but the more interesting aspect is the manner in which the bands split at the point of intersection. This splitting was identified by Åberg as a Germanic contribution to ornament and his examples show a wide usage within Style 2 art. Viking art makes great use of bifurcation: this, indeed, is what lies behind such motifs as the ring-chain or the so-called Manx tendril. Among the various types of split-bands is one in which the strand splits and then

1. For the animal-headed figures compare Kirklevington and Lancaster: see W.G.Collingwood 1907, 350, fig.1 and W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig.128.
2. See above p.147
3. N. Åberg 1947, 116-7:
4. F.M.C. Kermode 1907, figs.27 and 28.
5. Types of splitting in zoomorphic ornament, involving the contour lines or tendrils can be seen in D.M.Wilson and O.Klindt-Jensen 1966, fig.58 and plates XVIII, LIII, LVIIb, LIX, LXVIII.
recombines into a single strand. This is the type employed at Gosforth. It is found in early Viking art at Oseberg and later on stones at Ardre and Alstad. Geographically nearer at hand it is used on the heads of two Manx cross-slabs. But the only parallel usage in the whole of Viking English sculpture is supplied by the hogback, Gosforth VI, which stands alongside the Saint's tomb on the same display plinth.

The evidence for this monument as an example of a local style is thus overwhelming but does not, of itself, give any indication of date though it might be thought that it should indicate contemporaneity with the rest of the Gosforth sculptures. A firm assertion of dating has, however, come from Brøndsted and Kendrick who have argued that the wall panel on the north side carries "a pattern of ribbon-pattern animals expressed in generous easy-flowing curves of the true Urnes kind". If true this would indicate a dating to, at earliest, the middle of the eleventh century. Detailed analysis of this panel does not, however, seem to lend support to the Brøndsted/Kendrick conclusion.

There is nothing particularly Urnes about the motif of a chthonic struggle as such – indeed we have already seen that it seems to be a motif with widespread popularity though having a particular appeal to Viking-age sculptors in the north-west, perhaps even to sculptors of hogbacks in particular. Nor are the animal heads of a diagnostically Urnes type for they lack both pointed eyes and the hook-like extension of the lower jaw.

1. As opposed to (a) the band splitting and one half linking with half of the crossing strand (e.g., J. Petersen 1928, fig.11; W.G. Collingwood 1907, 390 fig.b; W.G. Collingwood 1915, 259 fig.b; D.M. Wilson and O. Klindt-Jensen 1966, figs. 9, 22, 50 and 58.) or (b) one element acting as a binding tendril or (c) a line-incised strand temporally dividing.

4. P.M.C. Kermode 1907, nos. 86 and 99. See also no. 110.
7. These characteristics and those which follow are taken from D.M. Wilson and O. Klindt-Jensen 1966, esp. 150ff.
The bodies also lack such Urnes characteristics as the split tail and the splitting off from the body of a trail which then forms a loop; nor is there any trace of the typical angled break in the curve. The only Urnes-like characteristic lies in the interplay of broad animal bodies set off against thin wiry strands on the panel on the north side. Here it seems that Collingwood's drawing has partly misled Kendrick (who reproduces it) for he fails to show how the bodies taper towards the elongated jaws: the "thin wires" are much broader than they appear in Collingwood's drawing and the contrast between the two thicknesses (essential to Urnes art) is much less marked on the original stone. What contrast there is on the side walls is between a central area of narrow and a flanking area of broad bands, not the typical polarised contrast between broad strands and a background of intertwining narrow. It also seems doubtful if the use of space is like that of Urnes work; certainly it seems impossible to find an example of Urnes art in which the strands issue from the jaws of animals or, indeed, in which the jaws become bodies. There is no compelling reason to associate this decoration with the Urnes style.\(^1\)

Since the shape of the monument and so many details of the zoomorphic, interlace and figural motifs are so closely paralleled amongst the rest of the Gosforth sculptures (particularly on the main cross) there seems no reason why it should not be placed within the same tenth-century period to which they have been assigned. Such a dating would also be consonant with the date of the other hogbacks in the north-west to which it has links. As support for a relatively early date in the Viking period it is worth drawing attention to the fact that the figure struggling with the snake on the south side has his legs in an "Anglo-Saxon lock".\(^2\) An early date would also fit the fact that the stone was

---

1. The small human heads in the lower corner of the panel are similarly not specifically linked to Urnes art: similar heads can be found on one of the Manx crosses and on a carved panel from Iceland in pre-Urnes-phase contexts: see P.M.C. Kermode 1907, no. 100 and E.M. Magerzó 1962, 155.
found, in broken and worn condition, beneath a twelfth-century wall: indeed Collingwood¹ was surely correct in seeing this as one of the main objections to the mid-eleventh-century dating given by Brøndsted and later followed by Kendrick.

VI

Gosforth VI was discovered in 1896 under the same twelfth-century foundations as the Saint's tomb.² Photographs, taken before the stone was placed in its present position where it is difficult to examine, were published by Calverley³ and these can be supplemented with the set produced by Clayton and the drawings executed by Parker, Collingwood, Walton and Schmidt.⁴

When seen in section Gosforth VI closely resembles Gosforth VII. It is both narrow and high and thus exhibits the same north-western tendencies which are even more exaggerated in the Saint's tomb.⁵ Like that hogback, and similarly linking it with other north-western hogbacks, it uses figural scenes as decoration on one of the walls.

Its gable-end is flat and inward-sloping⁶ and Walton was right to indicate that it had a cruck-like profile.⁷ Flat, inward-sloping gables are not common on hogbacks: we have already noted that the type occurs on the Saint's tomb and elsewhere in the north it only seems to occur at Plumbland (without an end-beast) and at Cross-Canonby. There seems some justification for seeing this general shaping as a north-western type. The tegulation, however, is a type which is found all over the north and is identical with local hogbacks at Bromfield and Appleby.⁸

2. C.A. Parker 1896, 81ff.; W.S. Calverley 1899a, 239ff.; W.G. Collingwood 1897-1900; J. Watson 1903, 399ff.
3. W.S. Calverley 1899a, plates I,II and III.
4. See bibliography in catalogue.
5. H. Schmidt 1970, fig.11 shows that only the Saint's tomb is taller.
6. This feature is not shown in Collingwood's drawings but is correctly rendered by Parker.
8. See p.298. To the example cited there from Lythe can be added others from Yorkshire at Burnsall and York: see W.G.Collingwood 1915, 152 and W.G.Collingwood 1909, 171.
The decoration on the north wall shows two facing rows of warriors, armed with spears and with overlapping shields covering the lower parts of their bodies. The leader of the dexter group has one hand extended from the elbow, the leader of the sinister grasps a staff with triangular flag. I can find no trace of the kneeling figure drawn between the two groups by Collingwood, nor is the detail sufficiently distinct to make out the beards seen by Parker on the dexter group. Still less observable is Calverley's distinction between the upward-pointing spears of the group to the left and the downward-pointing group to the right.

Processions of armed warriors are not a frequent motif in insular art. There is only one example from Ireland, three from Scotland and two from England. One of the latter is from Lindisfarne but it is the other which provides the most significant

1. Feet are visible on the sinister group, apparently in baggy trousers. Earlier scholars vary in their count of the number in each group: Calverley, Parker and Collingwood show at least 15 in the dexter group but Parker traced 13/14 on the sinister side whilst the other writers could only find 10. My count is 11.
2. H. Schmidt 1970, 23 claimed that this object was a crosier. I do not believe that the shape at the top of the staff can be reconstructed to yield this interpretation and the martial nature of the whole scene would also seem to preclude it. For some parallels for the flag-like standard see R.H.M. Dolley 1965, plate X no. 35; P.G. Foote and D.M. Wilson 1970, fig. 26; A. Bugge 1905, 288-9.
3. W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig. 211. There is a crack in the stone which Collingwood probably misinterpreted as the back of the kneeling figure. There is no trace of this figure in the nineteenth-century photographs preserved in the vicarage.
4. C.A. Parker 1896, 83-4. His drawing facing 84 is very schematised.
5. Though the latter would provide an interesting parallel to the reversed spears of the figures on Gosforth I.
6. F.H. Gilling 1937, plate XXXVI.
7. J.R. Allen 1903, III, figs. 156A, 334C and 475B.
8. C.R. Peers 1925, plate LVI. These figures wave weapons but lack shields: they are arranged in a single procession and not opposed groups.
parallel. This is the hogback Lowther VI which has the same type of representation of figures whose overlapping shields cover the lower parts of their bodies. The carving is of the same incised type. Since the composition of the Lowther group exactly repeats one known from the Gotland stones it seems reasonable to suggest a similar source in Scandinavia for the Gosforth composition. The inspiration need not, of course, come direct from Gotland to either Lowther or Gosforth for the Gotland stones merely preserve in a permanent medium a type of decoration which, in the more perishable forms of wood and tapestry, was probably widespread in Scandinavia. This source for the Gosforth composition is all the more likely since it is in Scandinavia, and not amongst any of the insular examples quoted, that armed warriors are arranged in confrontation. The import of the scene seems, like that of its Gotland equivalents, irrecoverable.

The ornament on the north wall, which is well shown in Parker's drawing, presents something of the same kind of puzzle as was posed by the tegulation on the Saint's Tomb because it shows a great variation in both aesthetic approach and competence of execution. At one end is a regular pattern of neatly interlocking circles which, in certain lights, appear to terminate in zoomorphic ornament. Further to the west, this breaks down into a jumbled arrangement of knots, differing in both size and order and placed, seemingly at random, over the wall surface.

At the western end is a version of the ring-knot. Shetelig rightly linked this particular knot to a characteristic Borre-style motif and quoted metalwork parallels. His point is a valid one because the use of a central hollow-sided motif is a particularly well-marked characteristic of that style. It will suffice here

1. See above p. 306.
2. After this chapter was written a further examination showed that there is a ? contoured animal at the end of the inter-locking circles. Details are faint but there seems to be a head-lappet which knots around the beast's neck. The animal thus appears to be of Jellinge type.
to refer to the discussion of the earlier ring-knot and once more to draw attention to metalwork parallels for this type of split-band link. The particular form of binding at the ring (see fig. 35) is also used as a termination on Manx crosses and occurs on one other hogback at Tynemouth.

Fig. 35
Gosforth VI
knot motif

The knotwork immediately to the lower left of the ring-knot uses the same type of split bands. Further to the east is an area of very irregular knotwork which has much in common with the irregular knotwork of such Jellinge work as Aspatria VII, Waberthwaite II or that surrounding the Gainford animals.

