

Durham E-Theses

The iconography of the crucifixion in Pre-Conquest Sculpture in England.

Coatsworth, Elizabeth

How to cite:

Coatsworth, Elizabeth (1978) *The iconography of the crucifixion in Pre-Conquest Sculpture in England.*, Durham theses, Durham University. Available at Durham E-Theses Online:
<http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/1862/>

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a [link](#) is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

The Iconography of the Crucifixion in Pre-Conquest Sculpture

in England

Volume I

Thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at the

University of Durham

1979

BEST COPY

AVAILABLE

Variable print quality

Abstract

The Iconography of the Crucifixion in Pre-Conquest Sculpture in England. Elizabeth Coatsworth.

This thesis is a study of Crucifixion iconography as it was expressed in sculpture in different regions of England before the Norman Conquest. All possible sources of evidence which might illuminate its development are used, including theories as to the relationship between Crucifixion iconography and Christology and Eucharistic Doctrine, which were also developing in this period. Other literary and documentary references are dealt with in a separate chapter.

The relationship between the Crucifixion and closely related themes such as the cross with accompanying figures or elements, or the Lamb, is also explored, since these have also been related to theological and liturgical developments and in the past have sometimes been held to pre-date the full depiction of the Crucifixion in the early medieval period.

The main evidence, however, lies in the sculptures themselves, both in the form of the monuments used to carry the Crucifixion theme, and in the relationships between the iconography exemplified in regional groups of sculptures and that found in other media and in areas outside Anglo-Saxon England. The final chapter attempts to see these regional variations in the context of social and religious institutions as these also varied due to political factors such as the Viking invasions and settlements from the ninth century.

Table of ContentsVolume I

List of Figures	iii
List of Plates	iii
Declaration and Statement of Copyright	xi
<u>Errata</u>	xi
Acknowledgments	xii
Chapter 1: The Need for the Study and its Scope	1
Chapter 2: The Cross as a Symbol of the Passion	20
Chapter 3: The Lamb as a Symbol of the Passion	50
Chapter 4: The Effects of Developments in Christology, Eucharistic Doctrine and Devotional Piety on Attitudes to the Depiction of Christ Crucified in the Early Medieval Period	67
Chapter 5: Poetry, Devotional Literature and Historical Writings as Evidence for the Development of the Crucifixion in Pre-Conquest Sculpture	83
Chapter 6: The Robed Christ from the Seventh to the Early Ninth Centuries	108
Chapter 7: The Iconography of the Robed Christ from the Ninth Century in the Heads of Free-Standing Crosses	130
Chapter 8: Architectural Sculptures in which Christ is Portrayed in a Long-Sleeved Robe	151
Chapter 9: The Development of the Iconography of Christ in the Loincloth: the Continental Background and Pre- Conquest Representations to c. 850	177
Chapter 10: The Iconography of Christ in the Loincloth in North-Eastern England North of the Tees from the Late Ninth to the Early Eleventh Centuries	209

Chapter 11: The Iconography of Christ in the Loincloth in Yorkshire from the Late Ninth to the Eleventh Centuries	232
Chapter 12: The Iconography of Christ in the Loincloth in A: the North-west and West Midlands; and B: the East Midlands	253
Chapter 13: The Iconography of Christ in the Loincloth in Southern England from the Late Ninth to the Eleventh Centuries	275
Chapter 14: Concluding Survey: the Distribution of Icono- graphical Features; and a Study of the Relationship between Regional Variations and the Art of Areas outside England	307

Volume II

Table of Contents	1
List of Figures	iii
List of Plates	iii
I. Alphabetical Catalogue of all Sculptures Discussed in Volume I	1
II. Hand-lists of Sites, Monument Types, Figures and Elements	55
III. Appendix A. Sculptures Of Pre-Conquest or Possible Pre- Conquest Date Rejected from this Thesis	66
Appendix B. Sculptured Crucifixion Scenes at Some Time Published as Pre-Conquest, but either Post-Conquest or Undatable	75
Appendix C. Two Slabs from Llanveynoe, Herefordshire	87
<u>Figures</u>	between 87-88
Abbreviations	88
Bibliography A	91
<u>Bibliography</u> B	116
<u>Plates</u>	following 91

Works cited in text.
Select Bibliography of Background Material

List of Figures (II, after p. 87)

- Figure 1. Sculptures with Christ on the Cross Dating from the Mid Ninth Century or Earlier (Chaps 6 and 9).
- Figure 2. Sculptures with Christ on the Cross Dating from the Late Ninth to the Eleventh Centuries (Chaps 7-8, 10-13).
- Figure 3. Sculptures with the 'Empty Cross' or Lamb Themes (Chaps. 2 and 3).
- Figure 4. Cross Types (by permission of Professor R. Cramp).
- Figure 5. Sculptures with or related to the Robed Christ (Chaps. 6-8).
- Figure 6. Sculptures with Christ in the Loincloth (Chaps 9-13).
- Figure 7. The Distribution of Christ Figure Types 1, 2, and 3.

List of Plates

1. Whithorn
2. Lancaster I
3. Halton
4. Kirkby Wharfe
5. Burton in Kendal
6. Escomb (Photo, T. Middlemass; copyright, R.J. Cramp).
- 7a+b. Weyhill
- 8a+b. Lindisfarne
9. Winchester I
10. Hoddon
11. Hart I
- 12a. Wirksworth
- 12b. Wirksworth, detail of Crucifixion
- 13a+b. Ramsbury
14. Durham I: Lamb (Photo T. Middlemass; copyright Chapter Library, Durham).

15. Durham IV: Lamb (photo T. Middlemass; copyright Chapter Library, Durham).
16. Rabula Gospels, Florence, Crucifixion.
17. Icon, Monastery of St. Catherine, Mt. Sinai, Crucifixion
18. Wall painting, Sta. Maria Antiqua, Rome, Crucifixion.
19. Parousia image, Dumbarton Oaks Collection.
- 20a. Pectoral Cross from Sant' Agapito, Vatican Museum.
- 20b. Pectoral Cross in the Vatican Museum.
- 20c. Pectoral Cross from Montcaret, Dordogne, France.
21. Pectoral Cross in the British Museum, London.
22. Votive Cross of Theodotus, Staatliche Museum, Berlin.
23. Reliquary Cross, Staatliche Museum, Berlin.
24. Pectoral Cross from Augsburg.
25. Durham Gospels, Durham Ms. A.II.17, Crucifixion.
- 26a+b. Hexham I.
27. Top of cross shaft, Rothbury, Northumberland (copyright University Museum, Newcastle upon Tyne).
28. Collingwood's reconstruction of Hexham I.
- 29.)
)
 30.) H. M. Taylor's reconstruction of Hexham I.
31. Author's reconstruction of Hexham I.
32. Hexham II (Photo T. Middlemass; copyright Professor R.J. Cramp).
33. Auckland St. Andrew, Annunciation and Crucifixion.
34. Auckland St. Andrew, Crucifixion.
35. Kirklevington I.
36. Brompton (Photo T. Middlemass; copyright Chapter Library, Durham).
37. Conisholme.
38. Thornton Steward III.
39. Sinnington.

40. Kirkcolm, Crucifixion and ?Risen Christ.
41. Kirkcolm, face opposite Crucifixion.
42. Thornton Steward I, Crucifixion.
43. Thornton Steward I, Christ.
44. Stanwick I, Crucifixion.
45. Stanwick II, face opposite Crucifixion.
46. Thornton Watlass II.
47. Thornton Watlass II, reconstruction.
48. Thornton Watlass I.
- 49a.+b. Lancaster II, sides.
50. Lancaster II, face i.
51. Lancaster II, face ii.
- 52a. Brigham, Face Cross.
- 52b. Brigham, opposite face.
53. Castledermot South Cross)
54. Castledermot North Cross)
55. Ullard)
56. St. Mullins) Copyright Commissioners of Public
57. Ballyogan) Works in Ireland.
58. Aghailten)
59. Moone)
60. Durham IV: ?Daniel scene (Photo T. Middlemass; copyright
Chapter Library, Durham).
61. Langford II (Photo, T. Middlemass).
62. Walkern (Photo K. Galbraith).
63. Walkern, detail (Photo, K. Galbraith).
64. Bitton: Feet of Christ and snake beneath the cross.
65. Bitton: Arm of Christ on the cross.
- 66a+b+c: Head of Christ.
67. Bitton: possible reconstruction.

68. Volto Santo, Lucca.
69. Plaque with the Crucifixion in the Dublin Museum
- 70a+b. Barton on Humber.
71. Sacramentary of Gellone, Paris, Bibliotheque Nationale, Ms.
lat. 12408, f. 143v.
72. Wall Painting, Cimitile, SS Martiri.
73. Mosaic, Hosios Loukas, near Delphi, Katholikon.
74. Wall painting, S. Lorenzo, S. Vincenzo al Volturno, Abruzzi.
75. Utrecht Psalter, f. 67r, detail. Utrecht, Bibliotheek der
Rijksuniversiteit, Ms, 38.
76. Gold Cross of Lothar. Christ on the Cross (back). Aachen,
Cathedral Treasury.
77. Ruthwell
78. Bradbourne I
79. Bradbourne II
80. Bakewell
81. Rothbury, Crucifixion (Photo, Newcastle upon Tyne University
Museum).
82. Rothbury, face with Passion symbols (Photo, Newcastle upon Tyne
University Museum).
83. Ninth Century ivory on an eleventh century book cover. Munich,
Bayerische Staatsbibliothek.
84. Alnmouth (Photo, University Museum, Newcastle upon Tyne).
85. Ivory panel: Panel of Adalbert I. Metz, Museum.
86. Aycliffe, St Peter (reversed for comparison) (Photo T.
Middlemass; copyright R.J. Cramp).
87. Aycliffe Crucifixion (Photo T. Middlemass; copyright R.J.
Cramp).
88. Bothal I)
) (Photos, University Museum, Newcastle upon Tyne)
89. Bothal II)

90. Durham II: Crucifixion)
)
 91. Durham III: Crucifixion)
)
 92. Durham I: ?Baptism)
)
 93. Durham II: ?Baptism) Photos T. Middlemass, copyright
) Chapter Library, Durham
 94. Durham III: ?Baptism)
)
 95. Billingham: Crucifixion)
)
 96. Billingham: face opposite)
)
 97. Hart II (Photo T. Middlemass, copyright R.J. Cramp.
 98. Sherburn
 99. Great Ayton
 100. Great Ayton, showing pattern on the end of the arm.
 101. Rothbury cross head, showing interlace patterns on the side
 (Photo University Museum, Newcastle upon Tyne).
 102. Kirby Hill I, Crucifixion
 103. Kirby Hill I, pattern on the end of the arm.
 104. York I (Photo, York Archaeological Trust).
 105. York I (Photo, York Archaeological Trust).
 106. North Otterington
 107. Ellerburn
 108. Finghall
 109.)
) Kirkburton
 110a+b)
 111. Dewsbury, Crucifixion
 112. Dewsbury, interlace face
 113. Dewsbury, vinescroll face
 114. Dewsbury, 'manticora' or Virgin and Child
 115. Kirkdale
 116. Stanwick II
 117. Kirby Hill II
 118. Thornton Steward II (from Collingwood 1927a, fig. 129)

119. Kirklevington II
120. York II (Photo, Royal Commission on Historical Monuments).
121. Sandbach.
122. Ivory from the collection of Graf Harrach.
123. Penrith
124. Penrith as drawn by Collingwood 1927a, fig. 162.
125. Gosforth I
126. Gosforth II, Crucifixion
127. Gosforth II, ?Risen Christ (Photo, J.T. Lang.)
128. Lancaster III
129. Nassington, Crucifixion
130. Nassington, Interlace
131. Nassington, twist patterns.
132. Harmston, Crucifixion
133. Harmston, side with zig-zag pattern
134. Harmston, ?Risen Christ.
135. Ropsley from the front
136. Ropsley from the side
137. Marton
138. Great Glen
139. Newent
140. Romsey I
141. Romsey II
142. Wormington
143. Walrus Ivory figure on gold covered wood crucifix. London,
Victoria and Albert Museum
144. Breamore, general view.
145. Breamore, Christ's arm and hand
146. Breamore, Christ
147. Breamore, Manus Dei

148. Breamore, John.
149. Headbourne Worthy.
150. Stepney
151. Langford I (Photo, T. Middlemass).
152. Langford I, Mary and John.
153. Langford I, photographic reconstruction
154. Cross of Lothar, jewelled face (see plate 76).
155. Bibury
156. Bibury figure compared with the figure of Mary from British Museum Ms. Harley 2904.
157. Bradford on Avon, angel on left
158. Bradford on Avon, angel on right.
159. Winterbourne Steepleton.
- 160a+b. Muchelney
161. Anthorn
162. Kirklevington III
163. Lancaster III
164. Lasswade (Photo, National Museum of Antiquities of Scotland, Edinburgh)
165. Lusby
166. Monkwearmouth (Photo T. Middlemass)
167. Nunburnholme
- 168a+b. Wath
- 169a+b. Finghall
170. Stonegrave
171. Barking, Essex
172. Bentham
173. Brockworth
174. Cridling Park
175. Daglingworth I

176. Daglingworth II
177. Daglingworth, seated Christ
178. Daglingworth, St. Peter
179. Langton by Spilsby
180. New Alresford
181. Westow
182. Llanveynoe, Crucifixion
183. Llanveynoe, slab with inscription
184. Bradbourne, east face
185. Bradbourne, west face
186. Garton on the Wolds (photo contributed by Miss K. Galbraith).

Declaration

I hereby declare that none of the material in this thesis has previously been submitted for a degree in this or any other university.

Copyright

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author. No quotations from it should be published without her prior written consent, and information derived from it should be acknowledged.

ERRATA

Throughout the thesis:

For Revelations read Revelation

for Synagogue read Synagoga

Acknowledgments

A thesis which covers so much ground , both geographically and chronologically, would have been impossible without the help and encouragement of scholars working in related fields.

In particular, I would like to thank my supervisor, Professor Rosemary Cramp for starting me on the project and for her continuing help thereafter. I also wish to acknowledge the help and advice given by Dr. R. Bailey, Mr. J.T. Lang, and Mr. C.D. Morris; and on particular aspects by Dr. E. Okasha and Miss K. Galbraith.

My thanks are also due to Mr. T. Middlemass for printing the photographs; and Miss Y. Brown for translating my originals into acceptable maps and reconstruction drawings. Acknowledgment of photographs contributed by individuals and organisations is made in the List of Plates.

Finally, I would like to thank the typist, Miss P. Hogg, for her patience and her careful work.

THE NEED FOR THE STUDY AND ITS SCOPE

i A survey of the Existing Literature

The iconography of the Crucifixion has been a popular field within the wider study of the development of Christian art for two centuries. A recent bibliography of both cross and crucifix (Berrenberg 1973) gives some indication of the wealth of literature on these two themes, while still not complete in its coverage of relevant publications for the early medieval period. The present thesis thus appears to follow a well-worn trail; (and indeed its indebtedness to much existing work will become clear in the course of the following chapters). This, however, is because depictions of the Crucifixion are found wherever the Christian religion has penetrated. Its origins and early development are to be traced in southern Europe and the Byzantine east, before the conversion of the Anglo-Saxon peoples to Christianity. Its subsequent development as an attempt to portray the fact and significance of the central event of Christian belief, was equally a matter for international discussion and even controversy. One might expect, therefore, the pre-Conquest sculptured Crucifixion in England to partake of characteristics, especially of iconography, which were not local or even national in origin. Certainly one would expect this for its beginnings when it must have been imported from previously Christianised areas, and at periods when pre-Conquest culture and intellectual life were most closely in touch with other centres of influence - whether these centres were Rome, the Byzantine east, the Carolingian or Ottonian Empires, or the Celtic west.