At the eastern end of the north wall this disorganised decoration is replaced by a regular series of inter-locking circles. The exact pattern seems to be unparalleled but its significance within the context of the Gosforth examples has already been indicated: only on Gosforth VII in the whole of insular sculpture does that type of split penetration survive.

A further link to the other Gosforth sculptures is found on the eastern gable. This end has been badly damaged but clearly carried a large human figure. Beyond this, however, any description must be open to doubt but repeated examination does seem to substantiate the fact that the figure is wearing a short kirtle, that he is bound across the lower part of this dress with knotwork which then runs down beside his left leg, and that his left arm holds something to his chest. The link to the main shaft

1. See above p. 92.
4. F. J. Haverfield and W. Greenwell 1899, nos.XXI and XXXII.
5. As described and drawn by Parker.
6. As drawn by Collingwood - this seems marginally more likely than the separate belt drawn by Parker.
7. All drawings agree that the left arm is bent across the chest.
and, indeed, to the figures on Gosforth II and the crucifixion of Gosforth VII lies in the treatment of the face which is rendered very flatly with the features worked out on a level surface. The kirtle with its pointed ends is equally characteristic of the Gosforth group.

Beyond this lies conjecture. Earlier writers like Parker and Calverley (and to judge from his drawing and description Collingwood) believed that the man was armed with an axe whose long haft could be seen between his legs. If true, the figure from Middleton, flanked by his axe amongst other weapons, provides some sort of parallel and it would not be irrelevant to note the practical and ritual significance of the axe in Scandinavia. But, equally, the object could be a book held in the right hand (as so frequently in carvings of saints and ecclesiastics) and the long object - if it exists - could be a crosier, probably of tau-shape. If he is bound across his body then the bound-man material already discussed would be relevant. But, since the figure is so worn, this is all speculation. The popular attribution of the hogback to a warrior, however, rests on very uncertain foundations.

The ornament on the western gable-end has received much less attention. It does not figure in the photographs published by Calverley nor in Collingwood's drawings. Yet it is chronologically highly significant for, despite the wearing of the stone, it is possible to decipher a downward-biting ribbon-beast, its upper jaw

1. W.G. Collingwood 1928a, 408 was able to identify it as a tenth-rather than eleventh-century type.
2. A.L. Binns 1956, fig.3.
3. P. Paulsen 1956. The dating to the tenth century which is proposed below would rule out the possibility of any link to the cult of St. Olaf. For a discussion of his iconography see D.M. Wilson 1969.
4. e.g., W.G. Collingwood 1927, figs. 61,63,87,88 and 92.
curled, which is bound in some type of light knotwork (see fig. 36).

![Fig. 36: Gosforth VI beast]

All of these features fit neatly with the characteristics of the Jellinge beast\(^1\) and very close parallels are afforded by the animals on a shaft from Gainford\(^2\) and (with more realistic legs) from Folkton.\(^3\)

Analysis of the ornament on the north side and on the western gable-end would thus point to a tenth-century date for the stone.\(^*\) A date early within the Viking period would also fit the Scandinavian-derived (? pagan) iconography. Since there are also close links between this stone and the others at Gosforth this stone can be used as further confirmation of their tenth-century dating.\(^4\) It would, however, be wise to set this stone slightly apart from the others in view of the shallow relief treatment of the north and south sides and its use of recognisable Jellinge animal ornament.

**VII**

The two cross-heads, nos. IV and V, now walled in at a great height inside the church near the hogbacks, complete the list of surviving stones from Gosforth. Analysis of their ornament seems to show that they, too, are characteristic of the sculpture from this site.

---

2. F.J. Haverfield and W. Greenwell 1899, no. XXXII.
3. T.D. Kendrick 1949, plate LXI, fig.2.
4. W.G. Collingwood 1927, 173 argued that the ring-knots had a nascent Ringerike element yet similar lobate protrusions are seen in the earliest phases of Viking art: see pp.98-9 above.

\(^*\) This dating is strengthened by the recognition of the Jellinge beast noted on p. 353.
The larger stone (Gosforth V) was drawn by Parker for Calverley's 1883 publication\(^1\) and earlier by J. Stuart.\(^2\) Photographs of both faces were published by Calverley\(^3\) though these seem to have suffered some re-touching. These illustrations are thus the only source for our knowledge of the now hidden face.

There is no doubt that this head came from a very large shaft - its proportionate size can be judged in Parker's drawing\(^4\) - nor can there be any doubt that it was a very ambitious carving. The central boss is surrounded by two circles of rope-moulding unparalleled in English sculpture as, indeed, is the rope arris to the ring. Decoration of the ring itself is very rare on Northumbrian crosses - there are only six occurrences in the entire Northumbrian corpus and three of those are at Gosforth.\(^5\) In these respects therefore this head resembles the rest of the Gosforth pieces in its ornamental ambition. But it also uses the same types of plaitwork: Parker long ago\(^6\) noticed that the incised plait of the lower arm resembled that on the north side of the standing cross and that the ring is decorated with an incredibly neat version of the ring-chain found on the main cross. To this list one can add that the evidence of Calverley's photograph suggests that the lateral arms on the now-hidden side carried a fleshy three-strand plait of typical Gosforth type.

This head must be placed into the same chronological context as the rest of the Gosforth group whilst the other cross head, no. IV, cannot be far separated from it. In shape it almost duplicates that of the main cross and this adds weight to Parker's suggestion\(^7\) that it was once the head of the other large shaft recorded in the eighteenth century.\(^8\) No description is available of the face which is now hidden and little can be made of the side now visible apart

---

1. W.S. Calverley 1885b, facing 373.
2. J. Stuart 1856, plate XXVIII.
3. W.S. Calverley 1892, plate facing 170 (labelled B1 and B2).
4. C.A. Parker 1896, fig. facing p.6.
5. The others are in Yorkshire at Kirklevington, Bilton and North Frodingham: see W.G.Collingwood 1907, 350 figs. a and b; W.G. Collingwood 1915, 140 fig.b; W.G.Collingwood 1927, fig.151.
6. C.A. Parker 1896, 72.
7. C.A. Parker 1896, 72.
8. Carbo 1799.
from noting its decorated ring and the intriguing possibility that the sinister arm once carried multiple ring-chain similar to that on the base of the main shaft.¹

VIII

The Gosforth sculptures are a thing apart in Cumbrian sculpture, for there is nothing like this quality of workmanship anywhere else in the peninsular, nor indeed elsewhere in Viking Northumbria. This is sculpture of high quality which reflects the taste of a patron who seems to have been both wealthy and individual enough to commission work of high standard on unusual themes. He was, moreover, a man who commissioned a good deal of work because there was at least one further cross of the size of the surviving cross as well as the two hogbacks and the two monuments represented by nos. II and III.

The analysis above has stressed time and again how interlinked these sculptures are with each other and that these links are much stronger than those between the individual sculptures and others in the area. They are interlinked, it should be stressed, in two ways: a) stylistically in that they use similar types of plait, of zoomorphic ornament, of ribbon-crossings, of figural types, of technical details like the use of the drill and b) thematically in that at least three of the monuments (Gosforth I, II and VI) illustrate stories which are not obviously Christian and in two cases clearly depict Scandinavian myth. Only at Lowther can similar claims be made.

This has a bearing upon the date of the group. Scholars who have been involved in national surveys have tended to separate these monuments by as much as 150 years, assigning the large cross to the early settlement period but wanting to place Gosforth II and VII near to the middle of the eleventh century. It has been demonstrated that such a late dating of those two monuments receives no support from any Urnes element alleged to be present in their decoration.

Given the facts detailed in the two paragraphs above we are left with two possibilities. The first is that the monuments were indeed carved over a long period, perhaps throughout the 150 years of Viking domination of the peninsular, and that the stylistic links between the carvings are the result of succeeding generations copying the masterpieces of their predecessors. Or we can assume

¹. Since this chapter was written a further examination has confirmed that the arm is decorated with multiple ring-chain.
that they are all the work of the same hand (perhaps workshop) working within the lifetime of a single master-sculptor or his patron.

The case against the former supposition involves several points. If this were a longlived school then we must assume that here alone in Cumbria there was a lengthy interest in the pagan mythical past and its potential interaction with Christian myth - an interest fostered by succeeding generations of the patron's family. This seems a little unlikely. Moreover, if there were a long-lasting workshop at Gosforth, one would have expected more signs of its influence on the crosses of the immediate neighbourhood. It seems much more likely that at Gosforth we have one craftsman, wholly employed by the one family and thus unable to take commissions outside, who used the same techniques and stylistic details on a series of monuments which reflected the idiosyncratic tastes of a single patron. As a slight modification one might admit the presence of a second sculptor as the artist of the Warrior's tomb, which we have seen as stylistically slightly set apart from the other sculptures. Whether the work of one hand or two, the stylistic analysis and the likely historical background combine to indicate that all of the Gosforth sculptures were carved in the tenth century and probably in its earlier half.

1. It is encouraging to note that Collingwood's early view was that "if the three crosses and two hogbacks were not carved by the same hand, they represent the work of the same age and race" \textit{VCH 1901}, 266.
CHAPTER THIRTEEN

Conclusion

"When the sculptor loses control of his medium to the extent that occurred in tenth-century Northumbria there is little purpose or value in attempting to catalogue or analyse his efforts." ¹ Stone's conclusion is not one which finds support in this dissertation: this final chapter attempts to indicate the value and variety of information which can be obtained from such an analysis and catalogue.

I

One of the most important issues is that of numbers and quantity of sculpture. The facts can be briefly stated. On the most liberal of estimates we know of seventeen sites which have produced carving of the Anglian period ² yet there are at least thirty-six from which sculpture of the Viking period is known. ³ The total number of Anglian monuments is, at most, twenty-six whilst the corresponding figure for the Viking period is at least one hundred and fifteen. Only six sites have yielded more than one piece of Anglian sculpture and none possess more than three: from the Viking period we know of nineteen sites with more than one piece of sculpture and fourteen of these have more than three fragments. Such a disparity between the two periods both in the number of sites and, massively, in the number of monuments requires explanation. ⁴

Several explanations are possible. The first is that the difference can be attributed to the likelihood of survival, the older Anglian material being at greater risk than the later Viking-period work. It is doubtful, however, if this would adequately

2. See above p. 20, note 1.
3. These figures and those which follow are based upon the material assembled in the lists of volume 2. For the purposes of these statistics Glassonby I has been counted as though it came from the submerged church at Addingham.
4. A similar disparity can be seen in Yorkshire in the material assembled by Collingwood, even if the stones classed by him as "C" are counted as Anglian and not, as seems likely, as of Viking date.
account for the size of the disparity and it would certainly be
dangerous to argue that there was a widespread destruction of
Anglian monuments at the time of the Viking settlement: they
are extremely difficult objects to destroy; at Irton and
Waberthwaite (and probably also at Beckermet St. Bridget) there
seems to be evidence of Viking-period copying of earlier carvings;¹
there is no documentary evidence from England of any pagan
iconoclastic movement.

A second explanation is that the disparity in numbers could
reflect a massive increase in the population during the Viking
period and thus of the monuments produced by, and for, Cumbria's
inhabitants. The onomastic evidence of fresh land-taking in the
area could be used in support of this argument. Yet whilst this
might account for the increase in the number of sites, and is
certainly an important factor to be taken into account, it is
still not a satisfactory explanation of the fourfold increase in
the number of monuments.

Without, therefore, rejecting either of these two explanations
as irrelevant, a third solution can also be advanced. It was
suggested in chapter two¹ that Anglian sculpture was rare and
predominantly the product of a monastic milieu. Such a monastic
background was no longer available in the tenth and eleventh
centuries in Cumbria. The patrons and craftsmen must therefore
have been members of the laity. The increase in both the number
of sites and the quantity of the sculpture could, then, be
interpreted as the result of a change in patronage away from the
monastery to the more numerous laity. The increased prosperity
of the area may also have been a factor. There is, admittedly,
much that is hypothetical in this third solution but it is as
attractive as the more orthodox explanations based on arguments
about survival or population increase.

The quantity of sculpture attributable to the Viking period
clearly shows that the population of the area in the tenth and
eleventh centuries was conforming enthusiastically to an earlier

¹. See above pp. 69,105,189-90. In general this thesis has
stressed the strength of traditional Anglian elements in
work of the Viking period.

2. See above pp. 24 - 5.
insular practice. Such information is valuable because, whoever was responsible for the erection of this sculpture, it is evidence of the vitality of a Christian civilisation in the area\(^1\) despite the economic impoverishment and organisational chaos which the Church had suffered in the north as a result of the Viking settlement.\(^2\)

Can it be demonstrated that the continued practice of erection of crosses was, at least partly, the work of the Viking settlers? There are clearly difficulties in establishing the race of a patron or sculptor, even if we assume that the "race" concept is a valid one for the period. Indeed, given the two facts that none of the crosses are closely dateable and that, a generation after the initial settlement, the population is already likely to have been of Anglo-Norwegian type, the question might appear unanswerable. It is certainly not possible, particularly when we lack any inscriptions,\(^3\) to make a simple equation between the geographical source of a particular motif and the racial origins of the patron or sculptor. But the sculpture at Lowther and Gosforth must imply that the patrons there were men interested in Viking myth: such men are more likely to have been Vikings, or men claiming Viking ancestry, than Angles. Whatever their date within the Viking period, therefore, these carvings demonstrate the adoption of a local form of monument by the incoming population\(^4\) and it is legitimate to infer that other sculptures, reflecting Scandinavian zoomorphic and knotwork tastes, may have had a similar patronage. The situation envisaged for Cumbria is thus similar to that suggested for the Isle of Man (where onomastic evidence for sculptors and patrons is available): in both areas the sculpture shows the same Viking assimilation of local insular practices as does the archaeological evidence for churchyard burials.\(^5\)

---

3. Though their evidence is often ambiguous.
4. Aided, no doubt, by familiarity with the use of wooden or stone grave-markers in the Scandinavian tradition: see G. Bersu and D.M. Wilson 1966, 90 for an insular example and the references there quoted for occurrences in Scandinavia.
Because the sculpture cannot be closely dated it cannot give information about the speed of conversion. For this we must make inferences from the evidence available in better documented areas of the country such as East Anglia. Such inferences must, however, take account of two opposed facts. The first is that many of the settlers had been resident in Ireland and may already have been Christian when they arrived in Cumbria. Against this must be placed the clear evidence of pagan activity in the north of England which, whatever its precise manifestation, was still causing concern as late as the early years of the eleventh century. The episode in c.920 at the church in Chester le Street, the concern with deofelgeld at Dacre in 927, the references to the heathen in the Chronicle poem on the freeing of the Five Boroughs, the necessity to baptise Eric Bloodaxe, all combine to show that many of the more active elements in Viking politics were pagan in the first half of the tenth century. Whitelock has frequently drawn attention to Wulfstan's concern with pagan practices and to other indications of the church's preoccupation with some form of pagandom in the eleventh century. Against this confusing background the very fact of the continuity of sculpture implies, at least, a toleration of local Christian practices. Conversely the absorption of Scandinavian ornament

1. D. Whitelock 1941.
2. B. Ekwall 1918 demonstrated the linguistic evidence for the Irish element though it should be stressed that Ireland is not the only Gaelic area which might have been involved. W.G.Collingwood 1927a is concerned with the Christianity of some of the invaders.
3. W.S. Angus 1965 stressed this factor in his interpretation of the political events of the tenth century.
4. T. Arnold 1882, 1, 72, 209, 238.
into insular sculpture implies that the toleration was a mutual process.\textsuperscript{1} The sculptures at Gosforth can be used as evidence of this toleration. They also, perhaps, hint at one of the methods of conversion. Berg, following earlier scholars, has argued that the scenes from Scandinavian myth have been deliberately organised for a Christian purpose.\textsuperscript{2} In the discussion of Gosforth II,\textsuperscript{3} I argued that at least one other sculpture from the site had a similar iconographic plan. It is perhaps legitimate to interpret the other scenes of serpent struggle at Penrith, Brigham and Great Clifton as similarly forcing an identification of Thor's struggle with that of Christian man and the serpent-dragon.\textsuperscript{4} This type of identification may have been one of the methods employed in the conversion of the settlers and would echo the type of approach adopted in the earlier conversion of Anglo-Saxon England.

The fusion of a local type of memorial with motifs (figural, zoomorphic and knotwork) whose homeland lay in Scandinavia occurred both in northern England and in the Isle of Man.\textsuperscript{5} It did not, however, take place in Ireland until the end of the tenth century.\textsuperscript{6} Ireland's sculptor\textsuperscript{s} in the tenth century devoted their efforts to "proclaim the faith"\textsuperscript{7} in an art which owed nothing to the Scandinavians in their midst. The difference between the sculpture

\textsuperscript{1} On this aspect see A.L. Binns 1956, 3-15 and A.L. Binns 1965. Note the implications of the presence of Archbishop Wulfstan at Leicester in 945 with the Viking king of York (whether or not the latter was a pagan): this seems to be evidence of mutual toleration between Angles and Vikings who were united in their opposition to southern domination. For additional comments see D. Whitelock 1959, 70-6 and W.S. Angus 1965, 154 footnote 6.

\textsuperscript{2} K. Berg 1958.

\textsuperscript{3} See above pp. 340-1.

\textsuperscript{4} See above pp. 175,340-1.

\textsuperscript{5} D.M. Wilson 1971.


\textsuperscript{7} F. Henry 1967, 197.
of the two sides of the Irish Sea reflects both the paucity of Scandinavian settlement in Ireland and the lack of fusion between two peoples with divergent linguistic habits. The difference is also presumably attributable to the fact that Irish sculpture in the tenth century was still dominantly a monastic art whilst it had moved into lay hands in contemporary England.

If we now return to the subject of the sites which produced Viking-period sculpture several interesting points emerge. Of the seventeen sites which can be claimed as centres of Anglian production no less than twelve provide evidence that they continued to produce carvings in the Viking period. The situation in Cumbria is thus similar to that claimed for Yorkshire but unlike the one which Kermode describes for Man: in the northwest of England there is a marked degree of continuity of sites as sculptural centres.

There are five sites which have Anglian but, as far as is known, no Viking-period sculpture. Two of these, Knells and the Falstead/Bow stone site, involve sculpture whose provenance is far from certain. There are, perhaps, explanations for the apparent lack of continuity at both Bewcastle and Heversham. It has already been seen that Bewcastle was an eccentric site in the Anglian period when its position was considered against a distribution map of Anglian place names: this suggests that there

1. K. Jackson 1962, 4: "There is no question of wide and deep Scandinavian settlement in Ireland as a whole." See also ibid., 8 and the summary of F.H. Sawyer 1970, 174: "The Vikings never settled widely in Ireland as farmers: they were content to establish themselves in strongholds from which they could launch plundering raids...."

2. See above pp. 19-20 for a complete list of Anglian sites and Maps 1-3 for their distribution. Those continuing to produce sculpture in the Viking period are: Addingham, Beckermest, St. Bridget, Brigham, Carlisle, Dacre, Irton, Kirkby Stephen, Lowther, Penrith, Usworth, Waberthwaite, Workington.

3. W.G. Collingwood 1915, 297. J.T. Lang has kindly confirmed that Collingwood's conclusions are still valid, despite the need to adjust some of his datings.

4. P.M.C. Kermode 1907, 7.

were special circumstances lying behind activity there in the Anglian period - and these may not have applied in the tenth and eleventh centuries. With Heversham we are on somewhat firmer ground for there is some evidence of piratical threats to its monastery:¹ the ultimate desertion of the monastery may well have taken with it the sculptural tradition. There is no easy explanation for Kendal's seeming lack of Viking-period sculpture though it may be significant that it is in the Kent valley (in which Heversham is also situated) where there is the highest concentration of Irish/Norwegian place-names (including both hof and lundr²) in the entire peninsular. It could therefore be argued that there was more social disruption in this valley than in other parts of Cumbria. But whatever the explanation for the apparent lack of continuity on these five sites, the important conclusion remains that about two-thirds of the Anglian sites remained productive in the Viking period.³

When those twenty-four sites are plotted, which provide evidence for production of sculpture solely within the Viking period⁴, they show an interesting tendency to cluster around the sites from which there is evidence of both Anglian and Viking carvings. Three groups are particularly striking: a set on the southern coastal plain in the area of Waberthwaite, Irton and Beckermet St. Bridget, another group (spreading mainly northwards) around Workington and Brigham and a final cluster represented by Hutton in the Forest and Appleby which can be associated with the Penrith/Lowther/Dacre/Addingham sites.