A survey of previous studies, therefore, must take into account the fact that they fall into two groups: those which have dealt or attempted to deal with the iconography of the Crucifixion either as an international phenomenon or as a regional or period phenomenon (but for areas outside Anglo-Saxon England); and those which have attempted to study the pre-

Conquest sculptured Crucifixion, again either as a regional development or as an example of external influence. It is to the first of these groups that most of the existing literature of the subject belongs.

In the last twenty years there have been several attempts at a survey of the development of Crucifixion iconography from its obscure beginnings to the present day. Among these are Réau (1956-7); Lucchesi Palli et al (1970); Schiller (1972); and Thoby (1959) and its supplement Thoby (1963). Only the last of these is concerned with the Crucifixion alone: the rest lay varying stress on the subject, and vary also in the number of illustrations and the bibliographical coverage they provide, and in any case treat it as one among many subjects peculiar to Christian art. These works have been made possible by three main factors which have strongly influenced the development of art history as a whole.

The first is simply that much more material has been discovered and made available for study, especially in this century - whether wall-paintings in remote churches, books or objects in previously unknown collections, or as objects discovered in archaeological excavations. Some discoveries have filled in gaps of knowledge that were previously scarcely even suspected (See Chap. 6 and Barány - Oberschall 1953; Wessel 1960).

Secondly comparative material both new and old has become, again especially in this century, increasingly easily available to scholars, not so much through the invention of photography itself as through the invention of satisfactory and reasonably inexpensive methods for reproducing photographs for publication. Much early discussion of Crucifixion iconography, based on relatively few examples and relying largely on line drawings has become redundant through this technological advance. This point is illustrated in the brief discussion of characteristics of the pre-Conquest iconography of the Crucifixion defined by Allen (1887), (below). The development of photographic and other copying

processes made possible the publication of works which attempted to cover all known works in one medium, such as ivory carvings or manuscript miniatures in for example Goldschmidt (1914) and Boinet (1913): works both used as sources of comparative material in the present thesis. Regional surveys attempting to cover for example all sculpture within a defined period were also made possible. One such used here, Wesenberg (1972), is a study of tenth and eleventh century sculpture in the Rhineland. For Scotland, Wales and Ireland the most useful to date are still Allen (1903); Nash Williams (1950); and Henry (1932), though all need to be supplemented by Royal Commission Volumes (for Wales and Scotland) and other more recent studies. For England, the cataloguing of all pre-Conquest sculpture is in course of preparation. Modern surveys of other media, such as manuscripts (for example Temple 1976); and ivory carvings (Beckwith 1972) have, however, proved useful and important sources of comparative material from within pre-Conquest England itself.

Thirdly, there has also been a great development in the study of art history as a scholarly discipline, both developing comparative methods for the study of style and technique as regional and period characteristics and taking into account the literary and intellectual background to the production of works of art and changes in iconography. Examples of such studies of the Crucifixion of the early medieval period include Hausherr (1963); Wessel (1960) and J.R. Martin (1955): these cited examples include a lengthy study of the background to the dating of a single monument; an analysis of the complex relations of a group of related monuments; and a discussion of the development of a single characteristic. Such detailed studies have led to a considerable re-assessment of the development of the Crucifixion theme as a whole over a long period of history. The effect of such studies on works which attempt a compendious approach such as Thoby (1959) or Schiller (1972) is very marked: equally marked in them, however, are the gaps which no-one has yet attempted to fill.

The pre-Conquest sculptured Crucifixions in England - like those of the rest of the British Isles and Ireland - are barely mentioned in any general survey, and this is not only because many of them are relatively humble works from areas outside the mainstream of European art (which would not in any case be a true assessment of the position for some monuments and at some historical periods). Few of the sculptured monuments are widely known and only rare examples such as the Langford Rood (Langford II, pl.61) are ever taken into account in discussions of the development of a particular iconography - in that case, the phenomenon of the robed Christ on the cross in the eleventh-thirteenth centuries. It is clear that the iconography of Langford II is parallel to that of many monuments in Spain, Italy and Germany between these dates (Haussherr 1962) but the usefulness of including in such discussion a monument of which the local connections, if any, are little known or understood is rather questionable. There are, for example, architectural arguments for the dating of monuments which are in some respects related, at Bitton and Walkern (Chap. 8 and Taylor H.M. and Taylor J. 1966, 6-13). I would also contend, following the example set in Talbot Rice (1966), that the development of this type should also be studied in relation to the continuous portrayal of the robed Christ in some areas (Ireland, Yorkshire in the Viking period) which were outside the mainstream of European art.

Another monument sometimes considered in isolation is the Ruthwell Cross. Dating of this monument has varied enormously (below, p.11) but claims have been made for a very early, i.e. late seventh century date, partly on the grounds that the Crucifixion is related to a very early iconography (Swanton 1970, 18-9 and 24-5). Such a claim can only be assessed against a background both of the development of the iconography of the Crucifixion in general, and a knowledge of the comparative material

from pre-Conquest England itself.

It is in this second area, however, that previous studies are thinnest. There has been no earlier attempt to bring together all known examples of the pre-Conquest sculptured Crucifixions, and only one at distinguishing any special characteristics they might have. This was by Allen (1887, 158). This brief discussion is based on those works he knew, and not only on stone carvings. He tried to differentiate between the iconography of the Crucifixion in Scotland, England and Ireland in the early medieval period. The 'Saxon' type, as he defined it, had the following characteristics:

- i Christ is shown in a loin cloth, unlike the fully draped type from the British areas of Scotland, Ireland and Wales.
- ii The sun and moon appear above the arms of the cross, instead of angels as in Ireland.
- iii Christ's feet sometimes rest on a suppedaneum.
- iv The Virgin and St. John appear at the foot of the cross without the spear- and sponge-bearers: the latter appear exceptionally on crosses at Alnmouth, Aycliffe and Bradbourne.
- v The head of Christ is almost always nimbed.

It should be clear from the list of elements (vol. II) that this analysis was based on too few examples. None of the characteristics described here occur on a majority of monuments, while others specifically excluded do appear - and some are even more common than those considered 'Saxon'. Possibly any attempt to define the iconography of the Crucifixion along national lines would be doomed to failure, but all that need be said here is that no one type, or even grouping of elements, can be considered dominant over the whole of England, or for a period of some four hundred years.

A study written at the beginning of this century by Stevens (1904) provides some useful references illustrating the importance of the cross in Anglo-Saxon life and literature, but is not primarily concerned with

the Crucifixion as such. Stevens dated several of the crosses he discussed very much later than would now be considered acceptable, basing his conclusions partly on the belief that the Crucifixion scene appeared in the visual arts only from about the tenth century onwards. This belief was held by a number of scholars in the nineteenth century but it was abandoned as both larger numbers of examples were published and literary references to representations of the theme from much earlier times also became more generally known. In fact Stevens knew little about the pre-Conquest crosses, and his phrasing suggests that he believed the Gosforth and Ruthwell crosses (Plates 77, 125) to bear the same type of ornament, and therefore to share the same date.

Much more important is a chapter on 'Crucifixes' by Collingwood (1927a, 99-105). This deals with crucifixes in Northumbria, although in fact 'Crucifixion scene' would be a better term since he does not restrict his discussion to cross heads. Many of the examples he mentions and illustrates demonstrate, however, the prevalence of the 'crucifix head' type of free-standing cross in particular in Yorkshire. In his introduction to this chapter, Collingwood briefly discusses some of the types of Crucifixion scene and crucifix which might have been available to the earliest Anglo-Saxon carvers, but he then goes on to treat the theme as a purely regional phenomenon, influenced only by the influx of Irish-Scandinavian invaders from the end of the ninth century onwards. He lists some but not all of the Crucifixions mentioned by him elsewhere in the book or in his other writings, relating them to his typology based on other decorative elements and the form of the cross heads¹.

¹Collingwood (1927a) is itself a chronological survey of Northumbrian sculpture, but a more detailed analysis of the criteria he used to establish his chronology is to be found in the introduction to his catalogue of Yorkshire sculpture in several volumes of Y.A.J. (see bibliography), especially Collingwood (1907).

If one regarded this chapter as an iconographical survey of the development of the Crucifixion scene in Northumbria, the omission of the Rothbury cross head would appear remarkable. Collingwood, however, was approaching the subject from the point of view of the typology of the total monument - which is indeed part of its context and cannot be ignored - and its importance is amply demonstrated in that he was able to show groupings of types, and also a development and progressive debasement. Some of his most debased types, are in my opinion, only doubtfully related to the Crucifixion scene and I have discussed the problems posed by these in Appendix A (vol. II). Nevertheless, his survey brings together a majority of surviving Northumbrian examples and shows clearly that the variety of types has both regional and chronological significance.

The remaining work on the pre-Conquest sculptured Crucifixion consists of studies of important individual examples such as Auckland St. Andrew, Langford I and II, Romsey I and II and Hexham I (see catalogue and bibliographies, vol. II). It would not be right to minimise the importance of these studies, of which indeed it will be seen in subsequent chapters, I have made considerable use. The most important individual contribution, however, in recent years, has been the work of H.M. and J. Taylor, and especially of the former. Jointly they collected for the first time all the architectural monuments bearing representations of the Crucifixion discussed in this thesis. I have not been able to add a single panel or architectural rood to their list (Taylor, H.M. and Taylor, J. 1966). In addition H.M. Taylor has written on several monuments discussed below - Reculver, Hexham, and Wormington - and his study of the positioning and distribution within a church of monuments in relation to their liturgical function is obviously also of importance in considering the development of the architectural rood (see bibliography for these monuments and also Taylor, H.M. 1975).

There is no one work, however, since that by Allen, which has attempted

a general survey of the treatment of the theme in any medium. The following thesis is an attempt to plug this gap through a consideration of the treatment of the Crucifixion in stone sculpture. The subject is a large one, since eighty-six sculptures have had to be discussed within the text, apart from those in appendices: the number of chapters attests to a variety not surprising for such a large area over such a long period of time. It has proved necessary to consider the influence of both regional and period fashions in style, iconography and choice of elements; the influence of intellectual and artistic developments of a more international character; the importance of political events in opening up new sources of influence; and the limitations imposed on iconography by the type of monument to which it has been adapted. In section ii below, I have attempted to define the scope of the subject, without which limits the treatment of such a large theme would have been impossible.

ii A Survey of the Surviving Pre-Conquest Monuments. The Problem of Definition.

The title of the thesis contains three terms - Crucifixion, pre-Conquest, England - which imply respectively the iconographical, chronological and geographical limits of the study. Each of these terms requires some further definition, since, given the actual remains, the period, and the area in question, all are open to at least slightly different interpretations.

It has not, for instance, always been as easy as it sounds to decide which sculptures should be included in a study of the Crucifixion. Where the figure of Christ on the cross is clearly depicted and the geographical and chronological criteria discussed below are also fulfilled, inclusion has been obvious (Chap. 6-13). There are, however, many instances in which the intention of the sculptors is obscure or

doubtful, and I have, for example, excluded some carvings which other writers have seen as debased or idiosyncratic depictions of the theme. These sculptures, and the grounds for their exclusion, are described and discussed in vol. II, Appendix A.

Other difficulties concern a more general problem of definition since the cross alone or the figure of the Lamb on the cross are sometimes, though not always, a substitute for the narrative representation of the event. This is a very difficult matter, especially for the first of these two elements, since the cross is always a symbol of the historical event, and indeed of all the complex significance attached to it. A definition which allowed the inclusion of all representations of the cross however, would prove unwieldy and unmanageable - and in the end, unilluminating. I have, therefore, limited my own discussion to two aspects of the cross (chap. 2). The first concerns the early development of the iconography of the cross and its possible influence on the iconography of the cross in pre-Conquest Crucifixion scenes; the second is a discussion of representations of the cross when it is accompanied by figures, symbols or other elements which could also appear alongside the figure of Christ crucified. Interpretation of some of these symbolic representations is extremely difficult, and many of them are in fact far from straightforward simplifications of narrative scenes. In the later medieval period, especially from the thirteenth century, symbolic representations of the Crucifixion for devotional purposes became extremely common, and it seemed interesting, and important, to look at what might be the tentative beginnings of this tendency in early medieval art.

The number of representations of the Lamb on the cross are also few (Chap. 3). Some of them, such as the Wirksworth Slab, have been seen as representing an iconoclastic phase in Anglo-Saxon art, with the Lamb as a substitute for the human figure of Christ. The Lamb on the cross and

Christ crucified cannot be divorced from one-another, but as with the representations with the cross, the relationship between symbolic and narrative depiction has proved far from simple.

Both these themes are discussed first since in Christian art both appeared earlier than, or as early as, the iconography of Christ crucified. It seemed important, therefore, to attempt to see in what ways these themes might have influenced or been related to the iconography of the Crucifixion in pre-Conquest England, not only at the beginning but throughout the period.

The geographical area from which the sculptures discussed in Chaps. 2, 3 and 6-13 are drawn may be defined as all the land held by the Anglo-Saxon peoples by the beginning of the ninth century. This definition includes southern Scotland which was part of the Anglo-Saxon kingdom of Northumbria at its period of maximum expansion, but excludes Cornwall which fell under Anglo-Saxon control in the course of the ninth century¹. This exclusion is not entirely satisfactory, but the problems posed by an area which was essentially part of the Celtic West until long after the establishment of a tradition of Christian sculpture are essentially different from those of areas which were conquered by Anglo-Saxon peoples relatively early. This distinction seems to me to be important however interrelated one sees the origins of Hiberno-Saxon art, and however great the subsequent modifications of the Anglo-Saxon traditions by Scandinavian/Irish influences. Two interesting slabs from Llanveynoe in Herefordshire have also been excluded on the grounds that they belong more properly to the Welsh series. They have been included in Vol. II, Appendix C, since one of them at least possibly shows Anglo-Saxon influence. Even with the geographical area so defined, the total of sculptures discussed

¹Cornwall: see Stenton 1947, 233.

Northumbria: see Hunter Blair 1954; and Kermack 1941.

in the text of Vol. I is eighty-six.

The chronological limits are, however, the most difficult to define in practice for a period for which few works of art bear a date or even the name of the artist or craftsman who made them. Few of the sculptures discussed can be dated or related to each other, or to similar representations in other media or from other areas, except on the grounds of stylistic or iconographical comparison. Inscriptions where they do occur add some epigraphic and linguistic data, but in no case do they provide a more precise date. They themselves are either irrelevant to the elucidation of Crucifixion iconography, as at Alnmouth; or add to the difficulty of interpretation, as at Auckland St. Andrew. Only one, on the Ruthwell cross, possibly relates a monument to a particular literary context (Chap. 4). This cross has, however, been assigned to a wide variety of dates, even if one omits from the reckoning the complete outsiders, such as the tenth century (Stevens 1904); and the twelfth century (Cook 1912). Allen and Browne (1885); Browne (1885a); Saxl (1943); Swanton (1970); Kendrick (1938); Okasha (1971): all have supported dates from the late seventh to the early eighth century. Page (1973) considered that the evidence of the runes permitted a date range from the mid-seventh to the mid-eighth century. Mercer (1964) and Cramp (1965) considered it belonged to the end of this range, in the mid-eighth century. Collingwood (1927a) placed it at the end of the eighth century. The chronological limits of even such a much studied inscribed monument, therefore, cannot be regarded as narrowly fixed, even though there is a consensus view as to its pre-Viking Anglian origins (Chap. 9).

Occasionally architectural and archaeological criteria can be employed, and where there is any such evidence the fact has been noted both in the catalogue (vol. II) and in the discussion of the monument in the text. The majority of the sculptures discussed below were first noted in

contexts which provided no evidence of this sort.