¹. See above p. 9.
². Both possible pagan elements: see A.H. Smith 1936, s.n. but compare A.H. Smith 1923 for lundr. Hof only occurs in Cumbria in the Kent valley.
³. See above p 360 for the statistics showing that these sites produced more sculpture in the Viking period than they did in the Anglian.
Though there are, of course, a scatter of sites which do not fit into this pattern of clusters it is still legitimate to look for an explanation of these concentrations. Since stone is readily available in all parts of the peninsula, one argument would be that it is only in those areas where the tradition of carving had been established earlier that there was likely to be a continuation of the practice in the following centuries. But a second explanation is probably more acceptable. This involves the concept of settlement focus and the onomastic background for the distribution of Anglian sculpture which was discussed in an earlier chapter.1 It seemed, from that analysis, that Anglian sculpture was usually found in those areas for which there was place-name evidence suggesting an early and (relatively) dense settlement and that the existence of sculpture reflected the economic wealth of the locality. What is reflected in these three concentrations of Viking-age material, therefore, is the continued wealth and attractiveness of those areas in the tenth and eleventh centuries. [This explanation is supported by the fact that the three areas mentioned are also, as will be seen later in this chapter, centres of concentration of certain types of Viking-age place-names.2]

One further point about the distribution of Viking-age sculpture must be made at this stage, though a discussion of its significance is postponed until a later part of this chapter.3 North of the River Ellen there is very little sculpture: Walton Carlisle/Stanwix and Rockcliffe each preserve one example. On this evidence there seems to be a distinction between the Solway plain and the habitable areas further south: this is a distinction which can also be traced in the place-names.4

1. See above p. 20ff.
2. See below p.
3. See below p. 383.
4. See below p. 384.
Whilst examining issues connected with production it will be convenient to summarise here the evidence for the methods of working adopted by the artists and the circumstances in which the carvings were produced.

Zarnecki's conclusions about a slightly later phase of English sculpture are equally applicable to this period:
"... we know practically nothing about the artists, their training, their organisation, their methods of work, what tools they used. Nor do we know what was the relationship between artists and patrons and how far work was dictated and influenced by the patron." ¹

Yet some information can be won from this seemingly unpromising material. Admittedly the lack of inscriptions has deprived us of the names of the artists² and the absence of unfinished sculptures has denied us insights into some of the sculptor's methods.³ But it seems reasonably certain that in most cases the artists used stone which was available in the immediate locality, as their counterparts did in Yorkshire,⁴ and did not rely on any organised production from a quarry. There is one group of sculptures which may represent an exception to this generalisation though, without petrographic examination, this cannot be established with certainty. The group is the work of the spiral-scroll school which, with one explicable exception, always used white sandstone.⁵ At each of the sites where work of the school survives there is a source of white sandstone in the vicinity. At each site there is also a local source for red sandstone and carvings using the red stone can be found in the vicinity.

¹ G. Zarnecki 1951, 9.
³ See, for example, F. Henry 1964, 16-17. If it is unfinished then Gilcrux yields no information.
⁵ See above p. 47 ff. The exception is at Addingham and is well distanced from the rest of the group.
same churches which preserve spiral-scroll sculptures. Only petrographic analysis can decide whether the spiral-scroll school artists were being supplied from a single source or whether they were united in the belief that their patterns were best presented on white sandstone and used whatever local source was available for this colour.  

It will be clear from the preceding chapters that the sculpture was probably produced under a variety of conditions. At one extreme there is the situation at Gosforth where the subject matter and the close inter-relationship of the monuments on the site suggests that we are probably dealing with the work of a single talented artist and a determined patron. Only thus is it possible to explain the close integration of the sculptures, the exceptional character of the carving, and the lack of similar material locally. At a humbler level it is possible to trace a single sculptor working in the two adjacent villages of Dearham and Aspatria. Further travelled, perhaps, was the sculptor who produced both Aspatria VI and the slab at Craignarget. There seems, however, to be little evidence for sculptors travelling great distances, as Collingwood often suggested; indeed in the case of the circle-head school Collingwood's suggestions would imply that the peripetatic sculptor changed his motifs according to the area in which he found himself. Most of the work studied in this thesis, therefore, is probably the work of local masons, occasionally linked in some "school" relationship, using a limited set of motifs.

The sources of inspiration for these motifs were probably various. Earlier monuments were certainly one such source: it has been suggested in earlier chapters that the Stafford knots of

1. This latter explanation is less convincing if we accept that the stones were painted, though it cannot be proved that all stones were so coloured nor that, if painted, they were completely coloured.
2. Aspatria II, Dearham II. See above pp. 70 and 77.
3. See above p. 255.
Irton I may account for the use of that pattern in the Beckermet school and that the inscribed shaft at Beckermet St Bridget is a likely source for the main motif of the spiral-scroll school. The vagaries of survival have possibly robbed us of further illustrations of such copying. Copying from other monuments erected within the Viking period probably accounts for similar motifs occurring in neighbouring villages or even on two carvings from the same site. Copying on the same site is particularly convincing at Penrith and Aspatria. At Penrith closely associated knots are found on one of the round-shafts of the "Giant's Grave" group on the "Giant's Thumb": the round-shaft is presumably the source of both the motif and the general shape of the smaller cross. At Aspatria there is a similar shared use of a rare knot on both the hogback and the largest of the cross-fragments from the site.

Inspiration from other media must also have played its part. A wooden prototype has been suggested as the most likely source of the decorative bosses on Waberthwaite II whilst the flat figures of the Gosforth cross, like similar work on Man, closely resembles the style of figure drawing fragmentarily preserved on the Oseberg wood carvings and once, presumably, widespread in the Viking north. Wall hangings, for which there is both archaeological and literary evidence, could have provided another possible source for the narrative scenes at Gosforth and Lowther. So too could the wall paintings and the shield decorations referred to in

1. See above pp. 69, 83, 105.
2. See above p. 190 for possibility that Waberthwaite II takes a knot from Waberthwaite I. It is also difficult to believe that Beckermet St. Bridget II would have been given a round-shafted shape but for the existence of Beckermet St. Bridget I.
3. e.g. Bromfield I and Aspatria I (and perhaps Rockcliffe): see above p. 129.
5. See above p. 188.
7. See H.R. Ellis Davidson 1950, 135; S. Krafft 1956; E.O. Blake 1962, x; I. Henderson 1967, 156.
the documentary sources.  

More portable objects certainly carried motifs over great distances. It was presumably from a metalwork source that the carvers of Cumbria first adopted the Trehwiddle beast into their repertoire.  

Ivory and bone objects, of which few now survive, would be another fertile source of decorative ideas. This group overlaps with the so-called "trial pieces" in bone and stone: these were used for a variety of purposes, including a direct use in metalworking, but they could have acted as aide-memoires for sculptors just as they seem to have done for metalworkers and manuscript illuminators. On such portable objects, or on wax tablets, motifs could be exchanged or travel over long distances.

Some such portable object must lie behind the curious development of the ring-chain in England and the Isle of Man. It is not important here whether the motif passed from one area to the other or whether it was introduced into both areas from a common source. The relevant point is that the same area developed the pattern in sculpture in a reverse form to the others. This would imply that the motif was introduced in a form that was portable and capable of being reversed and that, once introduced into an area, the possibility of the alternative handling of the pattern does not seem to have occurred to any of the sculptors.

---

1. See such material as that quoted above p.338. Perhaps some of the earlier church paintings would still be visible in the more ambitious churches: see the evidence for these paintings in C. Plummer 1896, I, 373 and F. Henry 1965, 90.

2. See in particular the discussion of Aspatria I, Cross Canonby I, Brigham IX on pp.112-14, 176-8. Note also the cut-out lead knotwork from Monkwearmouth, possibly used with window-glass but, like material from Whitby, a useful reminder that knotwork patterns also existed in portable metalwork form: see R.J. Cramp 1970 plate LIV f and C.R. Peers and C.A.R. Radford 1947, 51, figs. 2 and 7, plate XXVI, a and b.

3. e.g., P.M. Waterman 1959, fig. 2; D.M. Wilson and O. Klindt-Jensen 1966, plates XLV, LIV, LV; J. Kaftner 1941, plate 105, no. 4.

4. For some examples from the Viking period see: F. Cottrill 1935 (with references); L.R.A. Grove 1940; B. O'Riordain 1972, fig. 21a.


7. See R.A. Smith 1923, fig. 138. For pattern books at a later period see G. Zarnecki 1973, 9.

8. See the drawings and lists in Appendix. For portable objects (over page)
Two groups of material which might have been envisaged as possible sources of inspiration have been deliberately omitted from consideration. Manuscripts and fine ivory carvings cannot have exercised any effect on Cumbrian sculpture. It is doubtful if there were any in the area in the tenth and eleventh centuries, for they were essentially the work of the monasteries which had long since disappeared from the Cumbrian scene. If, as has been suggested, most carving was now the work of the lay village mason, then it is doubtful if such a man would ever have had the opportunity of seeing such material. Only the crucifixion scene on Gosforth I hints at familiarity (however vague) with such art. It is probably because of the general lack of familiarity with manuscripts and ivories that this sculpture has such an outdated iconography: lacking contact with Winchester art or with contemporary European Christian art the north-western sculptors continued to produce crucifixion scenes which by that date were outmoded.  

It has not proved easy to reach any certain conclusions about the type of tools used nor about the manner in which they were employed. On many of the stones any tool marks which may once have existed have now been erased by weathering or by the artist himself. Many deductions have to be based upon sculpture which does not appear to have been of a high standard: information from these sources may thus not reflect the methods of the more accomplished artists. Though monumental artists with whom I have discussed the problems seem convinced that most of the effects could be achieved with a range of chisels, it seems clear that at least two types of tool were employed. There are traces of both on such stones as Kirkby Stephen IV and Millom I: one is a round-nosed punch whilst the other is some form of chisel which cut the

cont. from previous page note 8.

using ring-chain see J. D. Cowen 1934, fig. 2 (from Hesket in the Forest, Cumberland); F. Henry 1967, plate 15; D. M. Wilson and O. Klindt-Jensen 1966, fig. 49; B. O'Riordain 1972, fig. 21a.
1. See above pp. 205-6, 211-12. There is a somewhat similar situation in contemporary Bernicia, where earlier manuscripts were available for nostalgic copying: see R. J. Cramp 1966.
2. For general comments see W. G. Collingwood 1907, 269-72; W. G. Collingwood 1915, 288-9; C. A. Gordon 1956, 41.
mistaken line at the bottom of the diamond tie on Millom I and produced the triangular marks on Kirkby Stephen IV. To these two tools can be added the possibility of a third because some form of drill would be the most likely explanation of the "drilled holes" on the north side of Gosforth I and among work of the Beckermet school. This effect could, however, have been produced by the use of a punch.

There is no doubt that a punch - or alternatively Collingwood's 'pick' - was used to obtain the "pocked" background for much of the relief sculpture: this background is particularly noticeable on Kirkby Stephen I and II and on Appleby I. The appearance of some stones seems to suggest that the pattern was first punched out on the levelled surface before the shaping was carried out with a chisel: this is the most likely explanation of Isel I and Walton I where the second stage of chiselling has not been carried through.\(^1\) The punch marks which often appear at the base of the depression between relief strands may be the remains of this marking-out but equally could have been cut at the final stage in order to emphasise the division between adjacent strands. Similar problems in establishing precedence occur when interpreting the "perforation" effect along the edge of relief ornament such as that on Dearham I: this also may reflect the original punched marking-out or may have been added at the final stage to stress the outline of the relief decoration. One certain indication from the miscuttings on the face and sinister sides of Great Clifton and the lower dexter side of Bromfield is that the central line of line-incised knotwork was cut first.

The present state of the stones is deceptive; in England,\(^2\) as in Ireland,\(^3\) there is evidence that sculptures were painted

---

1. Brigham VII seems to show the same procedure.
2. E. Okasha 1968, 249 provides a selection of references to which can be added: W.G. Collingwood 1907, 269-70, 352, 401; W.G. Collingwood 1909, 185; W.G. Collingwood 1912, 29; W.G. Collingwood 1915, 148 and 150. There is an unpublished example from Middleton in Yorkshire.
and such colouring would not be unfamiliar to Scandinavians whose wood-carving and stone-sculpture were similarly treated.\textsuperscript{1} On the continent during the period painting of stone monuments was widespread.\textsuperscript{2} There is both direct and indirect evidence for painting in Cumbria. The direct evidence comes from the Anglian shaft at Urswick (no. I) which still carries traces of red, blue and black paint on the inscription and knotwork panels of the face. The evidence from the Viking-period sculpture is all inferential.\textsuperscript{3} There is, first, the fact that Kirkby Stephen IV and Great Clifton I are carved from stones which have been cut across beds of differing coloured sandstone. Since there is no attempt to exploit this differentiation this would suggest, not that geological variation was prized (as Collingwood believed), but rather that it was hidden by paint.\textsuperscript{4} It was suggested that the decorative effect of the bosses on the knotwork on Waberthwait II would be enhanced (indeed, would only be visible) if they were coloured in a different pigment to that employed on the strands.\textsuperscript{5} The low relief of so many Viking-age carvings, which are now only visible in a raking light and at close quarters, also suggests that the design was intended to stand out in colour, perhaps with additional details added in paint. Unlike the, superficially analogous, linear ornament of St. Cuthbert's coffin\textsuperscript{6}, this decoration does not have a private meditative function and such items as the ship at Lowther VI can surely never have been planned to appear in their present reticent form.\textsuperscript{7}

\begin{enumerate}
\item J. Hubert et al. \textit{1969}, 8\textsuperscript{9} ; L. Coutil \textit{1931}, \textit{77}.
\item Traces of ? paint appeared on Bromfield I at some date between 1960 and 1966.
\item See above pp. 166, 251.
\item See above pp. 188-9.
\item E. Kitzinger \textit{1955}, 280, 298.
\item It is not, however, claimed that \textbf{all} sculptures were \textbf{always} painted. If this had been the case one would have expected more evidence of it among the unpublished material from York Minster where some of the memorials still lay undisturbed.
\end{enumerate}
Some claims have been made for the attachment of decorative metalwork, glass and paste to these crosses. There is no direct evidence for this from any of the Cumbrian crosses though the drilled bosses of Addingham I and Millom II could have been used as settings for some type of decoration.

Once completed, many of the crosses presumably acted as grave-markers though there is no direct evidence for this from Cumbria. The Gosforth cross, no. I, has an iconography which is more in keeping with a preaching cross than a memorial - though Ragnarök would not be an inappropriate notion for a grave - and it is not necessary to suppose that all of the surviving monuments were used for graves. Most were presumably placed outside, as is suggested by Aspatria I, Gosforth I, Waberthwaite II (which remained in their sockets to modern times) but it is conceivable that some were positioned within the church. Gosforth II, it was argued above, may have been a wall panel from within a church.

One of the main interests of the sculpture lies in the evidence which this material supplies for the cultural contacts and the artistic tastes of an area for which the documentary sources are virtually non-existent. Such evidence is, of course, subject to many reservations because all that it can really demonstrate are what patterns and motifs, perhaps available through a chance set of circumstances, appealed to a particular sculptor or patron whose work, again through a series of chances, has survived to the present day. Nevertheless the cumulative effect of the evidence does point to certain major conclusions.

1. The attachment of a metalwork sheet to one of the crosses at Sandbach seems likely since there is a blank panel apparently scabbed and drilled for an attachment. See: W.G.Collingwood 1903b, 265; W.G.Collingwood 1907, 274, 352; W.G. Collingwood 1915, 193, 281. E.Maclagan 1924, 210-11 discusses jewel inlays on ivories.

2. Footnote deleted.

3. For the confused evidence relating to the Giant's Grave group at Penrith see W.S. Calverley 1899, 241.

4. For evidence of this see above p. 27. Dr. Radford informs me that there is evidence of a cross inside the Minster at York in the twelfth century.

5. See above pp. 335, 340.
When compared with earlier Anglian work there are two features of tenth-and-eleventh-century Cumbrian sculpture which are immediately striking. The first is that the sources of inspiration no longer lie in areas to the east of the Pennines: Viking-period Cumbria became once more a westward-looking Irish Sea province just as it had been in the pre-historic and immediately post-Roman periods. The second characteristic is that the later sculpture betrays a regionalism and parochialism of taste for which there is no parallel in the Anglian period.

These two features are connected and reflect political and ecclesiastical changes in Northumbria. Politically the north of England was fragmented by the Viking settlement and was re-grouped into three areas: non-Scandinavian Bernicia, Anglo-Danish Yorkshire and Anglo-Norwegian Cumbria. The culture of these three regions, as represented in the ornament of the sculpture, develops in differing ways. An important contributory element to this fragmentation was the fact that the Scandinavian raids and settlement effectively ended whatever remained of Northumbrian monasticism. The result was that a unifying force was removed from northern English culture, for the links between the various Anglian monasteries had produced a certain identity of artistic outlook over the whole of Northumbria. The loss of the monasteries can only have accelerated the regionalisation which politics and geography imposed within Northumbria.

In the Viking period motifs have a restricted distribution which reflects the nature of the changed political and ecclesiastical scene. North of the Tees there is a revival of the Lindisfarne animal. More relevant for the subject of this thesis are the motifs which are limited to the Norwegian settlement areas of the north-west and the associated group in Yorkshire: the ring-knot, the hammerhead form, the "hart and hound". There are,

1. These labels simplify the racial mixture in the three areas but reflect the dominant elements.
3. See above p. 92 ff.
4. See above p. 59 ff.
5. See above p. 231 ff.
admittedly, general tendencies in sculptural practice which are not bounded by any political or settlement grouping, such as the use of enclosed members in knotwork or the production of pseudo-interlace, but regional differences within what had been Northumbria are now very marked. The removal of sculptural production from the near-international culture of the monastery, allied with the political disruption in northern England, results in an aggressively local art, cannibalistically feeding on its own limited stock of motifs. Nowhere is the parochial tendency of insular sculpture in the Viking period more marked that it is in Cumbria: it is an instructive contrast to compare the Anglian shaft Brigham I, using a vine-scroll which could have come from Hexham itself, with the Beckermet-school shaft Brigham II, which could only be the product of a limited part of the Cumbrian coastal strip.

In the last paragraph three motifs were listed whose distribution embraced the Norwegian settlements on both sides of the Pennines. Other types of decoration and monumental shapes are even more narrowly restricted to the north-west. There is a north-western version of the hogback which has a characteristic tall and slender section and there is a north-western form of hogback decoration with a long figural panel which seems to be found only between the Ellen and the Ribble. Along the western seaboard between the Solway and Anglesey are three separate manifestations of the circle-head cross, and one is limited to Cumbria. Between north Lancashire and the Cumbrian Derwent is a localised theme of small figures struggling with snakes and in the same area a particular form of framing for figural scenes was developed. Between the Ribble and the northern side of the Solw there is a taste for parallel strips of vertical ornament. The coastal strip of Cumberland is the only region to develop the

1. See above pp. 252, 269.
2. See above pp. 299, 344.
3. See above p. 295. For a local style in relating the frame and the rest of the monument on hogbacks in the area see p. 300.
4. See chapter five, especially p. 1071 and p. 112.
5. See above pp. 171ff, 207, 303.
6. See above pp. 157, 220.
7. See above pp. 58, 195.
multiple ring-chain in sculpture and the ornamented sockets of Brigham and Beckermet seem to represent a local type. Equally limited in their distribution are the motifs employed by the spiral-scroll and Beckermet schools.

Another striking feature of this parochial art is that, though it was carved within a period labelled as "Viking", yet it remains very faithful to earlier Anglian traditions. We have already seen this Anglian continuity in the very fact of the persistence of cross-erection. Many of the motifs employed on Viking-age sculpture derive from those current in Anglian art: the Stafford knot which is widely employed by the Beckermet school as well as at Waberthwaite, was probably taken from the Anglian cross at Irton whilst the lorgnette, scroll and interlace types of the spiral-scroll school are all developments from Anglian prototypes. The free-armed head used by this school, and by many other Viking-period sculptors in Cumbria, is similarly in an Anglian tradition. It is to this earlier art that one must look for the origins of the vine-scrolls at Penrith and for the source of the rosettes at Dearham and Gilcrux. Much of the animal art has more claim to an Anglian background than to any zoomorphic art in Scandinavia: witness the dissolving birds and the quadruped of Waberthwaite or the Trewhiddle -derived beasts on Brigham IX, Cross Canonby I and Aspatria I. Most of the problems in dating the material considered in this thesis stems from this element of Anglian traditionalism because, if the sculpture had more fully shared in the successive art styles of Scandinavia, it would have been easier to resolve issues of chronology.

2. See above p. 185.
3. See chapters three and four.
4. See above p. 82 ff.
5. See above p. 190.
6. See chapter three.
8. See above p. 122.
10. See above pp. 186-7.
11. See above pp. 176 ff.
12. See above pp. 112 ff.
IV

Most of the sculpture of Cumbria in the Viking period is, then, parochial and traditional in its ornament. But this is an art which betrays wider contacts which are summarised in this section. One of the more important results of the following survey is to isolate one adjacent area with which Cumbrian sculptors, surprisingly, seem to have had no contact. The area is that of modern Dumfriesshire, immediately to the north across the Solway.