On the other hand, many, though by no means all, of the Crucifixion sculptures occur on crosses or other monuments along with other scenes; a variety of abstract or foliage patterns, and with or on cross heads of a variety of shapes. They therefore have a context of monuments which can be related to each other by comparison of form, technique, style and iconography, on a wider basis than the Crucifixion alone. It is on the basis of such comparisons that various attempts have been made to place the monuments in typological and chronological series, notably by Kendrick (1938) and (1949); Collingwood (1916-8); (1927a); (1932) and in other works; Brown,^{G.B.}(1937); Brøndsted (1924); and most recently Cramp (1978a).

The conclusions of these writers as to the placing of a particular monument or group in relation to others often differs, as do their criteria, but from them has emerged a broad consensus as to what forms of monument, motifs and sculptured styles fall within the pre-Conquest period, while recent studies of small areas and of the development of particular pattern or ornament types have greatly helped to clarify the interrelations between early sculptures (for example, Cramp 1965a; Adcock 1974; Bailey 1974 and 1978; Lang 1967 and 1978).

This context (of the study of the great mass of surviving pre-Conquest sculpture) has two important implications for the structure of the present thesis. First, the representations have to be seen in that context: as a monument or part of a monument of a type which may have a period or regional distribution. In the case of a very simple or long-lived iconography, this context might be the only evidence of relative date that we have. Where necessary I have used criteria for relative dating developed in chronological surveys and area and thematic studies such as those described above, whether as the only evidence or as supporting

evidence for my own placing of a monument. Such criteria may be challenged by later work, and therefore I have tried in every case to make clear what type of evidence I have used. Secondly in most modern typologies there is at least broad agreement that the Viking invasions and settlements from the last part of the ninth century had some effect, and that there were new influences at work on southern art from roughly the same period. I have adopted the mid-ninth century as a rough dividing line, therefore, since it seemed necessary to attempt to establish the development of the two main types of the iconography of the Crucifixion in Anglian art before the question of, for example, Scandinavian (or Irish) influence was considered. The very few monuments which can on any grounds be dated to the mid-ninth century or earlier are discussed in chapters 6 and 9. Those which must be ninth century or later are discussed in chapters 7-8 (robed types) and 10-13 (loincloth types) with chapter divisions based on regional groups (which in some cases also correspond to monument types). The reasons for this method of dividing the later material are discussed more fully below, pp. 15 to 18 . It should be stressed, however, that there are no techniques by which absolute dates can be applied to pre-Conquest sculpture, and this applies particularly to the beginning and end of the period. A slab from Whithorn discussed in chapter 2, for example, is probably undatable, but could pre-date the Anglo-Saxon ascendancy in south-west Scotland. At the end of the period there are several sculptures which might actually have been carved in the late eleventh and even twelfth centuries: they have been included if the iconography and style are arguably pre-Conquest. Sculptures which have been published as pre-Conquest but which must be later, on iconographical or stylistic grounds, have been listed and discussed in Vol. II, Appendix B.

It should be clear from the foregoing discussion that both stylistic

and iconographical criteria, if they can be established, are of the highest importance. At the simplest level, both are perhaps at their most obviously convincing if it can be shown that a layout, grouping, or element characteristic of a particular school or artist has been faithfully reproduced by a copyist (see for example Rothbury, chap. 9; Alnmouth, chap. 10; Romsey I, chap. 13).

What is peculiar to the iconography of any theme, however, are the elements, figures and details which express the narrative basis of the theme and its ideological and symbolic significance. The narrative basis of the Crucifixion theme lies in the New Testament accounts. Its ideological significance has continued to be expounded to the present day: exposition in the early Christian and medieval periods often included additional legendary and symbolic detail, some of which was capable of visual representation. The central importance of the theme in theology, personal devotion and communal, liturgical practice, ensured both the development of an iconography and, apparently, a continual awareness that depictions of the theme were indeed visible expressions of dogma. Thus, at some times and in some areas, attempts were made to prevent the depiction of Christ crucified in human form at all; or to limit visual expression in line with a current orthodoxy. On the other hand there are times when iconography can be seen changing and developing in response to a new understanding of the meaning of the event.

It is interesting that the pre-Conquest centuries include periods of discussion and even dissension on the subject of the Crucifixion, and witnessed a fundamental change of attitude which brought it into the centre of personal as well as liturgical devotion. I have attempted to take this background into account in the introductory chapters 2 and 3 (for the Cross and Lamb) and chapters 4 and 5 (for the Crucifixion with Christ). In general, the study of the ideological background is concerned with developments in Christendom as much as with the Anglo-Saxon or

Insular background: in this respect, the study of the theme is different from that of a pattern or style peculiar to a region.

The search for conscious expression of theological or devotional insight might seem futile for many of the crude carvings discussed below. On the other hand, there are among the total of surviving works a number of carvings or fragments which are of exceptional quality. Some of these such as the Rothbury cross head (chap. 9) seem clearly related to developments which can also be seen in ninth century Carolingian works on which the influence of a new approach to liturgical piety seem particularly clear (chap. 4). A detailed study of the background to such a work might illuminate our understanding of many other cross heads in England, even though it be assumed that subsequent carvers were merely continuing in what had to them become a traditional way. In the consideration of large numbers of representations of a single theme from a large area and over a period of some 350-400 years (from the late seventh to the mid to late eleventh centuries), however, every possible source of evidence, internal and external, must be used.

Finally the types of monument on which the Crucifixion was sculptured in pre-Conquest England must be taken into consideration. With the exception of those listed in appendices A, B, and C, all eighty six sculptures discussed in the thesis are represented on the location maps (figs. 1, 2 and 3): on 1 and 2 are all those with the figures of Christ (chaps. 6-13) divided between the first and second half of the period: on 3, those with the Lamb and empty cross. The most notable fact which these location maps present is the marked regional variation in the number and type of surviving monuments.

The variation in type of monument emphasises the importance of the regional or local and sometimes period context: this is at its most obvious in the case of the cross-shaft and cross head types, with the

latter becoming predominant in Yorkshire and the North West in the second half of the period. Some of the monuments - pre-eminently the architectural rood - were designed specifically to carry the theme, while others were not developed originally with any figural carving in mind at all. One might expect, therefore, that the very varied forms of the monuments themselves (and the more or less restricted space they provide) might be the cause of some variations in iconography. To give one notable example (from chap. 7) an iconography limited almost to the figure of Christ Himself and showing only a limited number of variations may be seen to have both a regional distribution and to have been confined to the heads of free-standing crosses. (See also chapter 14).

One further note is needed in the information provided by the location maps. Talbot Rice noted many years ago the disparity in the numbers of surviving monuments between different areas (Talbot Rice 1952, 3), and one would expect to find this reflected in the numbers of surviving monuments with the Crucifixion theme. Such regional variation partly no doubt reflects variations in the supply of suitable stone: Jope's map showing supplies of good stone in southern and midland England, and the areas in which they were used, emphasises the point (Jope 1964, fig. 25).

This may not have been the only factor, however. Cambridgeshire, for example, has no surviving example of the Crucifixion theme, of any date, while Hampshire has four narrative representations and two further slabs with an empty cross, all from the latter part of the period. Jope showed that at least from the ninth century, good stone could be transported considerable distances as, for example, in the use of Bath type oolite at Britford, Codford St. Peter, and Ramsbury in Wiltshire; Newent in Gloucestershire; Steventon in Hampshire, and even in Surrey and London (Jope 1964, 99). The ability of some areas to import stone is a reflection of their economic and political importance at particular periods, and this might account for the prestigious nature of the sculptures in the south and

south west, where the surviving architectural roods are concentrated. If Peers was right about the geology of the Reculver cross head, it would seem that some areas or individuals had the ability to import stone from the continent at quite an early date (Peers 1928, 251-5). This seems confirmed by a letter from Charlemagne to Offa of Mercia, in which he refers to a Mercian complaint about the length of some black stones which had been sent to them (Whitelock 1955, 781-2). Loyn (1962, 85) conjectures these may have been for use in fonts.

Another factor, the effect of which it is impossible to assess, is whether the rate of survival, destruction or recovery of pre-Conquest sculpture has been the same for all regions. Northamptonshire, for example, with its own good quarries at Barnack, has only one example of the Crucifixion theme: are such gaps only an accident of survival or recovery? Recent archaeological excavation has added a new example from York (and one possible example), and the two symbolic sculptures from Winchester (chaps. 2 and 11). All these are from areas already well represented in the latter part of the period, but they suggest that the location maps may be unbalanced for both regional and period distribution in ways which cannot be accounted for rationally: further discoveries might introduce modifications into the present picture.

It is possible that architectural sculpture has a poorer survival value than some other kinds of sculpture. Cross shafts could be and were broken up and re-used as building stones - a practice which had already begun in the pre-Conquest period (see Kirkdale, catalogue). It is partly this habit which has led to the recovery of many fragments in more modern rebuildings and restorations. Some architectural sculptures were removed and set up again, as at Romsey and Langford (chaps. 8 and 13), or built in face inwards as at Daglingworth (Appendix B). But they could also be left in situ and simply defaced or dressed away as at

Breamore and Headbourne Worthy (chap. 13), or destroyed in the construction of a new roof line, as at Bitton (chap. 8). The figure over the west door at Monkwearmouth has sometimes been claimed as a rood (see Appendix A). It is almost completely defaced and serves now only as a reminder that large-scale relief sculptures were possible outside the areas to which architectural roods now appear restricted.

Figs. 1 and 2 seem to show a striking increase in the popularity of the theme as the period progressed: the possibility that this is a true reflection of the position can I think be borne out by the development of new variations in iconography and the use of more types of monument on which to display the theme. It is, however, both odd and interesting that in the early part of the period survivals of the Crucifixion theme are virtually limited to Bernicia and Mercia. The lack of anything from the southern part of Northumbria in the same period seems particularly odd. As I have stressed above, it may^{not} be possible to demonstrate any rational basis for this: the evidence for other areas may simply be lacking. It is of course also impossible to know when and where other monuments in more perishable materials fulfilled the same functions (see chap. 5). This early distribution is, however, possibly a reflection of the cultural and scholarly contacts of northern Northumbria and Mercia, which had their greatest political importance in the early part of the period. Continental sources make it clear that attitudes to the representation of the Crucifixion, or to certain variants, were not consistent in all areas as late as the eleventh century (chap. 4). Bede's discussion of the pictures at Monkwearmouth also suggests that some scholars of the early period were anxious to avoid the appearance of idolatry while still not supporting iconoclasm (chaps. 4 and 5). The literary evidence is, however, as incomplete as the sculptural. The

causes of numerical variation are entirely speculative, but the resulting distribution stands as a reminder of the incompleteness of the picture.

iii A Note on the Typology of the Figure of Christ

Throughout the thesis the pose attributed to the figure of Christ is classified as follows: type 1, 2 or 3. These types are based on the position of the trunk and legs of the figure only, since on many monuments the positions of the head and arms either cannot be determined because these are missing or damaged; or are clearly the result of the space provided by the type of monument on which the figure is set. The majority of sculptures belong to type 1, in which the body is upright and completely frontal, and the legs are straight. In type 2, the body is shown sagging to one side so that one hip is lower than the other: the legs however are still not bent at the knees and frontality is preserved. In type 3 the knees are bent and drawn to the side and the sagging of the body is more marked. The trunk and legs are therefore turned, at least slightly, from the frontal position. Degrees of variation are difficult to define, but are important in the development of the iconography of Christ.

Types 2 and 3 are rare in pre-Conquest sculpture (see fig. 7) in which (except possibly at Bitton, chap. 8) they are confined to a few of the sculptures in which Christ is represented in the loincloth. The development of Christ's figure type is discussed at appropriate points in the text, and especially in chapters 9 and 13, but the figure of Christ, if it has survived, is always classified as well as described. The variants are listed with other elements in volume II, and the distribution of types is discussed in the summary of the regional and period variations of all aspects of Crucifixion iconography, in chapter 14.

C H A P T E R 2

THE CROSS AS A SYMBOL OF THE PASSION

The sign of the cross in Christian art is always a reference to the Passion and death of Christ, but it is not always to be interpreted as a method of portraying the historical event. Plain or ornate, and without any accompanying figures or symbols, the cross has an extremely wide-ranging significance. To any individual observer it may be the sign of his faith; a symbol of Christ's suffering and death; or of his victory over that death and the promise implicit in this to every believer; and it is the most common interpretation of the sign which will herald the coming of the Son of Man on the last day. None of this complex of ideas can be disentangled from the rest. All are rooted in the central beliefs of the Christian church, that Christ suffered, died, was buried, rose again, and ascended into heaven. In art it is most commonly the sign of the cross which identifies the Risen and Ascended Christ, whether behind him, on his nimbus, or in his hand.

It is not within the scope of this thesis to discuss all representations of the cross in pre-Conquest sculpture. In this chapter it is intended only to explore the relationship between images of the cross and Crucifixion: i) by considering the early development of the cross as a symbol; ii) by noting the forms of the cross used in pre-Conquest sculptures of the Crucifixion and the Lamb; and iii) by a study of scenes in which the cross without Christ or the Lamb is accompanied by figures or elements which could also appear with Christ crucified. The last group may point to the significance of the Crucifixion in the related themes of Redemption and Judgement rather than straight forwardly symbolise it. The Crucifixion itself is rarely represented in a simple narrative way, however, and it is interesting to see how, in the pre-Conquest period, scenes with the cross developed as the narrative and

symbolic content of the Crucifixion scene itself also changed, at least in emphasis.

i. The Cult of the Cross

The cross was an object of veneration throughout the pre-Conquest period and for long before. Its early development is easier to trace than that of the Crucifixion. Historically it has its beginnings in Constantine's conversion in 312 and his adoption of the cross combined with the Chi-Rho as the Imperial labarum. The earliest surviving use of this symbol in art is on a sarcophagus in Rome of c.340, where it is linked with several scenes from the Passion (Schiller 1972, pl. 1). The legend of the discovery of the cross by Helena, mother of Constantine, was established by the end of the fourth century. By c. 440 a cross on Golgotha was replaced by a gem-studded cross by the Emperor Theodosius. There is an account from this early period of the exposure of a relic of the true cross for veneration on the morning of Good Friday (Pétre 1948).

Both the crux invicta (a cross combined with the Chi-Rho and other signs of victory such as the laurel wreath) and the crux gemmata (the gem-studded cross of Golgotha) were the inspiration for many future representations of the cross: the forms inspired by them have expanded arms and are elaborately decorated. The Golgotha cross is represented in a mosaic in the apse of Sta. Pudenziana, Rome: as a jewelled latin cross with expanded terminals (Beckwith 1970, pl. 18)¹. A development from this appears on a silver paten from Siberia now in Leningrad, on which two angels adore a cross which has arms expanding through a slight curve, and with the crossing and terminals elaborated by circular loops (Schiller 1972, pl. 6).

¹This is type B1 (fig. 4 and see section ii below); but not all forms of the cross in early Christian Byzantine and early Medieval art are represented in the typology of pre-Conquest cross form. The classification will, therefore, be used only for pre-Conquest representations.

The veneration of the cross expressed by these representations was embodied liturgically in two feasts of the church, the Exaltation of the Cross and the Invention of the Cross. The first of these was known to the Anglo-Saxons in the seventh century, the second became established in the eighth (Swanton 1970, 44-5).

The crosses of the veneration images had some influence on the iconography of the Crucifixion from the sixth to the eighth centuries: its influence can be seen on Hexham I and II and in the Durham Gospels (see chap. 6 and below). Its influence on the western narrative image was not permanent, however, and even on Hexham II (pl. 32) the movement towards simplifying the form can be seen.

The crux invicta and crux gemmata had a more lasting effect, however, on the development of the Insular cross, both free-standing and incised or in relief, removed from the narrative of the Crucifixion. Lionard (1961), for example, has shown their importance in the development of the Irish grave slabs. His main concern was to show influences operating on the development of the cross alone. In England, and probably in Ireland, however, it would be difficult to keep apart influences drawn from veneration and Crucifixion images, when, as I noted above, the one had already influenced the other: at the very start of our period we are faced with a multiplicity of related images.