Direct links to Scandinavia itself would be difficult to demonstrate because the successive animal styles which have been identified in the Viking homeland are but palely reflected in Cumbria's art and could have been transmitted through other western colonies such as those on Man. Thus the figure of Ecclesia/Mary on Gosforth I is presented in a style whose origin lies in Scandinavia, but the treatment can also be found on the Isle of Man and may have come to Gosforth from the island.¹ The decorative bosses of Waberthwaite II² and the "wooden" elements of Gosforth I³ may similarly have reached Cumbria from Scandinavia through an intermediate source. More positively what can be shown is that some sculptures correspond more closely to material in Scandinavia than to the known art of the colonies. The scene in Lowther VI, which is nowhere else preserved except on a stone from Gotland, would seem to fall into this category⁴ and so too does the warrior scene on the south side of Gosforth VI.⁵

Irish influence has been much canvassed⁶ but has found little support in the preceding analysis. Such influence would be expected in view of the onomastic evidence that some of Cumbria's settlers were Irish or had had sufficient contact with Ireland to adopt Gaelic habits of place-naming. I have argued against such influence for the Penrith crucifixion⁷, the Fall scene at Dacre⁸,

---

¹ See above p. 322.
² See above p. 189.
³ See above pp. 334–5.
⁴ See above p. 306.
⁵ See above p. 353.
⁶ e.g., D.M. Wilson 1968, 301.
⁷ See above p. 159.
⁸ See above p. 225.
the Isaac scene at Dacre¹ and am similarly sceptical about its alleged presence on Gosforth I, preferring to see its unpanelled scenes as a reflex of a wood tradition similar to that seen on Man, rather than tracing the figural presentation to the scripture crosses of Ireland.² The "hart and hound" motif may have its ultimate origins in Ireland but on Man and in Cumbria it is found in a form which has involved a selection from Celtic hunt scenes, and the evidence does not allow us to say where this selective form first occurred.³ Irish elements are also certainly present in the crucifixion of Brigham V but the existence of this type elsewhere outside Ireland may indicate that it was not directly imported to Cumbria.⁴ The link between Aspatria VI, Craignarget and slabs from near Dublin is an interesting one but could be indicative only of contacts between Irish Sea colonies and not necessarily suggestive of Irish influence on the eastern side of the Irish Sea: indeed the presence of analogous motifs on a stone from Sweden could even point to a Scandinavian origin for all the insular occurrences.⁵ The cross head, Bromfield III, with its apparent bishop's mitre, was linked to a group of Irish crosses in the discussion above but again the link may not be direct: both English and Irish examples could jointly reflect the growing importance of the episcopate.⁶

A stronger case for Irish influence could be made for one feature found on many of the Cumbrian crosses. This is the use of the ring-head. In his papers on the Yorkshire crosses Collingwood long ago established that this type of head is not found in the Anglian period and, in an important article, suggested that it came from Man.⁷ The map which accompanies that article certainly seems to demonstrate that the basic distribution is

¹. See above pp. 230-1.
². See above p. 334.
³. See above p. 236.
⁴. See above pp. 205-6.
⁵. This last suggestion is not made with great conviction: see above pp. 255ff.
⁶. See above p. 132.
⁷. W.G. Collingwood 1926.
(a) Viking and (b) centred on the Norwegian areas of England. What is less convincing is the suggestion of a Manx origin: the slab-like examples from the island are unlike the majority of the English crosses and, given the problems of identifying and dating pre-Viking sculpture on Man, the case cannot be made convincingly on chronological grounds. At best it can only be rated a possibility. A source in Ireland, where the type was certainly established by the eighth century, seems more likely though it would be dangerous to ignore a potential source in Iona where the ring-head was also known in the pre-Viking period.

There are other links to the Isle of Man which are more certain. The two areas are within sight of each other and the sculpture shows traces of contact in the pre-Viking period. Some of the motifs shared between the two areas in the tenth and eleventh centuries are also found elsewhere and cannot be claimed as exclusive to Man and Cumbria: the "hart and hound" motif, the animal style of Kirkby Stephen V, the humped shoulders seen on Kirkby Stephen I, and the ring-chain belong in this category. They demonstrate some identity of culture between Man and the mainland to the east but it is very difficult to establish which area was the donor, and which the recipient, of a motif or, indeed whether there was a common source drawn on independently. But some direct and exclusive links can be identified: the Manx crossing of Stanwix I, the Manx tendril on Lowther IX, the Mammen animal on Workington III, the lobate extensions of Beckermet IV. All of these are isolated occurrences in English sculpture yet are characteristic of Manx carving and are thus

1. e.g., P.M.C. Kermode 1907, nos. 36,37,38,40,41 and 42.
2. F. Henry 1965, plates 67,75,76,78,84.
4. P.M.C. Kermode 1907, 38.
5. See above p. 236.
7. See above p. 245.
8. See above p. 264.
10. See above pp. 118-20.
11. See above pp. 98,99,104.
likely to have reached Cumbria from the island. Clear examples of motifs travelling from Cumbria to Man are more difficult to trace but there is some justification for claiming an imitation of the Beckermet school at Braddan¹ and of the spiral-scroll school at Maughold.²

Cumbria's sculpture is, then, in contact with areas in and around the Irish Sea. There are traces of a sharing of some motif with the Tees valley area of Yorkshire³ but the main non-Irish, non-Manx, insular links are with Galloway and, less strongly, with Carrick and the Clyde valley. The evidence comes from a variety of stones. The close identity of Aspatria VI and a stone from Craignarget might even suggest that they are the work of the same artist.⁴ Millom I and Craiglemine show a similar type of drawing which does not appear elsewhere.⁵ The spiral-scroll school finds its closest parallel for stopped-plait in Galloway and on the Clyde: one of the Whithorn group seems to be directly derived from the Cumbrian school.⁶ The distribution of the incised swastica and incised crosslet covers Galloway and Cumbria, with some outliers in the Clyde valley.⁷ In Carrick is one of the few imitations of the spiral-scroll school arrangement of parallel strips of ornament flanking a central scroll.⁸ In Galloway and at the head of the Nith valley are traces of imitation of the Beckermet school⁹ and both Galloway and the Clyde valley share with Cumbria the "elephant ears" motif.¹⁰ On the southern side of the Solway the ornamental organisation of the shafts of circle-heads seems to be linked to that adopted by the Whithorn school¹¹ and the shape of the head of Rockcliffe I seems to copy a Whithorn type.¹² One of the popular patterns of the Whithorn school seems

¹. See above p. 104.
². See above p. 75.
³. The "hart and hound" motif, the hump shoulders of figures. See also the discussion of Addingham V on p. 292 above.
⁴. See above p. 255. Map 11 shows the main sites involved in the material summarised here.
⁵. See above p. 254.
⁶. See above pp. 534-725.
⁷. See above pp. 63 and 268.
⁸. See above pp. 745.
⁹. See above p. 105.
¹¹. See above pp. 115-6.
to have been borrowed for use on Penrith II. 1 The total list is an impressive one and it is a legitimate deduction that Cumbria was in close contact with the extreme south-west of modern Scotland and (either through Galloway or directly) with Carrick and the Clyde valley beyond. But negatively, there seem to be few traces of artistic contact with Dumfriesshire. 2

V

Three of the issues which were raised in the preceding sections of this chapter, as a result of study of the sculpture, can now be related to the place-name evidence. The three are:

(a) The indication, both from the number of sculptural sites and from the quantity of surviving material, that the Carlisle plain was in some way different from the area south of a line drawn from (approximately) the Ellen valley to Addingham. 3 In the Carlisle plain there are only four sites out of a Cumbrian total of thirty-six 4 and the total number of monuments represented is only four out of the one hundred and fifteen in the entire peninsular. The relative scarcity of sculpture is not, it should be emphasised, due to lack of suitable stone.

(b) The close links with Galloway.

(c) The seeming lack of contact with Dumfriesshire.

The distinction between the Carlisle plain and the areas further south is one which can be traced in the place-names though its presence has hitherto been obscured by the joint mapping of a range of elements. 5

2. One apparent example is discussed above pp. 271-2.
3. The relative scarcity of Anglian monuments does not allow any deductions about the situation in the pre-Viking period.
4. Assuming that Carlisle and Stanwix are counted as two sites.
5. As in A.H. Smith 1956, map in end pocket.
Map 6 shows the distribution of the element **erg** which has long been recognised as a borrowing into Old Norse from Irish **airigh**. Its meaning was defined by Smith as that of "a small dairy settlement with huts and pastures on a mountain-side used only in summer"; the location of some of the Cumbrian examples in low-lying areas and their occurrence in such compounds as Salter would suggest that this definition may need modification but, in general, they seem to indicate seasonal agricultural activity based on a neighbouring permanent settlement.

On the basis of the material assembled for Cumberland and Westmorland by the English Place Name Society, and for Lancashire North-of-the-Sands by Ekwall, it is clear that the distribution of the type is on the fringes of the Cumbrian massif. It is obvious that the distribution of this element must be controlled by topography and this explains the absence of the type from parts of the Carlisle plain. But topography does not explain its absence from the eastern and northern sides of the Eden valley nor from the higher ground to the east and north-east of the Carlisle plain. In both of these areas the topography would seem suited to activity of the type represented by **-erg**. Its absence must therefore be indicative of some difference in settlement between the areas fringing the central Cumbrian massif and those to the east of the Eden and to the east and north-east of Carlisle.

---

1. See A.H. Smith 1956, I, 157; E. Ekwall 1918, 74. Note also C. Matras 1956. For names plotted see Appendix Five.
4. E. Ekwall 1918 and E. Ekwall 1922.
5. The map in W.H. Pearsall 1962, 88 shows that soil types are also a controlling factor.
6. Further distinctions within the **-erg** group can be drawn (e.g. the high proportion of compounds with personal names in the Kent valley as compared with the Cumberland coast). It is, however, the overall distribution which is significant.
Map confirms that such a distinction does exist. This map plots the occurrence of certain types of inversion-compounds, a type of name which was at the heart of Ekwall's work on the Hiberno-Norse settlement of the north-west.\(^1\) His conclusion that such names, when formed with Scandinavian elements, demonstrate contact with a Gaelic-(presumptively Irish-) speaking population has since been widely accepted.\(^2\) The type continued into the Norman period\(^3\) but does not seem to have been so productive by that date. The map of these compounds has, however, been selective and plots only those compounds containing Gaelic or Scandinavian personal names together with elements which did not ultimately form a part of Standard English. The selection is admittedly a crude one, removing names which could have been coined within the Viking period and including some which may have been formed later, but it is a selection based upon purely linguistic principles and is aimed at isolating names formed by Scandinavian speakers whose pattern of name-giving had been influenced by contact with Gaelic speakers.

The resulting map offers support to the -erg map in showing that there was little Hiberno-Norwegian naming to the east of the Eden or to the north and north-east of Carlisle. But this type of naming, which is not directly subject to any kind of topographical control (unlike -erg), is also absent from the Carlisle plain. North of a line drawn from the Derwent to Penrith there are very

1. E. Ekwall 1918.
2. See, for example, A.M. Armstrong et al. 1952, xxiii and A.H. Smith 1967, I, xli-xl ii. There are some modifications, mainly centred on the precise location of the meeting of the two languages: see J. MacQueen 1956; W.F.H. Nicolaisen 1960, 61ff. Nicolaisen excludes the Hebrides as a possible point of contact with Gaelic. Note also A. Janzen 1960.
4. The later persistence of Scandinavian personal names poses problems here. For the base material see A.M. Armstrong et al. 1952, xxiii-xxiv and A.H. Smith 1967, II, 322. For names plotted see Appendix five.
few: the sculptural line from the Ellen to Addingham includes almost all of them. This abrupt termination of the inversion type had been noticed by Ekwall, but he had not mapped or identified its boundary and, in 1918, assumed that it was only a lack of evidence which caused this apparent northern boundary. The exhaustive collection which lie behind the English Place Name Society volumes indicate that Ekwall's assumption was false: the northward limitation of the inversion type is a fact and not the result of inadequate evidence.

It is this same area, containing the -erg names and the selected inversion compounds, which is also onomastically marked by the strong presence of Gaelic personal names, Gaelic place-name elements and the preservation of Scandinavian inflexions. On purely linguistic grounds there is justification for separating the Carlisle plain from the areas to the south—a distinction which was also indicated by the sculpture. The correlation of the two types of evidence is not, of course, exact but it is sufficiently close to be significant.

There are, of course, Scandinavian names in the Carlisle plain. What is lacking is the Gaelic element. One Scandinavian element, when mapped, does seem to have a complementary distribution to the Hiberno-Norse material examined in the two other maps. This is the element -by whose dating and significance have been the subject of much recent dispute. In the north-west

1. E. Ekwall 1918,
3. See A.M. Armstrong et al. 1952, 466,469 (cnocc and dind) and A.H. Smith 1967, I, xlii. It may be significant that the only occurrence of Ira in Cumberland is at Ireby on the northern fringe of the Hiberno-Norse area: perhaps only on the fringe was an Irish element sufficiently distinct to merit identification.
4. See A.M. Armstrong et al. 1952, xxv.
5. The problems involved in correlating different types of evidence were well emphasised in F.T. Wainwright 1962. Though the point may not be pressed note the existence of a dialect isogloss on the line of the River Ellen as mapped in E.Kolb 1965, figs. and 12. Note also the limited distribution of material on map 10.
there is clear evidence for its use in the post-Conquest period but the majority of these later formations can be removed by merely selecting those names in which -by is combined with a Scandinavian personal name or a Scandinavian element which did not later become part of the standard English language. The selection, like that of the inversion compounds, is crude but the bulk of the names plotted should be of the tenth or eleventh century. The resulting map (Map 8) shows a distribution which centres on the Carlisle plain and the Eden valley.

Comparison of the maps showing -by and those showing Hiberno-Norse elements does seem to point to two different types of settlement in Cumbria within the Viking period. It also points to two different linguistic groups for if the distinction were purely one of differing types of farming then one would have expected a Gaelic element in the Carlisle plain and a -by element along the coastal strip. The chronological relationship between the two groups is not clear but the essential point remains that the differences which were noted in the distribution and density of the sculpture thus become part of the evidence for proposing that the history of the Carlisle plain in the Viking period did not follow the same pattern as the events to the south of the Ellen/Derwent - Addingham line.

The documentary sources which were reviewed in the first chapter showed that there was another reason for differences between the Carlisle plain and the area to the south: Strathclyde expanded into the Solway basin at some date during the tenth and eleventh centuries. On the basis of the documentary evidence it appears that it was only the Carlisle plain which was affected and there is some onomastic material which supports this view. In 1963 Jackson plotted the (relatively large number of) Brythonic village names in Cumberland and showed that the bulk of them were on the Carlisle plain north of the River Derwent. Several of

2. Even if the complete list of -by occurrences is plotted the distribution is not significantly changed.
3. W.H. Pearsall 1962 has drawn attention to the fact that Furness may also have had a Scandinavian population in which the Gaelic element was insignificant - in contrast to the Kent valley.
4. See above pp. 10-12.
these names could, of course, have been formed in the pre-Anglian period. Less doubtfully some could have been given by British speakers during the Anglian period. Most importantly Jackson suggested that some are apparently much later, showing British influence on both Anglian and Scandinavian names, and imply a late revival of British. It may, therefore, be reasonably deduced that the distribution of Brythonic village names partly reflects the Strathclyde expansion and, further, gives us an onomastic indication of its southern limit.

What was the chronological relationship between Strathclyde's political/linguistic expansion and the settlement represented by the -by names? The evidence is not conclusive. The form of Carlatton near Carlisle suggests that the sequence may have been Scandinavian and then Brythonic but it would be difficult to refute an interpretation which saw the -by names as succeeding the period of Strathclyde control and representing a settlement from Yorkshire.

1. A persistence of British in the area seems unlikely in view of the evidence Jackson cites from Dumfriesshire: see K.H. Jackson 1965, 79.


3. The case for regarding many of the inversion compounds employing car- as late is attractive: see K.H. Jackson 1965, 81. The implications of the distribution of this element as plotted in W.F.H. Nicolaisen 1964, fig.3 suggest that it was not widely employed before the seventh century (witness its south-eastern limitations where it does not touch areas occupied by the Angles at that date). Since a situation of fresh British land-taking in Cumbria in the seventh century is historically unlikely some could reflect events in the tenth century. Jackson's map of Brythonic village names is not materially changed by the addition of the Westmorland evidence: see A.H. Smith 1967, I,xxxiv.

4. See the discussion of this name in K.H. Jackson 1965, 83.

5. This was the source for the group in the upper Eden advanced by Stenton: see RCHM 1926, 1.
What does positively emerge from this onomastic confusion is that there are explanations, drawn from other kinds of evidence, for the division of Cumbria which is apparent in the sculpture. It is relevant also to add a further dimension to this dichotomy by pointing out the essentially unattractive nature of the Carlisle plain for early settlement. The area is low-lying and "thickly spread with compact, impervious boulder clay....(with) an average thickness of 25 feet in the Carlisle area". The natural vegetation would be oak forest with dense wet undergrowth and the extensive remains of this were still present in the medieval Inglewood Forest. The draining and clearance of the Carlisle plain is largely a work of post-medieval times. It follows that both the settlements represented by the -by names and the area controlled by Strathclyde were in a region of Cumbria which was difficult to farm and (presumably) economically poor. In view of this it is not surprising that three of the four sites yielding sculpture (Carlisle, Stanwix and Rockcliffe) should be places where the presence of a bridge or ford would encourage non-typical economic growth.

The other two issues which were listed on p. 383 concerned the links of Cumbrian sculpture with the south-west of (modern) Scotland. Purely on the basis of the sculptural evidence there appeared to be a division in south-west Scotland between Galloway, with which Cumbria had contact, and Dumfriesshire, with which it appears to have had few links. The negative point is partly explained by the evidence presented above. South/north contact by land across the Solway plain from the main centres of sculpture in Cumbria would involve a journey through an area which was forested, which at some stage was under the political control of Strathclyde and in which the Scandinavian element differed from the Hiberno-Norse group to the south. In Dumfriesshire itself

4. For Rockcliffe as a crossing point see W.T. McIntire 1939, 156ff.
there is an extension of the -by group of names from the Carlisle plain:¹ the presence of this group of settlers and Strathclyde's control cannot have encouraged contact, even by boat across the mouth of the estuary.

The -by group of names in Dumfriesshire have a westward termination at the Lochar Moss and its attendant bogs.² In Wigton and Kirkcubrightshire is the centre of a different type of name. The division of south-western Scotland seen in the sculpture is thus one which is also present in the place-names.³ The western group of names are ones which reflect a Gaelic/Scandinavian mixture⁴ and it would thus be an attractive proposition that the sculpture shows that there were sea-born links between two Hiberno-Norse groups separated from each other by an area at the head of the Solway Firth which had a different type of population, a different political allegiance for much of the period and, additionally, was unattractive to settlement or passage. Unfortunately the onomastic picture is not quite as it once appeared, though the fundamental division within south-western Scotland remains a valid division. The complication is that the Scandinavian/Gaelic mixture in Wigton and Kirkcubrightshire is not identical to that in Cumbria. MacQueen has argued strongly that there was already a Gaelic element in the area before the Scandinavian settlement⁵ and Thomas has shown that such a theory has archaeological support.⁶ Nicolaisen has accepted that this early Gaelic presence could supply the Celtic background for many of the inversion compounds using kirk- but he follows Ekwall in

1. W.F.H. Nicolaisen 1960, 61 ff. and fig. 4; W.F.H. Nicolaisen 1964b, fig. 1.
2. This limit was commented on by E. Johnson-Fergusson 1935, vi. Note also the distribution of bveit in W.F.H. Nicolaisen 1964a, 96-103.
3. The distinction between the two groups was noticed by both Collingwood and Truckell: see W.G. Collingwood 1921a, plate facing 97 and pp. 116-17 and A.E. Truckell 1963, 96.
4. See map in W.F.H. Nicolaisen 1960, fig. 2 and pp. 55-7 and 66-7.
attributing others to the simultaneous arrival of Gaelic speakers and Norse immigrants in the tenth century.\(^1\) Despite differences of emphasis among place-name scholars it is clear that there was a Gaelic/Scandinavian element in Wigton and Kirkubrightshire, whatever the date of the advent(s) of the Celtic group. The interesting conclusion still remains, therefore, that Cumbrian sculpture indicates contact with artists in an area which also contained a mixed Gaelic/Scandinavian population.

**VI**

This thesis opened with a quotation from T.D. Kendrick. It cannot be claimed that "the principal problem of chronology and stylistic development" are now solved for this area: indeed much of the dissertation has been concerned to show that many of them are not soluble. But certain chronological adjustments have been made and stylistic analysis of sculptures, which range widely in competence, has shown the varied and complex influences which operated on an area for which we have little documentary evidence.

---

\(^1\) W.F.H. Nicolaisen 1964, 61-8 and E. Ekwall 1960, xxlii.
Appendix 1

Viking-period graves and metalwork from Cumbria

Numbers refer to the sites plotted on Map 10.