This is true of those small early Northumbrian grave markers, related to those in Lionard's series, in which crosses with expanded terminals are accompanied by the letters A and Ω. The origins of the image are in Revelations:

'I am the Alpha and the Omega' says the Lord God, who is and who was and who is to come, the sovereign Lord of all.' (Revelations I, 8.NEB).¹

Within a few verses the idea is put into the mouth of the Son of Man:

I. 'Ego sum α et ω, principium et finis, dicit Dominus Deus, qui est, et qui erat, et qui venturus est, Omnipotens.'

'I am the first and the last, and I am the living one; for I was dead and now am alive for ever more; and I hold the keys of death and death's domain' (Revelations I, 17-8. NEB)¹.

The first and last letters of the Greek alphabet therefore acknowledge the divinity of Christ, who as man died on the cross.

The iconography of the cross accompanied by the letters Alpha and Omega was common in early Byzantine art, as for example on the fifth century sarcophagus of Bishop Theodore and the sixth century apse mosaic in Sant'Appollinare in Classe, both Ravenna (Schiller 1971, pl. 348). By the mid-eighth century it was a commonplace of Merovingian art, as in the frontispiece of a Gospel Book in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris (Chatzidakis and Grabar 1965, pl. 137)². Such models undoubtedly influenced the Irish series of grave markers, and the iconography had a wide distribution and a long life there. In England there are only two, among a relatively limited series of name stones, from Hartlepool and Billingham, both Co. Durham (Okasha 1971, pls. 9 and 48).

The relationship of such name stones to the design and layout of the carpet pages of early Northumbrian manuscripts such as the Lindisfarne Gospels has been frequently noted. It is especially interesting that one of those with the Alpha and Omega, and which also has inscriptions running around the border, (from Billingham) is very close to one of the earliest examples of the Crucifixion from Northumbria - that in the Durham Gospels (see pl. 25)³. It is in fact the earliest surviving in an Anglo-Saxon manuscript. There the iconography clearly links Christ on the cross with the Christ of the Second Coming, just as the cross with

¹'...ego sum primus et novissimus, Et vivus et fui mortuus, et ecce sum vivens in secula seculorum, et habeo claves mortis et inferni.'

²See also Raw 1970, esp. pp.241-3.
Ms. Lat. 12108.

³Durham MS. A.II.17.

the Greek letters alone does in a more symbolic, and simpler way¹.

The manuscript and the namestones illustrate the point that the iconography of the Crucifixion cannot always be clearly separated from that of other major themes, such as Victory, Judgment and Redemption, which are inextricably linked with it. The Durham Gospels, the Hexham sculptures (see chap. 6), and the Grave markers with Alpha and Omega, all attest the closeness of the relationship and the degree of cross fertilisation which could take place between the visual images. Several of the sculptures discussed in section iii below have been included in an attempt to explore this relationship.

ii The Cross as an Element of Crucifixion Iconography

The cross is so basic and central a symbol that one might expect it to be the one element common to all representations discussed in chaps. 6-13. Yet in three cases certainly - Bothal I and Gosforth I and II - and three more possibly (Bothal II, Lancaster III and York II) it is not present at all. In these cases the crucified Christ presumably represent both Himself and the instrument of His death, a curious reversal of the usual symbolic process. The three certain examples are all late and all show strong Scandinavian influence. The Jellinge Christ is also without a cross (Holmquist 1951, fig. 1). It is possible only to speculate on what influenced its omission in England. Possibly the cause may be that the cross became 'invisible' to some observers when the fashion for placing the crucified Christ in the cross head became widespread. (See for example Brompton, pl. 36).

Where the cross does appear, its importance is usually stressed in some way. In a very large number of cases the cross head or head and

¹See chap. 6 and Coatsworth (forthcoming) 'The Art of the Durham Gospels' in T.J. Brown, ed. The Durham Gospels Early English Manuscripts in Facsimile. Copenhagen. See also Morris, C.D. 1974, 54.

and shaft of a free standing cross is itself used as the cross of the Crucifixion: twenty eight times, or thirty two if all doubtful examples are included¹. There are also four examples of a cross head with the symbol of the Lamb (Vol. II, Handlists). The raising of the scene into the cross head is discussed in chap. 9 with particular reference to the earliest surviving example at Rothbury, and its possible influence on the development of the architectural rood is discussed there and also in chap. 5. Positioning the Crucifixion within the cross head may have been one way of stressing its importance, but the forms of the heads are not related to the iconography of the Crucifixion but to the development of the free-standing cross in pre-Conquest sculpture as a whole: their typology is in no way different from that of other heads of the same date with different scenes or purely abstract patterns. For this reason the typology of cross shapes used throughout this thesis is that compiled by Professor R. Cramp for the forthcoming Corpus of Anglo-Sculpture and published in Cramp 1978a (fig. 1.3). It is reproduced here as fig. 4.

When the scene appeared on an architectural monument, or on the side of a cross shaft or a grave monument, however, artists and designers were presumably more free to portray the symbol as they wished. In all these cases the cross is made to dominate by its size. The most common method was to make it the full height and width of the available area, or in the case of architectural roods by making it very large in relation to the available area. The dominance of the cross by size or height is a commonplace of all periods, but the quartering of a panel or design area, though found for example in some ivories is not always found in

¹The number thirty two includes Durham IV, the slab at Kirkcolm which is in some ways treated like a free standing cross; and the sculptures which survive only on the shaft but which may have extended into the head. See vol. II, Handlists.

continental examples which are otherwise parallel in iconography. In pre-Conquest sculpture, it was the practice on cross shafts from Hexham II at the beginning to Aycliffe, near the end of the period, even if it prevented the portrayal of Christ with arms outstretched at human proportions. This domination by the cross must be a reflection of the veneration given to the cross itself (exemplified in poems such as the Dream of the Rood, see chap. 5) and perhaps even of the interest in the dimensions of the cross and their symbolic significance which was sustained throughout the period. Bede, in his exegesis of the Crucifixion account of the Gospel of St. John, introduces the words 'What is the length and breadth and height and depth (of the love of Christ)¹' (Ephesians III, 18) and interprets them as meaning the cross (Migne 1844-64, XCII, col. 913). [De Divinis Officiis, a work possibly by Alcuin, follows the same tradition:

Jacens vero crux quatuor mundi partes appetit,
orientem videlicet, et occidentem, aquilonem et
meridiam quia et Christus per passionem^{suam} omnes
gentes ad se trahit.... (Migne 1844-64, CI, col. 1208).

Indeed as it lay, the cross stretched out to all the four quarters of the world, east and west, north and south, because even so by His passion Christ draws all people to Him... 2

Two centuries later, Aelfric wrote in his sermon on the Passion in very similar terms of Christ on the cross:

Drihten was gefæstnod mid feower nægelum; to west-dæle awend; and his synstra heold ðone scynenden suð-dæl, and his swiðra norð-dæl, east-dæl his hnol; and he ealle alyside middaneardes hwemmas swa hangiende.

The Lord was fastened with four nails turned to the west; his left held the shining south; his right the north; his head the east; and he redeemed all the regions of the world hanging thus. (Thorpe 1844-6, II, 254-6).

1. Quae sit latitudo et longitudo et altitudo, et profundum.

2. Bede and Alcuin are both following earlier fathers of the church, cf. St. Augustine on St. John's Gospel, C.C.S.L. XXXVI, p. 657

When Christ or the Lamb are present, on monuments other than cross heads, the form of the cross is usually surprisingly simple: of the thirty one sculptures involved, eighteen have a plain latin cross (type A1); seven have a latin cross (type A1) with mouldings or some kind of elaborated terminal; and a further five have a plain cross with wedge shaped arms and V-shaped armpits (type B6)¹. Only one with the figure of Christ, the slab at Kirkcolm which is like a relief version of a standing cross with a crucifix in the head (pl. 40) shows any influence from the development of the cross as a free-standing form in pre-Conquest Sculpture. Two with the Lamb have a staff cross. (See vol. II, Handlists). It is difficult to know how much significance to give to this simplicity: it could suggest that the models used were themselves venerable; but it could also mean that a distinction was drawn between the cross as an object of veneration - as it becomes in a crucifix or when completely isolated - and the cross in more or less narrative scenes of the historical event, more realistically portrayed as the instrument by which Christ died. In either case, it was a development, as two early Crucifixion scenes - Hexham I and II - show some influence from the crux gemmata tradition (see above).

The crosses without the figure of Christ or the Lamb which are the subject of the remainder of the chapter are much more varied in form though none is free-standing (see vol. II, Handlists). This in itself might suggest that the reference to the Crucifixion is a symbolic one, and that they might represent attempts to convey visually a complex association of ideas.

¹Three sculptures which I have rejected as pre-Conquest: Daglingworth I and II and Westow (see Appendix B) also have crosses of type B6. This form is found in a number of ivory crucifixes accepted as pre-Conquest by Beckwith (1972). Type A1 with mouldings and stepped or expanded terminals is also a feature of later pre-Conquest manuscript art in Crucifixion and other scenes (see chaps. 12 and 13 on sculptures from the East Midlands and the South in the later period).

iii Sculptures in which the cross appears as a symbol of the Passion, without the figure of Christ or the Lamb (map, fig. 3).

An iconographical type, once established, can have a very long life, so that when archaeological and architectural evidence are lacking the relative dating of a fairly simple monument even within very wide limits can be difficult. This is the case with the first monument to be discussed.

Three empty crosses: Christ between the two thieves
Whithorn, Wigtownshire, (cat. and pl. 1).

This small slab, a grave marker, or possibly an architectural sculpture (see below) is damaged but apparently almost complete. It is carved on only one face. The design consists of a group of three crosses, the central one being taller and larger than the others, which are set beneath its arms. All three are in very shallow relief, formed by slightly cutting away the field around the crosses. The arms of the crosses are decorated by incised lines which follow the outline and are closed at the centre. The central cross has an incised rectangle at the crossing, and circular hollows mark the centres of the two smaller crosses. The arrangement suggests the Crucifixion between the two thieves, and this is how such groups are usually interpreted when they occur elsewhere (see below).

Radford and Donaldson (1953, 40) describe this stone as follows:

probably copied from a manuscript source. The slab is probably architectural. The form of the crosses and the ornament suggest a date in the ninth century.

The forms of the crosses, however, are not easy to date. In spite of the crudity of the carving, the smaller crosses are quite clearly based on a form with square rather than curved angles (A1 or perhaps B1): the same is probably true of the central cross also although this is not perhaps immediately obvious because the sides of the arms are composed of convex curves, splaying out towards the tip which brings it close to type B9 though the *armplk* does not form such a smooth curve. The upper arm of

the tallest cross has a terminal which narrows slightly after the splay, producing a shape reminiscent of some of the great Anglian free-armed heads of type C9, like, for example, Lastingham or the surviving arm of the head of the Ruthwell cross (Collingwood 1927a, figs. 101, 133). This resemblance seems merely fortuitous, the result of poor workmanship, since this tapering terminal does not appear on any other arm. There is, therefore, no feature which can be said to be distinctively Anglian.

The forms of the crosses, crudity apart, are related to the Early Christian/Byzantine development of the crux gemmata, discussed above. Early crosses of this type are of the latin form with splayed terminals (see above, p. 21), but a type with splayed arms, often with a pronounced convex curve, soon developed. An example of this development is the silver gilt cross of Justin II made between 565 and 578 (Beckwith 1970, pl. 83). It is of course essential to the crux gemmata that its surface be richly decorated, and in mosaics and metal work this includes decoration framing each face and particular emphasis of the crossing with inset jewels or medallions. The Whithorn slab is not, of course, a direct copy of one of these rich models, but the impact of the type on art earlier than that of the Anglo-Saxon conquest of Galloway can be amply demonstrated.

The symbolic grouping of three crosses, for instance, is found on Merovingian sepulchral monuments, and a fairly close parallel is in fact provided by an example from Mandourel in Aude, dated by Salin to c.600 (Salin 1952, 88 and fig. 44). Radford and Donaldson (1953, 36 and pl.6) noted a connection between the Celtic community at Whithorn and Merovingian Gaul, in the use of a Gaulish alphabet on an inscribed stone which they date to the seventh century.

Similar cross forms have often been noted from Ireland and other Celtic areas. A pillar from Loher, Co. Kerry, a cross from an early seventh century manuscript, Codex Usserianus Primus;¹ and a slate

¹Trinity College Dublin, MS. 55.

headstone from Tintagel, all illustrated by Thomas (1971, figs. 54-5), reinforce the point that crosses of the Whithorn type were known and widely used in Celtic art before the Northumbrian conquest of Galloway¹. Small crosses above or below the arms of larger crosses are also found on at least twelve slabs from Ireland (Lionard 1961, 105 and fig. 10, nos. 6, 8, 9, 10; and pl. XXVII, 4).

The symbolic three cross group also seems to have had a long history in south west Scotland itself: examples at Drumore; Kirkmadrine; and Laggangarn have had a wide range of dates assigned to them (Allen 1903, 542, 544-6). This suggests it was a regional motif: certainly it seems to have had no appeal for Anglo-Saxon sculptors - at least so far no example has been discovered in any other part of Northumbria.

The Whithorn slab, then, possibly, predates the Anglo-Saxon conquest of Galloway. It is not possible to assert positively that it was not carved within the period of Anglian dominance, especially since the development of the Anglo-Saxon cross types was also influenced by the crux gemmata tradition. Pectoral crosses such as that of St. Cuthbert, for example, were influenced by similar models: the lobed circle at the crossing and the framed jewelled face can be closely compared to Byzantine examples such as the Stuma Paten (565-578) in the Istanbul Archaeological Museum (Battiscombe 1956, pl. XV; Beckwith 1970, fig. 82)./1

Most of the sculptures with which the Whithorn slab can be most closely compared appear to be grave markers, and there is no evidence for suggesting it was not one also.

Cross accompanied by ?Evangelist symbols
Lancaster I, (cat. and pl. 2).

This slab-like shaft has on one broad face an incomplete scene, of

¹Whithorn became the seat of an English bishopric shortly before 731 which implies English dominance for some time previously though perhaps not until late in the seventh century (Hunter Blair 1956, 47).

which the only certain fact is that it is dominated by a cross with wedge shaped arms and wide curving armpits (type B9), set on a tall stem, and which apparently extended the full height and width of the design area. The face or panel is damaged and incomplete at the top. There is no clear border at the bottom, though the cross and the two enigmatic figures beneath it are represented as standing on a wavering uneven line which could possibly be a border or a stylised ground level. The vertical edges of the face are bordered by a broad outer and inner narrow moulding, though those on the left are somewhat worn.

There are carvings in all four spandrels of the cross. Those above are both incomplete and that on the left is impossible to identify. That on the right could be a bird flying towards the centre of the cross. The figures below the cross are symmetrically disposed and are possibly but not certainly differentiated in head type, while being identical in body. The figure on the left is more worn than that on the right. Each has a cloaked or robed human body, seen in profile, and apparently without arms, although the unusually bulky chests might imply crudely carved arms with hands placed on the breast. There are traces on the left hand figure which might indicate such a possibility. Each figure has a beast head with long jaws raised to the cross. That on the right has a long lolling tongue: possibly the left hand figure originally had this feature also. The head shape on the left seems bulkier than on the right, but this may be the effect of wear on a carving technique that aimed at flat outline shapes in shallow relief. It is not possible to determine the type of beast denoted by these heads.

An early commentator on the iconography of the scene rejected the suggestion that the creatures below the cross could be evangelists with symbolic heads, and suggested instead that they were figures of evil mocking the cross from below while holy doves (sic) descend on it from above (Taylor, H. 1903, 51-2).