2. Brayton, NY 163423. Pennanular brooch discovered at some date before 1790: see VCH 1901, 283.
8. Kirkby Lonsdale ("near Kirkby Lonsdale"). Near SD 612786. Thistle brooch discovered "some thirty years" before 1907: see W.G. Collingwood 1906-7b. It is very likely that this brooch is the same as that listed in (4) above though Collingwood was not aware of this at the time of his publication.
14. Ormside. NY 702176. The Ormside bowl, discovered in the churchyard at some date before 1823, may have belonged to another burial: see W.G. Collingwood 1899; R.S. Ferguson 1899.
19. West Seaton. NY 018307. Sword, bent before deposition, discovered 1902-3: see W.G. Collingwood 1901-3; J.D. Cowan 1949, 75.

Note. Much of this material is listed and discussed in: VCH 1901, 282-4; J.D. Cowen 1934; H. Shetelig 1940; J.D. Cowan 1949; D.M. Wilson 1967, 43-4.
Appendix 2

Stopped plait in (modern) Scotland.

A. Galloway group. (Whithorn numberings as W.G. Collingwood 1925a)

Craiglemine: see W.G. Collingwood 1925a, plate X.
Kirkinner: see W.G. Collingwood 1925a, plate V.
Kirkmaiden: see W.G. Collingwood 1925a, plate XI.
Longcastle: see W.G. Collingwood 1925a, plate VI.
Monreith House: see W.G. Collingwood 1925a, plate VII.
Old Kirkconnel: see C.F. Charleson 1929, plate facing 129.
Penninghame: see W.G. Collingwood 1925a, plate VI.
St. Ninian's Cave: see W.G. Collingwood 1925a, plate V.
Whithorn 14: see W.G. Collingwood 1925a, plate IV.
Whithorn 20: see W.G. Collingwood 1925a, plate VI.
Whithorn 22: see W.G. Collingwood 1925a, plate VIII.
Whithorn 25: see W.G. Collingwood 1925a, plate VIII.
Whithorn 26: see W.G. Collingwood 1925a, plate IX.
Whithorn 28: see W.G. Collingwood 1925a, plate X.
Whithorn 29: see W.G. Collingwood 1925a, plate X.
Whithorn 30: see W.G. Collingwood 1925a, plate X.
Whithorn 32: see W.G. Collingwood 1925a, plate XI.
Whithorn 33: see W.G. Collingwood 1925a, plate XI.
Whithorn 35: see J.R. Allen 1903, III, fig. 565.

There are at least two other fragments from Whithorn of which no illustrations seem to have been published.

Wigtown: see W.G. Collingwood 1925a, plate IX.

B. Clyde group.

Govan no. 1: see J.R. Allen 1903, III, fig. 483.
Govan no. 2: see J.R. Allen 1903, III, fig. 484.

Govan nos. 13 and 29 are probably also relevant.
Inchinnan no. 2: see J.R. Allen 1903, III, fig. 477A.
Cairn, Ayrshire: see J.R. Allen 1903, fig. 504.

Other stones at both Govan and Inchinnan might also be classed with this group (e.g., J.R. Allen 1903, III, figs. 476 and 488) but the "stopped" nature of the plait is not as marked as in the examples listed above.
Appendix 3

Round-shafts and round-shaft derivatives of the Viking period in Wales, the Midlands and the north of England.

1. Decorated round-shafts.

**Type 1:** junction of cylindrical and squared sections marked by scallop but without encircling band:
- Gosforth I

**Type 2:** junction of cylindrical and squared sections marked by scallop and encircling band(s) - Kendrick's "Leek type".

a) with a single thin band:
- Astonefield, Staffs. (2) see T. Pape 1946, plates facing 29-30.
- Beckermet St. Bridget II

b) with a single broad decorated band:
- Leek, Staffs.: see T. Pape 1946, plate facing 35.
- Penrith I
- Penrith II

c) with two bands:
- Beckermet St. Bridget I
- Bakewell, Dby.: see R.E. Routh 1938, no. 25.

d) with three bands:
- (West) Gilling, Yorks.: see W.G. Collingwood 1907, 323.
- Stapleford, Notts.: see T.D. Kendrick 1941b, plate V (though this cross has other individual features)

**Type 3:** junction of cylindrical and squared sections marked by band(s) but with no scallop - Kendrick's "Ilam type".

a) with one band:
- Ilam, Staffs.: see T. Pape 1946, plate facing 38.
- Chebsey, Staffs.: see T. Pape 1946, 31-2.

b) with two bands:
- Brailsford, Dby.: see R.E. Routh 1938, plate IXB
- One example at Macclesfield from Ridge Hall, Greenway or Wildboarclough, Cheshire: see T. Pape 1946, 38-9 and J.R. Allen 1895, fig. facing 165.
The following are too fragmentary to be classified though they seem to belong to either Type 1 or 2:

Bisley, Cheshire (2): see T. Pape 1946, 39 and 41.

Astonefield, Staffs. (2): see T. Pape 1946, plates facing 29 and 30 and see also p. 30.

Stoke on Trent, Staffs.: see T. Pape 1946, fig. 36 and plate facing 37.

Gosforth III (?)

There are at least two further fragments at Bakewell which should be grouped with the decorated class and T.D. Kendrick 1941b, 12 adds another example from Rainow, Cheshire. One of the Bow stones (near Lyme Park, Cheshire) was decorated: see C.W. Phillips 1937, plate I.

II. Non-decorated round-shafts.

Type 1: junction of cylindrical and squared sections marked by scallop but without encircling band:

None.

Type 2: junction of cylindrical and squared sections marked by a scallop and encircling band(s):

a) with a single thin band:

Eliseg's pillar: see V.E. Nash-Williams 1950, no.182.

b) with a single broad band:

None

c) with two bands:

Wincle, Prestbury, Cheshire (now at Swithamley, Staffs.): see T. Pape 1946, plate facing 38.

Clulow, Cheshire: see T.D. Kendrick 1941b, plate V.

Upton Hall, Cheshire: see T. Pape 1946, 38.

Two examples now at Macclesfield whose source is disputed (? Ridge Hall, Greenway or Wildboarclough, Cheshire): see T.Pape 1946, 38; W.H. Andrew 1905, 203; J.R. Allen 1895, fig. facing 165.

Fernilee Hall, Dbys.: see W.J. Andrew 1905. (Probably from Whalley Bridge).

I have not seen the two following examples of the undecorated class

Bushbury, Staffs.: see T.D. Kendrick 1941b, 13.

Heaton, Staffs.: see M.M. Rix 1962, 72.
The following shafts could have belonged to either the decorated or undecorated class:
One of the Bow stones (near Lyme Park, Cheshire): see C.W. Phillips 1937, plate I.
The so-called "Picking Rods", Ludworth Moor, Derby: see C.W. Phillips 1937, plate II.
Pym Chair, Taxal, Cheshire.
Appendix 4

Occurrences of ring-chain on non-Manx British sculpture.

1. The type used on Man:

- Burnsall, West Yorkshire: see W.G. Collingwood 1915, 147.
- Kirkby Moorside, North Yorkshire: see W.G. Collingwood 1907, 342.
- Kirklevington, North Yorkshire: see W.G. Collingwood 1907, 350.
- Penmon, Anglesey: see V.E. Nash-Williams 1950, fig. 38.

2. The reverse of type 1:

- Gainford, Co. Durham: see F.J. Haverfield and W. Greenwell 1899, no. XXXVII.
- Gosforth I (and Gosforth V).
- Muncaster I
- ? St. Bees I

3. Multiple ring-chain:

- Cross Canonby III
- Dearham I
- Gosforth I
- Gosforth IV

4. a) False ring-chain:

- Bromfield I
- Lancaster: see W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig. 171.
- Melling: see W.G. Collingwood 1927, fig. 179.
- Osmotherley: see W.G. Collingwood 1907, 378.
- Rockcliffe I
- Warkworth: see J. Stuart 1867, plate LXXXII.
- Sockburn, unpublished.
b) False ring-chain:

Sockburn (2): see W.H. Knowles 1907, 114, 115.

5. Unclassifiable:

Kildwick in Craven, West Yorkshire: see W.G. Collingwood 1915, 198.
Appendix 5

Notes to the maps of place-name elements

The maps are based upon material assembled in A.M. Armstrong et al. 1950-1952, A.H. Smith 1967 and E. Ekwall 1922 and there is an unavoidable difference in the amount of information available from these sources. Lost names have only been plotted where their location is reasonably certain; these names are underlined in the lists below. In all cases a note is added where the existence of a lost name in a particular parish might seem to run counter to the indications of the plotted distribution. Both the inclusion and exclusion of certain names is debatable but the place-name evidence is only used in this thesis for general indication of population concentration and distribution.

Map 2. See pp. 20ff. above.

The names plotted are:

(a) -ing+hām (Cumberland): Addingham, Hensingham, Whicham.
   -ing+hām (Lancashire north of the saits): Aldingham.

(b) -hām (Cumberland): Brigham, Dearham, Hames Hall, Holm Cultram, Sebergham.

-hām (Westmorland): Brougham, Heversham.


-tun (Lancashire north of the sands): Bolton, Broughton, Colton, Crivelton, Dalton, Egton, Marton, Newton (2), Gleaston, Stainton, Pennington, Plumpton, Ulverston.

(d) -wic (Cumberland): Keswick, Warwick.
   -wic (Westmorland): Butterwick.
   -wic (Lancashire north of the Sands): Urswick.

NOTE The lost name Eschingham, in the parish of Strickland Roger, north of Kendal, adds an early name to the otherwise sparse material from the upper Kent valley. In the adjacent parish of Strickland Ketel was another lost name, Hutton.


The names plotted are (with lost but locatable names underlined):

a) Cumberland: Berrier, Birker, Cleator, Glaramara, Hewer Hill, Mosser, Ranerdale, Ravenerhals, Salter, Stepney, Stockdalewath, Winder (2), Langley.

b) Westmorland: Docker, Mansergh, Moser, Muserg, Ninezergh, Potter Fell, Sever, Sizergh, Skelsmergh, Tirril, Tosca, Winder (2), Windyhill.

(c) Lancashire north of the sands: Biggar, Bethecar, Houkler Hall, Robswater, Stewnor, Torver, Winder.

Map 7. See p. 385 above.

The names plotted are (with lost but locatable names underlined):


NOTE The lost name Watchcomon is listed under Midgeholme parish in Eskdale Ward and lies outside the distribution shown on the map.
Map 8. See pp. 386ff. above.

The names plotted are:


b) Westmorland: Appleby, Asby, Beathwaite, Bomby, Colby, Nateby, Soulby, Sowerby (2), Waitby.

c) Lancashire north of the sands: Birkby Hall, Sowerby Hall.
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