Collingwood refers to the lower figures as the soldiers beneath the cross 'made ugly with beasts' heads', and two subsequent commentators have endorsed his interpretation that these are figures of evil. All three: Collingwood (1927a, 102); Scott (1959, 280n); Roe (1945, 15) explicitly compared this stone to another fragment from Kirklevington which shows two figures grasping a stem or staff (pl. 162). This fragment and a small number of possibly related pieces were accepted especially by Collingwood and Roe as representations of the Crucifixion. In every case but that of Lancaster I, I consider this ascription doubtful, partly on the grounds that of all of them only Lancaster I shows two beast headed figures in a certain relationship to a representation of a cross. Alternative interpretations of the other fragments are put forward in vol. II, Appendix A.

Lancaster I is distinguished from these doubtful relations, not in the fact that it clearly has beast-headed figures beneath a cross, but also in that it has other, though less easily distinguishable creatures or elements above, of which, however, one may be a bird. An explanation of this arrangement which is at least possible is that which was summarily dismissed, that these are evangelist symbols. Final proof of this is lacking in that one of the upper figures is irrecoverable. The full length clumsy figures below the arms are difficult to parallel, though one is reminded of the armless outline figure of St. Matthew in the Book of Durrow (Werner 1969, fig. 2). Nearer in date and rather more interesting, are the full length though winged evangelist symbols in the Book of MacDurnan (Henry 1967, pl. K)¹. One of those below the cross is a frontal figure, but the one on the right turns to face the cross and has a long lolling tongue. This miniature follows a tradition well established in Insular art in setting the symbols in the spandrels of a cross which is treated decoratively and without the figure of Christ or

¹Lambeth Palace Library

the Lamb (Werner 1969, figs. 1,6,7). The 'cats' cradle' pseudo-interlace on the opposite face at Lancaster is also reminiscent of the strap-like diagonal pseudo-interlace on the Chi-Rho monogram in the same manuscript (Henry 1967, pl. I).

The Book of MacDurnan, on the evidence of inscriptions referring to Maelbrigte MacTormain, Abbot of Armagh from 888 to 927, could have been made at Armagh in the late ninth or early tenth century: a monastery which, as Henry shows, had connections with and influence in England, both north and south. The manuscript was in fact taken to southern England in the tenth century (Henry 1967, 59, 102-5). The round shouldered armless figures are also in an Irish sculptural tradition, as exemplified by the cross at Moone, which is possibly not as early as Henry's eighth century dating (Henry 1965, 42-3 and see also chap. 7). Irish influence through the medium of Scandinavian settlers might be expected in the north west in the tenth century, which is certainly the earliest date possible for Lancaster I's angular pseudo-interlace. Other Irish-Scandinavian influences on the iconography of tenth-eleventh century cross heads in the north west and Yorkshire are discussed in chap. 7.

Cross accompanied by Sts. Mary and John Halton (cat. and pl. 3); Kirkby Wharfe (cat. and pl. 4); Burton in Kendal (cat. and pl. 5).

The three sculptures discussed in this section are closely linked though they vary widely in both style and competence of carving.

a) Halton (pl. 3): Though worn this is the most competently carved and detailed of the three. It is the lowest scene on the west face as the cross now stands. This part may in fact be in situ (see cat.).

It stands below a scene which may be interpreted as representing the risen Christ (Pattison 1973, 228-9), which will also be noted on other crosses with the Crucifixion¹.

¹See Brigham; Lancaster II (chap. 7); York I (chap. 11); Gosforth II (chap. 12); Newent (chap. 13); and Burton in Kendal, below.

The scene is set within an arched frame which sits within the cabled angles of the cross shaft. A tall cross with a slim and slightly tapering stem and with a very small head divides the panel longitudinally. It seems to be a staff cross of the plain latin type (A1), with a rather rounded surface like a roll moulding. It may have stood on a base though this is not now clear. On either side beneath the cross head is a robed figure standing on something that now appears as some kind of pedestal-like feature with a bulbous top and narrow stem (but see below). The heads of these figures are now almost completely featureless but they are frontal and have shoulder length hair or nimbs. Their bodies are quarter turned towards the cross. The left arm of the figure on the right is held rigidly against his side to the elbow and then raised across the body at about waist level. The right arm is not clearly distinguishable but may have been raised to the face in which case it would seem the right elbow is supported by the left hand. The figure on the left has both arms held close to the sides to the elbow and then held out to the cross, which the hands possibly clasp. There are some traces which suggest that a fold of fabric lay over this figure's right arm.

b) Kirkby Wharfe (pl 4): Here the scene in question occupied apparently the whole of one broad face of a relatively small shaft. The proportions of the shaft suggest this even though the panel which is edged above and at the sides with plain flat band mouldings is incomplete at the bottom. A tall cross with a slim tapering stem divides the panel vertically and horizontally, though the spandrels left above the arms are small. The head of the cross (type B9) is much more emphasised in form and size than that at Halton. A large leaf or leaf flower springs from each arm of the cross and fills the upper spandrels.

Below each arm stands a figure each with hair or nimbus stiffly framing his face. The figure on the left is rigidly and indeed awkwardly

frontal. He has incised features and a pointed chin, possibly a beard. His dress is short, perhaps a tunic or even trousers of some kind, belted at the waist. His left hand hangs rigidly at his side, his right hangs down straight to the elbow, then crosses his body to clasp the stem of the cross. The figure on the right is three-quarters turned away from the cross, with a frontal head. The features are incised, with a rounded chin. This figure wears a longer robe, which seems to suggest a female. Her right hand is not visible but the left arm crosses in front of her body and grasps the cross with its disproportionately enlarged hand.

c) Burton in Kendal (pl. 5): This is the crudest of the three crosses in the group, and the soft stone is also very worn. Many details are really indistinguishable and some of the features represented by Collingwood (1927a, fig. 195) possibly belong to an inner arched frame rather than to the figures: the panel below has such a frame. Two figures, each with a large nimbus, stand on either side of a tall staff cross with a slightly tapering stem and a small and rather nondescript head. The cross divides the panel longitudinally. The figure on the left seems to have his right arm hanging down by his side at a rather awkward angle. His left arm may reach out towards the cross as Collingwood has it, but now it is indistinguishable from the nimbus which comes down to the shoulder. He is frontal and the clear division of the legs suggests a short dress. The figure on the right may be frontal or partly turned towards the cross and has a slightly longer though still not full length dress, but the position of the arms cannot be determined. The figure in the panel below also shows the Risen Christ, a further example of the juxtaposition of this theme with that of the Crucifixion.

It is not easy to discuss these sculptures as a group. They differ greatly in style and technique, and the monuments on which they appear have little in common beyond the fact that all are cross shafts. There

are also differences in detail, where they are not so worn that detail is distinguishable. All have long-stemmed crosses with thin tapering stems, but while those at Halton and Burton in Kendal have small rather anonymous heads and are clearly staff crosses, Kirkby Wharfe has a full sized head which is also symbolically associated with the tree, as it is clearly flowering. It is difficult to say whether all the figures beneath these crosses have nimbs or nimbus-like hair. The figures at Halton have also the distinctive podia - whatever they may be - on which they stand.

The figures beneath the cross have commonly been identified as John and Mary, though the figure with the shortest dress appears on Christ's right at Kirkby Wharfe and Burton in Kendal (though in the latter case the figures are not only worn but apparently so crudely rendered that even that is scarcely a safe assertion) and therefore presumably is to be identified with John. Both figures at Halton wear long robes and there is now little to distinguish between them.

Pairs of figures on Welsh, Irish and Scottish crosses are also commonly identified with John and Mary¹. One of these sculptures, that from Fahan Mura, has been dated as early as the middle of the seventh century (Henry 1965, 56-60; Roe 1960, 206). This date has, however, been disputed and this dispute is of interest here because it has been said that Fahan Mura demonstrates the influence of sixth century models spread by such means as textiles and pilgrim flasks in early Irish art. One Palestinian pilgrim flask from Monza shows a palm-cross surmounted by the head of Christ, accompanied by two kneeling figures, the two

¹Wales: Margam; Nash (Glamorganshire) Nash Williams 1905, pls. XXXVIII and LIV; Scotland: St. Vigean's II, III; Meigle III; (Allen 1903, figs. 282A, 288A, 351). Ireland: Fahan Mura (Henry 1965, pl. 54).

thieves and Sts. Mary and John (Grabar 1968, pl. 318). Although this iconography is related (rather than a fore runner) of the iconography of the robed Christ of the type of the Rabula Gospels (see chap. 6) it does offer one possible source for an empty cross with Sts. Mary and John on either side (even though there both figures stand well back, neither grasping the cross) and even though the presence of Christ is indicated by a bust rising from the top of the cross. All three crosses from England are likely to be as late as the tenth century, or even the early eleventh. Burton in Kendal and Kirkby Wharfe both belong to what Kendrick (1949, 58) saw as the disintegration of the Northumbrian panelled cross; all three show various forms of Scandinavian influence¹. Fahan Mura is the only comparable Irish example, however, and for this, Stevenson (1956, 94-6) has also argued for a date in the tenth century. It does seem necessary to reconsider both the significance of John and Mary beneath the cross, and also other possible parallels perhaps closer in date.

The figures of John and Mary belong to a narrative type of representation of the Crucifixion. Their presence records the moment in the Gospel when Christ commits His mother to John's care and John to His mother as her son (John, XIX, 26-7). John is also present as an eye witness to the event. The two figures, therefore, emphasise the historicity of the Crucifixion and one of the sayings of Christ on the cross which could have been a focus for devotion.

The three pre-Conquest crosses might simply be a reduction of this narrative type of representation, possibly as a result of the difficulty which pre-Conquest sculptors always experienced in fitting a full sized

¹See Bailey (1974), II, 208-20 (Burton in Kendal). Halton has a scene from Scandinavian mythology, and Kirkby Wharfe the angular strap work in the cross head.

figure of Christ into a narrow panel: this point is raised in all the chapters in which the Crucifixion carved on the cross shaft is discussed (and see also above in the discussion of the size of the cross in relation to the panel). Such an adaptation could have been the work of an individual sculptor in the first instance, or even of several individuals, and one might not need to look further for close parallels.

The reduced Crucifixion image of the earlier half of the pre-Conquest period was more often confined to Christ with the spear-bearer and sponge-bearer (see chaps. 6, 9, 14): the presence of John and Mary up to the early ninth century is suggested only once, at Auckland St. Andrews (chap. 6). They were more frequently represented in both north and south on sculptures which date from the late ninth century onwards (see II, Handlists). This in itself suggests a new interest in the significance of their presence, which might suggest new sources of influence.

There is a reliquary which has been variously dated from the mid-ninth to the early eleventh century - called the reliquary of Pope Paschal II - in which Christ on the cross is shown flanked by Sts. Mary and John standing on what at first sight appear to be elaborate footstools (Thoby 1959, pl. LIX, no. 134). The 'footstools' on which these figures stand at Halton have been described as both 'pedestals' and 'chalices' because of their apparently waisted form (March 1892, 62-4; Allen 1886, 330-5). The 'footstools' on the reliquary are actually, however, the roofs of buildings, and this could provide an important clue as to the true significance of the 'pedestals' at Halton, especially taken together with the flowering tree cross at Kirkby Wharfe.

Adam had been represented in Crucifixion iconography of the west from the ninth century (Schiller 1972, pls. 389-91). On a metal book

cover of the tenth century, Adam and Eve are shown grasping the fruit of the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil, one on either side of the tapering peg of a cross shaft which is buried deep in the earth (Schiller 1972, pl. 370). Adam is on Christ's right, Eve on His left - that is, on the opposite side from those on which Mary and John are most commonly shown. On an ivory book cover of the earlier tenth century, Adam and Eve are shown as the lowest tier of scenes on either side of a very tall cross (Schiller 1972, pl. 373). In the Fulda Sacramentary of the late tenth century (c.975) they appear resurrected standing in little box like tombs. Here they replace the earlier image of the Resurrection of the Dead, and are shown one on either side of a cross fixed into the earth with a long tapering peg (Schiller 1972, pl. 381). In a mid-eleventh century Gospels from Echternach the motif of the pegged cross appears again. On either side are little burial mounds inside which are shown Adam and Eve. John and Mary are shown standing on these mounds to witness the death of Christ. Here Mary stands on Christ's right as she usually appears and Eve is also on His right and beneath her feet, a reversal of her usual position (Schiller 1972, pl. 387).

This series of images emphasises the theme of the Redemption of fallen man through the death on the cross. The parallelism is not strictly between John and Mary and the first man and woman, but with Christ and Mary as the new Adam and Eve. A similar linkage of ideas seems to occur in the very full Crucifixion image from Newent (see chap. 13). The theme was commented on in a sermon for the feast of the Annunciation, written in the tenth century:

And then men despised his teaching and gave way to envy,
and hung him on the cross, and he through his Passion
overcame the old traitor, and put down the devil's kingdom
on this earth, and then was excluded the lamentations of
Eve through the ever pure Virgin.

'Ond hie nu his lare forhogodan, 7 him æfest to genaman, and
hine on rode ahengon; 7 he þurh his þrowunga þone ealdan
gedwolan oforswiþde, 7 deofles rice geneþerode on þyssum
middangearde; 7 þær wæs Euan wóp úte betyned þurh þære á
clanan fæmnan....'

The Halton example is the nearest in detail to the metalwork and manuscript images. Indeed, in their light it is possible to see that the 'pedestals' or 'chalices' might indeed be the mounds beneath which are the figures of Adam and Eve. Certainly the 'stems' of the 'chalices' are not as clearly defined as one would wish if 'chalice', 'footstool', or even corbel is to be their interpretation. The theme of the Redemption linked to the Fall could also explain the reversal of the figures of Mary and John which is clear at Kirkby Wharfe, probable at Burton in Kendal and at least possible at Halton.

Kirkby Wharfe clearly has a cross which is linked to the idea of the Tree. One is reminded of the legend of the cross traditionally made from the Tree of Knowledge¹. The fact that some of these figures grasp the cross as Adam and Eve are shown grasping the fruit of the Tree seems a pointer to the same interpretation.

The worn condition of all the crosses in this group means, alas, that this interpretation has to remain a suggestion, no more than a possibility. Yet the distribution in time of the Crucifixion with Sts. Mary and John does suggest that in the latter half of the period there was a new interest in the possibilities of their presence, while the small stone from Newent (chap. 13) shows that at one southern centre at least the link between the Fall and Redemption was made visually explicit.

The Cross linked to scenes of the last Day: the development of images of the Trinity (or Binity)

Two of the five sculptures discussed in this section are very worn; all five are ambiguous, and not only for this reason. In

¹For early eastern legends of the cross, see Riessler (1928): they are summarised in Schiller 1972, 12-14.

considering them I am exploring the limits of this thesis, as I will also in the chapter on sculptures with the Lamb instead of the figure of Christ. The sculptures will be described and discussed separately, except for the two from Winchester which both represent the same scene.

Escomb (cat. and pl. 6): This is an upright round headed tapering slab, probably decorated on only one of its broad faces, though the opposite face cannot now be seen. It is probably a grave marker, although it looks well in its modern use as a kind of reredos serving as an altar cross. It shows a tall cross with a head with curved armpits and expanded cusped terminals (type D11). The cross has a base and extends the full height and width of the tapering arched panel with its square cut moulding. The centre of the head is decorated by a deeply cut circle, the centre of which is not simply rounded like a boss but appears to have been modelled in some way. This central circle may have had a central hollow, but this appearance may be the result of damage. Each of the three lower arms has a similar circular element: the upper arm is too damaged to show whether it had a similar decoration. On either side of the cross, touching the corners of the lower arm of the head and completely filling the space between it and the frame is a circular feature in relief, apparently containing some element within an outer moulding. The detail has survived best on the left. Unfortunately the inner detail is too worn to permit of any certain identification.

The cross with its (presumably) five roundels can be seen as a jewelled cross, a descendant of the crux gemmata (see above). It is easy to imagine that the five 'jewels' represent the five wounds of Christ: less easy to prove either that this was so or that devotion to the wounds was a major theme in pre-Conquest devotions. This problem has been discussed by Raw (1970, 240-1) in relation to the five jewels on the cross

bar in the Dream of the Rood. Crosses set with five jewels or with a five fold division at the centre are known in Anglo-Saxon art, both in metal work and sculpture¹. Raw, however, rightly makes the point that the showing of the wounds at the Day of Judgment was a well known theme, and that there are signs of an incipient devotion to the wounds in Christ's side in the eighth-ninth century Book of Nunnaminster².

It is sad that the two roundels below the cross at Escomb are so worn. It is unlikely that they represented evangelist symbols - which would be appropriate in either a symbolic reference to the Crucifixion, or as the Beasts of the Apocalypse in a reference to the Day of Judgment - for it is clear that the frame of the panel arches above the cross with no room for another pair. Another possibility is that they represent the sun and moon, though whether personified or not cannot now be seen: in this case one would have to assume that they were fitted in below the cross because the arch of the panel above left too little space.

The sun and moon had been associated with the Crucifixion from an early date, as may be seen from the Monza ampullae (Schiller 1972, pl. 324). In the iconography of the Crucifixion they can represent either cosmic symbols of Christ's Godhead - His power over all creation - in which case they are symbols of victory; or the darkening which took place at His death. They are also associated with the Last Judgment, again either as cosmic symbols, or as symbols of the earthly light which will be unnecessary for the Lord God will give the Light' (Revelations XXII, 5)³.

'quoniam Dominus Deus illuminabit illas ...' -

¹See for example the Thurnham cross, Bruce Mitford 1967, 290-1; for the Cuthbert cross, Battiscombe 1956, pl. XV: for the sculptured examples see the discussion in chap. 7.

²Bede for instance discusses the reasons why the Risen Christ retained the five wounds: see Migne (1844-66), vol. XCIV, 141-2. Raw (1970), n.2, p.254; de Gray Birch (1889), 77. See also chaps. 4 and 5).

³See also Cynewulf's poem 'Doomsday' translated in Gordon 1954, 284-8; and chap. 5.

The Escomb carving has three elements of which only one, the cross, is certain. It is just possible, however, that it is a surviving trace of that area of Christian imagery in which the last Day is represented by the sign of the Son of Man, linked to the Crucified Christ through the Passion imagery of the cross and the five wounds, linked also perhaps through the cosmic symbolism of sun and moon which belongs to both images. The cross has been most commonly identified with the sign which will appear on the last day (Matthew XXIV, 30). It is one of the signs by which Christ is recognised as God, as are also the five wounds received on the cross and perceived by His disciples at the Resurrection. Bede's fourth and final reason for the retention of the Wounds is that they may be shown to the Jews at the Last Judgment that they may see how much He suffered through them (see above, p. 42).

The date of the sculpture at Escomb depends on its placing within the pre-Conquest series of roundheaded grave markers with the cross. The form of the cross might indicate a date as early as the tenth century: but the Durham cross heads (pls. 14-5, 90-4) are a reminder of how long lived was the type in the north. There is nothing in its imagery (if my interpretation is the right one) which is not implicit in earlier exegetical writings, but the use of isolated symbols of the Passion in art as a flexible means of conveying multiple meanings seems to have been both late and slow in developing. This aspect is discussed further below, and is also briefly discussed with reference to Rothbury in chap. 9.

Weyhill (cat. and pl. 7): This very worn stone is built into a wall. It represents an ornate cross (type B9) decorated with double mouldings half way along the upper and side arms and with, at the centre, a rosette with seven petals. The intention seems to be to portray a

metalwork cross. Above the cross is another motif, separately panelled and now very worn, but possibly representing the Manus Dei reaching out of a cloud formation, or perhaps a wide sleeve, towards the cross¹. The Manus Dei had been a symbol of the presence of God from an early period. From the ninth century it was used by artists in Crucifixion scenes to convey God's acceptance of the sacrifice of Christ. If it is the Manus Dei which is represented here then the same meaning must be attached to its appearance with the empty cross, the symbol of Christ's sacrificial death. It might, however, also represent an early stage in the development of an image of the Binity, discussed further below.

The form of the cross is not unusual in pre-Conquest art, but the elaborate mouldings suggest that the carving belongs to the revival of southern art in the tenth century. Langford II should be compared, among Crucifixion sculptures. A presumably metalwork cross (though of type A1) with elaborate mouldings is shown in the miniature from the New Minster Liber Vitae², in which Cnut and Algifu are shown presenting an altar cross (Talbot Rice 1952, pl. 81).

Lindisfarne (cat. and pl. 8): The iconography of this roundheaded grave marker is enigmatic rather than worn. It is perhaps one of the most interesting sculptures in the pre-Conquest corpus. The opposite face with its procession of armed warriors is, however, more often reproduced in illustrations than the side with the cross (pl. 8).

On this face, a tall empty cross with rectangular arms and small circular armpits (type A12) occupies the centre of the scene. Above, on

¹As suggested by Bickler (1911, 398).

²New Minster Liber Vitae: British Library MS. Stowe 944, f.6.
See also the discussion especially of Langford I and Stepney in chap. 13.

the left, is the concave disc of the sun, and on the right is the moon, also with a concave surface. A hand extends from the border on either side, reaching towards the lateral arms of the cross. Below the cross, on either side, is a bowed worshipping figure: only the upper part of each figure survives. Their dress and sex are uncertain.

Every element of this scene can be paralleled in scenes of the Crucifixion: the cross; sun and moon; the Manus Dei, here oddly duplicated (see below); and the worshipping figures at the foot of the cross. The latter are not to be identified, as far as can be seen, with any of the historical, legendary or symbolic figures which could accompany the Crucifixion image. However, worshipping figures also accompany the Crucifixion at Newent (see chap. 13) and are to be found on a number of manuscript images such as the late ninth century Psalter of Louis the German, where a worshipper/donor figure kneels at the foot of the cross which he grasps (Boinet 1913, pl. CLX, B).

Worshipping donor figures of course also appear in scenes where the cross alone is represented as in the scene from the New Minster Liber Vitae already mentioned in which Cnut and his queen are shown in the act of presenting an altar cross (Talbot Rice 1952, pl. 81). This last scene is particularly interesting since it is also an image of the Veneration of the cross linked to the theme of the Judgment: above it angels point to a mandorla in which Christ as Judge of the world is flanked by Sts. Mary and Peter. As possibly with Escomb, the Lindisfarne stone also presents an imagery of Judgment Day: the cross as the sign of the Son of Man (Matthew XXIV, 30); the worshipping elders, though reduced to two (Revelations IV, 5 and see also the discussions of Ramsbury, chap. 3); the sun and moon (Revelations XX, 5). If the duplicated hands are the hands of God - and it is hard to see what else they could be - then this too could indicate the Godhead of Christ, or God's

acceptance of the sacrifice which justifies the cross as the sign of the Son of Man.

An empty cross, decorated with symbols of the Passion - spear, sponge, crown of thorns and scourge - and over which hovers the Manus Dei, appears in the ninth century Utrecht Psalter (Schiller 1972, pl. 643). Here it is an illustration to Psalm 22. This is one of the psalms of suffering which begins with a description of ill-treatment and mocking, but which also foreshadows the end in looking forward to the day when all the families of earth shall bow before the Lord. The psalm encapsulates the medieval image of the Last Day when men shall bow before what was before mocked. The Utrecht Psalter image is almost unique in early medieval art. A fully developed image of the Arma Christi, a devotional image, belongs to the centuries after the Norman Conquest of England. Images such as that of the donation of the cross in the New Minster Liber Vitae and that at Lindisfarne and perhaps Escomb in their linking of Passion symbolism with that of the Judgment, seem to represent parallel attempts to express the same combination of ideas.

The duplicated hands at Lindisfarne need a further comment. There is a full medieval image of the Trinity also called the Throne of Grace, in which God the Father is shown seated behind and often grasping the cross with the figure of Christ, and with the Holy Spirit between them represented by a Dove (Schiller 1972, pls. 412-4). Examples exist, however, in which only God the Father and Christ are represented, accompanied by personifications of the Sun and Moon drawn from the Crucifixion image and worshipped by adoring saints (Schiller 1972, pl.411). It could be that images such as that of the Liber Vitae and Lindisfarne, and perhaps Weyhill, in their combination of Passion and Judgment, are also on the way towards this developed image. This theme is taken up again in the discussion of the Winchester sculptures, below.

Winchester I and II (cat. and pl. 9): This footstone and the fragment of another with an identical iconography are to be dated to the late tenth, early eleventh century on both archaeological and epigraphic grounds, since the complete example was discovered in situ at the foot of a grave slab which had an inscription (Biddle 1966, 325 and pl.LXIb; Okasha 1971, 126-7).

The complete example is roughly cut at the base for insertion into the ground. The upper half of the carved face has an arched panel enclosed in a square moulding within which is a representation of a large hand extending from the left of the frame to grasp a small staff cross.

There is no exact parallel for this motif, but it is of great interest in the light of the above discussion of Escomb, and especially Lindisfarne. It seems clear that in the late tenth and early eleventh centuries there was a move towards the development of images in which Christ's Godhead and the link between Passion and Judgment was stressed. There seems no other possible explanation for the Winchester image but that it represents the Manus Dei not only accepting but grasping the cross on which Christ died - an unusual but clear statement of the belief that God and Christ are one. There is other evidence of the Winchester interest in the image of the Binity¹. Weyhill, too, is within Winchester's sphere of influence. This new thinking is more likely to have spread from the south to the north, perhaps through the contacts we know were occasionally maintained with the community of St. Cuthbert at Chester-le-Street. Aethelstan, for example, gave splendid gifts to the community of St. Cuthbert c.925 (Symeon 1882, I, 75; and see Battiscombe 1956, 30-5

¹See Beckwith 1972, 126, no. 41 and pls. 78-9; also Kantorowicz 1947, 74, note 6.

for this and other contacts). There is no link, however, between any of these diverse images, and it seems only that they indicate a tenth or even eleventh century interest in the promise of Redemption through the Passion and particularly the death on the Cross, at the Last Day.

Conclusions: There are few general conclusions which can be drawn from the very varied sculptures which have been discussed in this chapter. Only one (Whithorn) and that the least safely datable to the period, reproduces a symbolic image which could be described as a 'pure' reference to the Crucifixion event. The remainder combine in various ways the image of the Crucifixion with that of some other major theme or themes, with which it is closely linked in doctrinal or exegetical terms. The Redemption is the linked theme with those sculptures with the cross and Sts. John and Mary. Those with the cross and other symbolic figures and elements seem to represent images of the Last Day, but through their emphasis and the stress on the identity of Christ and God, they also seem to be concerned with the promises of Redemption. It is unlikely that any of these sculptures (with the exception of Whithorn) is earlier than the tenth century: they seem to represent a movement towards devotional images - which up to the present seems to have been regarded as a development of the Trinity and Arma Christi - entirely of the later middle ages. It is interesting to note that these themes were developing in centuries when the image of Christ in the loincloth was already predominant, and in which representations of the suffering and dead Christ on the cross were also developing (chaps. 9-13). Such images do not bridge the gap between dead and risen, ascended Christ so clearly as the robed iconography which was dominant in the early part of the period (chap. 6). Possibly the images discussed in this chapter were developed to fill this gap in a different way. The link between Crucifixion and Judgment is an important and recurring theme in the literature of the Anglo-Saxons

(chap. 5) and it is not therefore surprising to find it also recurring as a theme in art.

CHAPTER 3

The Lamb as a Symbol of the Passion

Like the cross, the Lamb in Christian art rarely symbolises the Crucified Christ in a straightforward way. The identification of the Lamb with Christ occurs in two places in the New Testament. In John I, 29, John the Baptist recognises Christ and points Him out with the words 'There is the Lamb of God, it is he who takes away the sins of the world'. In Revelations, always attributed to John, the Lamb symbolising Christ appears with various attributes indicating both His death (the marks of slaughter) and His power as God (the book with the seven seals, a variety of worshipping figures and creatures). The Lamb thus represents both the living Christ, the willing victim, and the Crucified but also risen, ascended and glorified Christ. Interpretation of the symbolic meaning of the Lamb in any particular image rests on the attributes, figures and inscriptions which accompany it.

In many images of the Lamb, the cross does not appear. In an early version of the Apocalyptic image on a Roman sarcophagus, for example, the Lamb is shown standing on a mound from which flow the four rivers of Paradise, and worshipped by two more Lambs perhaps representing apostles (Beckwith 1970, pl. 32). It could also appear as an attribute of John the Baptist, combined with details which link the words of the saint with the Apocalyptic vision, as on the throne of Archbishop Maximian in Ravenna (Beckwith 1970, pl. 94).

From Revelations also comes the image of the Adoration of the Lamb, as for example in the miniature from the Codex Aureus of St. Emmeram of Regensburg, c.870 (Beckwith 1964, fig. 61). Here the Lamb stands in a circular medallion moving to the right. His head, in a cruciferous nimbus, is frontal. Beneath his feet is the scroll with the seven seals, and also present is a chalice into which His blood pours. Below the circle

are the twenty four elders, casting their crowns before Him. The cleansing power of the Blood of the Lamb is also part of the Apocalyptic vision. The chalice here links the image with that of the Eucharist - an interesting link in view of the developments in Eucharistic doctrine in the ninth century discussed in chap. 4.

The images of the Lamb which form the subject of the present chapter are all on or accompanied by the cross, an image which is not explicit in the Apocalyptic vision of Revelations, but which as I noted in chapter 2 was the common interpretation of the sign of the Son of Man (Matthew XXIV, 30). Any image of the Lamb, however, is likely to have apocalyptic associations, and possibly none of the sculptures to be discussed is purely a symbolic reference to the Crucifixion.

In the Eastern church, the Lamb as a symbol of the Passion was specifically abolished at the 'Trullan' Council - a synod at Constantinople in 692. This was clearly a result of an iconoclastic controversy which had torn the eastern church and which had centred on a heresy concerning the Person of Christ. The attitude to Iconoclasm in the West is discussed in chap. 4. It is clear, however, that Iconoclasm had little support outside the Eastern church and indeed the introduction of the Agnus Dei into the Western mass at the end of the seventh century by Pope Sergius led to the further development of the image and an increase in its popularity (Klauser 1969, 47, 67). It had been used in the liturgy of the Eastern church as early as the sixth century. The presence of the Lamb on the cross cannot, therefore, be taken as evidence of the early date of a sculpture, as has for example been suggested for Wirksworth (see below). The development of the image and its sculptural context have to be taken into consideration in the same way as for the Crucifixion with the figure of Christ.

i The Lamb encircled on the cross, without other attributes
Hoddon (cat. and pl. 10)

The Lamb without attributes appears only once in a pre-Conquest sculpture. It is on an incomplete head of type D9, carved on only one face. The head is outlined by a double roll moulding. The arms appear to have been plain except for an eight petalled flower incomplete on the fragment with the Lamb, but also appearing near the end of a second fragment of cross arm said to have formed part of this cross (Radford 1952-3, no. 23). The centre of the head is a circular medallion with a border of circles in relief. In the circle, with its head breaking the border, stands the Lamb, facing left and with raised head and drooping tail. Its fleece is conveyed by scalloped lines. There were certainly no other motifs within the circle.

Such an image is at least as early as the sixth century. There is for example a lamb on one leaf of an ivory diptych of north Italian origin in Milan (Beckwith 1970, pl. 120). It occupies the same position as the cross on the other leaf but the reference to the Crucifixion is not made more explicit. This is no different from the image at Hoddon, nor is it markedly different from a second miniature from the Codex Aureus of St. Emmeram in which the encircled Lamb stands at the centre of a page, with, however, a scroll at its feet¹. The Lamb at the centre of the cross seems to have appeared first in the late seventh century, when it is found on a cross of Justin II (Beckwith 1970, pl. 83). Here however the encircled Lamb holds a staff cross, the same symbol with which figures of the Risen Christ were often represented. Such images of the living Lamb, with or without the staff cross, then seem to refer to the Lamb of the Apocalypse: unlike either of the images in the Codex Aureus of

¹Schiller (1972), pl. 398. This image is from the Incipit page of St. Luke's Gospel.

St. Emmeram already referred to, they carry no particular reference to the Eucharist. Their position at the centre of the cross, however, is a clear identification of the Lamb as a symbol of Christ crucified.

The Hoddon Lamb, therefore, follows an early but longlived iconography, and the cross head can only be dated by its style and its relations with other pre-Conquest sculptures. The plainness of the head and the rosetted decoration recall an early phase of the free standing cross found at sites such as Hexham and Whitby (Cramp 1974, pl. XXIII, c, d). The cusped head, however, and the vine scrolls suggest that it should perhaps be placed in the ninth century. The cusped head, for example, is also a feature of the Rothbury cross which is unlikely to be earlier than about the second quarter of the ninth century (chap. 9 and pl. 81)¹.

ii The Lamb, on a cross, accompanied by symbols of the Evangelists or Apocalyptic beasts.

Hart I (cat. and pl. 11); Wirksworth (cat. and pls. 12A and B); Ramsbury (cat. and pls. 13A and B).

On Hart I (pl. 11), the Lamb appears on one broad face of an incomplete cross head (type A9). The Lamb is moving to the right, with backward turned head. Its nimbus has two roundels cut out of it, near its edge: one of these cuts the circle and the impression is of a cruciferous nimbus. As far as can be seen, there are no other objects with it. Two roundels cut into the face of the cross below and before it seem merely decorative, if part of the original design. The Lamb is delicately carved, with slender legs and distinguishable hoofs. On its right, in the cross arm, a winged beast with a similar halo flies towards

¹Decorative carving on one face only is no criterion of an early date. Compare for example the Kirkburton staff-crucifix (chap. 11 and pl. 109) which is likely to be tenth-eleventh century in date.

the Lamb. Only its forelegs are represented. It has four wings and a rather blunt head (see below). It carries a book with, on the cover, a circular depression, perhaps ^{the setting} for a jewel. In the lower arm is a second beast, with its head, possibly frontal, towards the centre. It possibly has horns. Only two wings are shown (it is incomplete), and it too carries a book.

The winged creatures as Divine attributes originated in Ezekiel's vision of God (Ezekiel, I): there they are described as having bodies of human form but also wings and the heads of a man, an eagle, an ox or bull, and a lion. In Revelations IV, 7-8, they appear as attributes of the Lamb, as an indication of its Divine status. Their identification as symbols of the four Evangelists began early in the history of exegetical writings, though different writers made different ascriptions: western exegetes and artists gradually came to accept the identification made by St. Jerome, although an eastern pattern laid down by Irenaeus seems to have had some effect on early Insular artists (Werner 1969)¹. The order laid down by St. Jerome is (following the order of the Gospels): Man, Lion, Ox or Bull, Eagle. At Hart the pattern seems to be:

?

? Lion (Mark)

 Bull (Luke)

which suggests that the order laid down by Jerome was being followed. Here, too, the beasts are positively identified as Evangelists^s by the books they carry. They had appeared so identified as early as the sixth century at least, in scenes in which they accompanied representations of the Risen Christ in human form, as on the apse mosaic of St. Apollinare in Classe, Ravenna (Beckwith 1970, pl. 95). The Lamb in such scenes seems

¹See also the discussion of Wirksworth below.

a straight substitution for the human figure of Christ, as Werner (1969, 8) has shown. The introduction of the cross into this image, however, suggests that the link between the Apocalyptic Lamb and the Agnus Dei is being demonstrated.

The desire to stress this link is certainly foundⁱⁿ an image comparable to Hart I in an eighth century copy of Orosius' Historiae adversum paganos in Laon (Charlemagne 1965, fig. 49; Werner 1969, fig. 11). Here the Lamb, with cross nimbus, stands at the centre of a cross. It has a turned back head, and like Hart, no other attributes. It is accompanied by the four winged creatures, in circles at the end of the arms of the cross. The Lamb is identified by the words Ecce Agnus Dei, and is thus related closely to the meaning of these words in the Mass. The image seems a first step towards those images in ninth century manuscripts such as that in the Codex Aureus of St. Emmeram (see above) in which the Lamb is accompanied by the chalice to stress the link between Crucifixion, Risen Christ, and the meaning of the Eucharist. Such an image also suggests one reason why the symbols of the four evangelists were among those chosen to enrich the expanded Crucifixion image of the ninth century, since the Lamb at the centre of the cross links both the Maiestas image of the Risen Christ and the image of the Crucified Christ, and could be seen as a substitute for either.

A date in the first half of the ninth century would be consistent with the form of the Hart I cross head, and with the fine delicate plant scroll on its reverse. A cross head at Masham in Yorkshire dated to the same period may be compared for the way in which the plant scroll spreads into all four arms around a central boss or motif (Collingwood 1927a, fig. 133).

At Wirksworth (pl. 12A) is a large fragment which appears to be the cover of an important tomb. The Lamb on the cross is here one scene among several arranged in two rows one above the other. It is in the upper row of the sculpture as it is now, built into the wall of the church,

but as both rows face the same way it was presumably meant to be seen from one side. The scene has a broad-armed plain cross (type A1) which has been described as a Greek cross, that is as equal-armed (Werner 1969, 8). This is not strictly true, as the lower arm is in fact longer than the upper, though only slightly (pl. 12B). A Greek cross would lend support to the theory of an eastern origin of the iconography of the tomb cover but in this case the symmetrical layout could have been dictated by the need to cram the cross and figures in its spandrels into a relatively constricted space. What is true is that the cross quarters the area devoted to the image, which is unframed. The shaft of this cross is slightly damaged, but was probably undecorated. The Lamb is in the centre of the cross, facing left, its legs curled beneath it and its head drooping. It is quite shallowly and crudely carved. In the spandrels of the cross are the symbols of the four evangelists, with the man symbol of St. Matthew clearly identifiable top right and the eagle of St. John bottom left. The other two figures are not readily distinguishable as the bull or lion. These symbols are half figures of humans with beast heads. All but St. Matthew have their heads turned towards the cross. Their bodies are frontal and each figure holds a book.

A date prior to 700 was suggested for this sculpture by Cockerton (1962), on the grounds that the image of the Lamb was abolished by the 'Trullan' council of 692. The writ of this council did not run in the west, however, (see above and chap. 4), and such an early date is very unlikely. Some of the other scenes on the slab are readily identifiable, others are enigmatic but if some interpretations which have been put forward are correct, they would also be difficult to parallel in the seventh century¹.

¹See for example those suggested in Kurth 1945.

Werner in an important article has compared the scene with the Lamb with the four symbols page in the Book of Durrow (Werner 1969, 8). He there considered that both the sculpture and the manuscript depended on a now lost eastern, possibly Coptic model, representing a Maiestas image in which a Lamb at the centre of the cross is surrounded by the four beasts in the order in which they appear in the visions of Ezekiel and St. John - that is:

angel eagle

lion ox

rather than in the order of the gospels

man (Matthew) lion (Mark)

ox (Luke) eagle (John)

following the western tradition established by St. Jerome. His point seems valid for Durrow, where indeed the symbols of f. 2r appear in the eastern order. At Wirksworth, however, the order appears to be

man

eagle ? ox

and if the identification of the ox is correct, the lion would be top left.

This is not the order found on the Durrow page, nor is it the order followed by St. Irenaeus and also followed in Durrow by the whole page symbols preceding each Gospel. It is much more likely an odd transposition of the Jerome tradition, reading from right to left rather than from left to right. The more usual placing is found further north, on the Crucifixion panel of the cross at Sandbach (see chap. 12).

The Lamb at Wirksworth is of a most unusual type, because it lies with drooping head. It is difficult to know whether it is meant to be a seated Lamb, carved by an unskilful artist, or whether it is meant to be shown dead, just as Christ from the ninth century is sometimes shown dead on the cross. I can find no parallel for such a direct exchange,

as this would be, of the Lamb for the human figure. The Crucifixion is most commonly related to the Lamb through the presence of the cross, or of blood streaming from the side of the living Lamb, or through the presence of symbols of the Passion such as the spear and sponge - these last from the tenth century onwards (Schiller 1972, pls. 397, 399). A Lamb with backward turned bent head which appears to be staggering occurs in an eleventh century Reichenau manuscript (Schiller 1972, pl. 402). The Lamb shown pierced by the lance is found c.1000 (Schiller 1972, pl. 401). Perhaps there was an intention to equate the Crucified Christ with the Lamb very closely at Wirksworth. Like Hart I, therefore, it is a Maiestas image with the bust of Christ replaced by the Lamb, and accompanied by the four beasts in their dual capacity as witnesses to the truth of the Crucifixion and as companions of the divine throne.

The slab could be as early as the late eighth century, though it is also possibly of the early ninth. Its carving is not different in style from that of the crosses at Bakewell and Bradbourne (see chap. 9).

At Ramsbury (pl. 13A and B), the Lamb motif appears on the top of a rectangular block of stone, clearly a recumbent grave cover. The main feature of the design is a raised latin cross (type A1) with a rolled border which extends from edge to edge of the stone. The stone is damaged and incomplete, and the upper and right arms of the cross and the top right spandrel are missing. In the centre of the cross, its head rising into the upper arm, is a seated Lamb, recognisable as much from its position as from its appearance, which is not markedly lamb-like. Its hind legs are drawn up beneath it, its kneeling forelegs extend into the left arm of the cross. Its feet are quite hoof-like. It faces left.

Below the Lamb, the shaft of the cross is decorated, first by three rows of arcading, with below, in a small square panel with a plain flat

border, a single interlaced knot, very shallowly incised. The remaining space within the shaft is occupied by a small robed figure, possibly seated and either winged or with hands held above its head.

The sunken spandrels each contain a carving. The top left has a small winged beast flying upwards. The top right is missing. The bottom right is a serpentine, double-outlined beast, head down, whose ribbon-like tongue or lower jaw penetrates its body three times. The carving at the bottom left was possibly similar, but is very damaged.

It is not possible to identify the animals in the angles of the cross positively as evangelist symbols or apocalyptic beasts, though the creatures at the top left could be a winged lion or bull. Certainly the beast at the bottom right has been interpreted with more regard to period and regional taste than to the iconography of any recognisable theme. The seated posture of the Lamb might, however, indicate what the sculptor of Wirksworth was aiming for: the seated Lamb, as a literal interpretation of the enthroned Lamb in the Apocalyptic vision, and identified with Christ crucified by being placed at the centre of the cross. The tiny figure below is possibly a reminiscence of the twenty four elders, though one of the angels round the throne would be equally appropriate. It could also have been a way of getting in the symbol of St. Matthew if the love of symmetrical animal ornament in the spandrels had completely overcome the dictates of iconography. As with Hart and Wirksworth, however, the image of the Lamb is related to the Maiestas image, though the very dominant cross suggests an emphasis on Crucifixion symbolism.

The date of the Ramsbury slab is in my view difficult to determine because of its damaged state. The combination of a free, winged creature with a double-outlined ribbon animal fitted into a rectangular panel is, however, still closely in contact with a pre-Viking manuscript tradition which extended from the late seventh into the ninth century. On the other hand the ribbon animal is of a tighter, more organised type than

the ribbon animal involved in interlace on a cross shaft from the same site which Kendrick dates to the same period, which he considered to be the second half of the ninth century (Kendrick 1938, pl. C). The animal on the slab is penetrated by its tongue, a feature which Kendrick (1938, 145, 214) held to be a ninth century feature. Its origins are earlier, however, and an example of penetration can be seen in the Durham Gospels, f. 2r¹ in the animals in the cross stroke of the second letter, N (Kendrick 1960, pl. 50e). This manuscript is certainly no later than the early eighth century (see chap. 6). This method of interlacing did become more popular later, however, and a date early in the ninth century, as suggested in Cramp (1975, 187) seems at least possible. Unlike Kendrick (1938, 214) I do not consider the unusual seated Lamb at Ramsbury particularly close to the Lamb on the Aethelwith ring (Wilson 1964, pl. XI) since that on the slab is not nimbed and its erect neck position could be the result of the confined cross space: there is, therefore, no need to see it as later in the century. In attitude it is certainly much closer to the Wirksworth slab.

It is probable that other sculptures with this theme have survived as fragments too incomplete for inclusion in this thesis. Cramp (1978b) has brought together a number of fragments of cross heads, for example, which possibly represented this theme. These are, from the eighth-ninth century period, two fragments of the head of the Ruthwell cross (Cramp 1978b, pls. VIII, IX, and XIII); one arm of a cross from Otley, Yorkshire (Cramp 1971, pl. 45, 4); and one arm of the cross from Auckland St. Andrew of which part of the shaft is discussed in chap. 6 (Cramp 1978b, pl. XVII). One which is possibly from the tenth-eleventh centuries, however, is a cross

¹Durham MS A.II.17. See chap. 6 and Coatsworth (forthcoming) 'The Art of the Durham Gospels' in T.J. Brown, ed. Early English Manuscripts in Facsimile, Copenhagen.

arm from Aycliffe, Co. Durham (Morris 1978, pl. 6.10; Cramp 1978b, 128 n.5). On these fragments only the evangelists and/or their symbols survive, and there is now means of knowing whether the centre of the head was occupied by a Christ Majesty or the Lamb; and if the Lamb, whether this was represented without further symbolism as in the three examples discussed above or with added elements as on the Durham cross heads discussed below. The fragment, therefore, cannot be discussed further here, except by pointing to the difficulty which they raise in any attempt to draw neat conclusions from the material that has survived more or less complete.

iii The Lamb accompanied by a staff cross
Durham I (cat. and pl. 14); Durham IV (cat. and pl. 15).

The Lamb motif occurs twice at Durham on cross heads which are usually dated between 995 and the late eleventh century on both historical and archaeological grounds (see chap. 10 and cat.). The two cross heads differ from each other in style and competence of carving and the opposite face of Durham IV is different in iconography from any of the other three heads found at the same time and place (see chap. 7). The programme of heads I - III is also discussed in chap. 10.

The lower arm of the head of Durham I is missing (pl. 14). The face of the cross is edged by a single roll moulding. In the upper arm, a figure stands with his feet turned out on the central circle. His hair or halo is curled up at the ends. A human head in relief appears above each shoulder, that on the left facing centre, that on the right turned away. These heads probably represent personifications of the sun and moon: the latter is often shown turned away (Schiller 1972, pl. 362). The sun and moon belong to both Crucifixion and Apocalyptic imagery (see chap. 2). Triangles in relief fill the remaining space in the upper

arm, on either side of the figure's legs.

In the left arm, the focal point of a crowded scene is a beast-headed figure surrounded by half-figures and busts of angels, and what looks like a bird perched on a branch. In the right arm, a central beast-headed figure with claw-or paw-like feet appears with the half-figure of an angel and the head of another; a bird-like creature; and a monkey-like creature on a branch. The central figure stands on a kind of perch and a single slender strand coils round him.

The centre of the head is surrounded by a single roll moulding. Within the circle, a Lamb faces left and seems to be in movement. Its ears are pricked, its tail hangs down, its fleece is lightly indicated, and it has three-toed feet. Its right foreleg is raised and rests on an object represented as a square in relief. In front of its feet is a raised circle. Behind it is a long-stemmed cross on a rectangular base with a double contoured outline.

Taken as a whole, the head is an unusually full depiction of the vision in Revelations *IV*, where the Lamb is described as standing within the circle of living creatures and elders. The origin of winged creatures as Divine attributes in Ezekiel I has already been discussed. Here, though it is impossible to identify even the form of the heads in the right and left arms of the cross with certainty, the combination of one man-headed with two beast-headed figures suggests that these were intended as winged creatures and perhaps as Evangelist symbols. The square object beneath its feet then must be the book with the seven seals (Revelations V, 1). The circular object before it is more difficult to interpret but an architectural relief of the same period in France has a markedly similar iconography, and includes the staff cross on its base. There the circular object which is marked with a cross has been identified as a representation of the Host (Schiller 1972, pl. 305). The staff cross and the Host, evangelists-cum-winged creatures and the Sun and Moon on Durham I link the Lamb of Revelations with its 'marks of slaughter' to the

death of Christ on the cross and the significance of this in the Eucharist.

Dolley (1971) in his discussion of the late Saxon iconography of the Lamb in movement before a staff cross considered that all referred to the Agnus Dei of the liturgy and therefore to the words of John the Baptist in John I, 29 rather than to the Apocalyptic Lamb (but see chap. 8). Certainly he produces very convincing evidence that a liturgical innovation which brought into use the petition dona nobis pacem became general in the early eleventh century and that this change, as it affected a chant by the congregation would have popular interest: the liturgical change seems to have encouraged a new iconography of the Lamb which influenced coins and the design of a brooch from Sulgrave, all of which are dated by Dolley to the first quarter of the eleventh century.

If the round object on the Durham heads is indeed the Host, this would support his interpretation of the Lamb as the Agnus Dei: yet the imagery of the surrounding arms make it clear that this Agnus Dei is being consciously identified with the Apocalyptic Lamb. Other scenes on the head seem to indicate that the link between John I, 29 and the Apocalyptic Lamb is made in a different way. The full programme of the heads I - III is discussed in chap. 10 (see also Coatsworth 1978).

The Lamb with the cross and book or scroll had appeared much earlier in western art outside England. The Lamb with the staff cross either before or behind it, as one of the symbols of the Passion, began to appear in the tenth century (Schiller 1972, pl. 399). The Durham iconography seems to be taken from this type rather than the earlier type in which the Lamb holds a staff cross as in Maiestas images of the Risen Christ¹. This too strengthens the interpretation of the Durham scene as a

¹As on the sixth century cross of Justin II, Beckwith (1970), pl. 83.

combination of the Agnus Dei and Apocalyptic images.

Durham IV (pl. 15) is more crudely carved than the other three. The greater crudity of the face with the Lamb can be measured by the very squashed looking central circle. The upper and side arms of this face contain interlace only. The lower arm has a snake-tailed beast reminiscent of the animal below the ?Baptism scene of Durham III though the remains suggest its body was less substantial (see chap. 10). Except for this, therefore, the central scene has lost its Apocalyptic setting, so that the intellectual interest displayed by heads I -III must have been short-lived indeed.

The central circle appears to be a crude copy of the same motif on Durham I. The Lamb faces left, with pricked ears and drooping head and tail. The fleece is represented by parallel vertical stripes. The right foreleg is raised and rests on a square object, which may again be identified as the book with the seven seals. The circular object has been moved to above the flank of the Lamb: this move seems to have been dictated by the different head position given to the Lamb, but it also suggests, whatever the interpretation given in the case of Durham I, the carver of Durham IV saw it merely as a space filler. The long-stemmed cross with its rectangular base behind the Lamb is much the same as on Durham I. All one can say is that Durham IV is secondary to I, and dependent on it, since it offers both a cruder and a reduced image. It can hardly be much later (see chap. 10), but is certainly be a different hand.

Conclusions

An important point to make is that none of the surviving sculptures is likely to date from much before c.800, and it is in fact possible that the four earliest - Hoddum, Hart, Wirksworth and Ramsbury - could all have been made in the first half of the ninth century. This means that the Lamb motif was apparently popular in a period in which the Crucifixion

itself was well established as an image at least in Northumbria and Mercia (chaps. 6 and 9) and indeed in which several variations in iconography of the Crucifixion had become established in these areas, some showing contact with ninth century Carolingian developments of this theme (chaps. 4 and 9). There are thus no grounds for seeing the Lamb image in England as connected with Iconoclasm or iconoclastic tendencies. Its development at the same time as the Crucifixion image suggests rather it had a different function, perhaps fulfilling a need to associate themes which could not otherwise be expressed easily in one image. Since in all cases discussed both the Lamb and cross appear, the complex of ideas they sum up must refer to the identification of the Apocalyptic Lamb with the crucified, risen and ascended Christ, and with the Agnus Dei of the Mass. This would certainly be in line with the development of eucharistic piety from the ninth century (see chap. 4). It is possible only to speculate that the increasing popularity of the Christ clad only in a loincloth (and, therefore, shown as a suffering and later dying human figure)¹ led to a need to associate the crucified and risen Christ more frequently in the Lamb image: the robed image associates them in the depiction of Christ himself.

The iconography of Durham I seems only a more explicit elaboration of the same idea, made under the impulse of a further addition to the words of the Mass. More clearly than the earlier examples, or Durham IV, it exemplifies the intellectual (and didactic) impulses which underlie the adoption or development of iconography in religious art.

The fragments mentioned briefly in section ii above do not, from the dates which have been assigned to them, seem to invalidate these few conclusions, whatever their actual iconography. Rather, from their distribution and date (fig. 3) they seem to confirm that the Lamb and related themes were well established in Northumbria and Mercia in the latter

¹See figs. 5 and 6, and chaps. 9-13.

part of the pre-Viking period, with only Ruthwell possibly as early as the mid-eighth century (see chaps. 1 and 9). The distribution and date even of the fragments suggests that the one outlier at Ramsbury, was carved under Mercian influence, which may assist in supporting the early ninth century date I have accepted for it.

C H A P T E R 4

The Effects of Developments in Christology, Eucharistic Doctrine and Devotional Piety on Attitudes to the Depiction of Christ Crucified in the Early Medieval Period.

The iconography of the Crucifixion was relatively late in making its appearance in art, and slow in the early stages of its evolution. This view, which is based on the numbers of surviving representations from all sources (and which are not numerous even from as late as the eighth century) is generally accepted, even though the causes of such tardiness are a matter of argument (below). A much greater quantity of comparative material, however, immediately becomes available when one turns to representations which have been dated to the ninth century and later.

By the eighth century there had appeared two main variations in the dress of Christ on the cross - the long robe (sleeveless and sleeved); and the loincloth - but these are found in very unequal proportions in the surviving corpus. The early history of the loincloth is in fact very difficult to trace throughout the sixth to the eighth centuries (chap. 9) in contrast to the robed types in the same period, for which a number of developments can be demonstrated quite convincingly (chap. 6). From the ninth century, however, there is a marked change in this picture. The robed types fall into comparative obscurity with some stages in their continuing development difficult to trace (chaps. 7 and 8); while the loincloth types form a clear majority among surviving works, and it is among them that we see the most interesting new developments. These include the expanded Carolingian image with the addition of symbolic figures and elements either not seen before or found only in a simpler aniconic form; and the admission into the iconography of both Eastern and Western churches of figures of Christ clearly sagging and drooping in suffering and death (types 2 and 3, see especially chaps. 8, 9, 12 and 13).

This brief analysis is based on the available published comparative material, but as the chapter divisions indicated above suggest many of

the same features are found in pre-Conquest English Sculpture. These cannot be seen only as local phenomena when some of the changes they manifest have an international dimension. It is important, therefore, to see, if possible, why the ninth century should have such an apparent importance since it seems to emerge either as an era of change or as one in which changes initiated earlier became established and began to bear fruit.

One possible line of approach to this problem has been through the study of attitudes towards the depiction of Christ crucified expressed by theologians and exegetes up to and including this important period. Most of the existing work in this field has been undertaken with either the rich supply of Carolingian or Byzantine material in mind; the evidence from other areas has not been taken into account. In the following pages I have attempted to give an account of these studies, to relate them to evidence from other sources, and to consider their usefulness in relation to the matter in hand.

Possibly the earliest known representation of a crucified figure is a graffito of c.200 found on the Palatine Hill in Rome, where, however, the figure is depicted with an ass's head. This has never been accepted as proving the existence of a Crucifixion iconography among Christian groups at such an early date. It has been explained as either an attempt by an individual to mock a Christian believer, or as evidence for some diluted form of those beliefs influenced by paganism (Dinkler 1967, 153).

There are also several gems engraved with a Crucifixion scene (see for example Schiller 1972, pl. 321). Some of these have been dated from as early as the second and third centuries (Derchain 1964, 109-13). It is difficult to use these as evidence for the early development of the image, however, for their early dating has been disputed, and some scholars have seen these, too, as evidence for Gnosticism rather than Christianity (Dinkler 1967).

The reasons for the tardy appearance of certainly Christian representations are open to debate. A common view is that put forward by Réau (1956, 476): that there was an actual disinclination to depict the death of Christ while the form of that death was the common method of dealing with criminals. Reil (1930, 4) thought that the influence of heresies such as Docetism, which asserted that the Incarnation was an illusion only, prevented any naturalistic representation of the Crucifixion in the early centuries. Certainly somewhat later and in the Byzantine East heresies concerning the Person of Christ had a marked effect on the representation of Christ. Then, however, the heresy was widespread and allied to political power. It does not seem reasonable to suppose that the mainstream of Christianity had its artistic expression dictated by heretical doctrines.

Within orthodox Christianity there was, however, a continuing influence from Judaism in the matter of representing the Divine. Chadwick (1967, 277-81) notes several examples of iconomachy among early Christian writers which clearly express Judaic conservatism and perhaps also a fear of the influence of idolatry in a predominantly pagan society. Tertullian and Clement of Alexandria, for example, regarded the second commandment as binding on all Christians. The Council of Elvira (c.300-315) recorded its disapproval of paintings in churches. Eusebius objected to the sale of pictures of Christ at the beginning of the fourth century and nearly a hundred years later Epiphanius of Salamis (c.403) tore down a curtain in a church porch because it had on it pictures of Christ and some saints. Western Christian writers of the early medieval period always took this anti-idolatrous strain within Christianity very seriously, even when they concluded pictures and images were permissible for certain uses: this will become clear in the discussion of western attitudes to the Eastern iconoclastic controversies.

Other motives for the slow appearance of the Crucifixion theme in very early centuries could have been prudent avoidance of overt representations

of a Christian theme while the religion was proscribed; and later, the lack of any available model on which to build (Grabar 1968, 131 ff.).

From the time of Constantine's conversion and the acceptance of Christianity as the official religion of the Roman Empire, the symbol of the cross alone, and soon that of the cross with the Lamb, must have served in many cases to fill the lack of an image of Christ crucified. It is not possible, however, to see these images as mere fore-runners, or even as simple substitutes for the image of Christ crucified in iconoclastic periods. As we have seen above (chaps. 2 and 3), the images of the Lamb and cross went on being used in the West to link the theme of the Passion and Death of Christ with other related themes, such as redemption and judgment, throughout the early medieval period and beyond. On the other hand, the earliest surviving certain depictions of the crucifixion theme date from as early as the third-fifth centuries (see below and chap. 9). It seems reasonable, therefore, to look at all streams of Christian thought, and not only the iconoclastic, to discover both the ideas which gave impetus to the creation and development of a crucifixion iconography, and those which retarded it.

The iconography of the crucifixion from the third to the eighth century will be discussed in more detail in chaps. 6 and 9, as an introduction to Anglo-Saxon examples of the theme. It is interesting to note, however, that while a limited variety of types had evolved by the eighth century, all examples share some features in common. For example, all show Christ erect on the cross, without sagging (type 1); his eyes are shown open even when his side is pierced with the lance (an act which historically takes place after his death, John XIX, 34); he is strongly distinguished from accompanying figures by being shown larger or raised above them, as well as being the centre of the composition. Subsidiary figures do not make dramatic gestures, and are limited to the figures from the biblical narrative, with the exception of angels and seraphim. A majority of surviving examples represent Christ in the priestly robes of the risen

Christ, rather than in the loincloth of his human suffering. Symbols and personifications of any kind are absent. These representations seem clearly to stress both the historicity of the event, and the belief that Christ as God triumphed over His death on the cross.

Christology - the definition of the Person of Christ - has been called the chief work of the early church. The definitive formula was laid down at the Council of Chalcedon in 451:

Following therefore the Holy Fathers, we confess one and the same our Lord Jesus Christ, and we all teach harmoniously (that he is) the same perfect in God-head, the same perfect in manhood, truly God and truly man, the same of a reasonable soul and body; consubstantial with the father in Godhead, and the same consubstantial with us in manhood, like us in all things except sin; begotten before ages of the Father in Godhead, the same in the last days for us; and for our salvation (born) of Mary the virgin theotokos in manhood, one and the same Christ, Son, Lord, unique; acknowledged in two natures without confusion, without change, without division, without separation - the difference of the natures being by no means taken away because of the union, but rather the distinctive character of each nature being preserved, and (each) combining in one Person or hypostasis - not divided or separated into two Persons, but one and the same Son and only begotten God, Word, Lord Jesus Christ; as the prophets of old and the Lord Jesus Christ himself taught us about him, and the symbol of the Fathers has handed down to us (Hardy 1954, 373).¹

A more emotional statement of the same position is to be found in the Tome of Pope Leo, a document which was approved as orthodox at the Council of Chalcedon and was very influential in the western church. It was written in the fifth century in reply to Eutyches, who held that there was only one nature in Christ after the union - the basis of the heresies which tore the eastern church for several centuries. One quotation suffices to demonstrate the orthodoxy of the Tome:

As then - to pass by many points - it does not belong to the same nature to weep with feelings of pity over a dead friend and, after the mass of stone has been removed from the grave where he had lain for four days, by a voice of command to raise him to life again; or to hang on the wood and to make all the elements tremble after daylight had been turned into night; or to be transfixed with nails

1. The full Greek text is given in Schwartz, 1947-74, Tom. II, Vol. II, pp. 325-6.

Footnote p. 72:

I. 'sicut ergo, ut multa præteream, non eiusdem naturæ est flere miserationis affectu amicum mortuum et eundem remoto quadriduanæ aggere sepulturæ ad uocis imperium excitare rediuuium aut ligno pendere et in noctem luce conuersa omnia elementa tremefacere aut clavis transfixum esse et paradisi portas fidei latfonis aperire, ita non eiusdem naturæ est dicere ego et pater unum sumus et dicere pater maior me est. quamuis enim in domino Iesu Christo dei et hominis una persona sit, aliud tamen est unde in utroque communis est contumelia, aliud unde communis est gloria. de nostro enim illi est minor patre humanitas, de patre illi est æqualis cum patre diuinitas.

Schwartz 1914-74, Tom. II, vol. II, 1, p. 29.

and to open the gates of paradise to the faith of the robber, so it does not belong to the same nature to say "I and the Father are one", and to say "the Father is greater than I"...; ... for from what belongs to us he has that manhood which is inferior to the Father; while from the Father he has equal Godhead with the Father. (Hardy, 1954, 365-6).¹

Unlike the East, the western church was rarely troubled by outbreaks of formal monophysitism after the fifth century (Martin, E.J. ed., 1930, 127 et passim). It continued to be involved on a conciliar level, however, and the heresies in the east were never far from the minds of scholars and theologians. One might see a need to give visual expression to a Christian orthodoxy as one impulse which lay behind the development of a Crucifixion iconography.

The last council on the subject which the West regarded as ecumenical, the Third Council of Constantinople (Sixth Ecumenical) in 681 issued a clear statement that in Christ there are two genuine wills:

not as this is sometimes understood in the sense of a split human personality, but in that of the fulness of the humanity as well as the deity of the Son of God. (Hardy 1954, 36).

The Anglo-Saxon church knew of this council. Pope Agatho appealed to the various national churches for declarations of orthodoxy to be presented at a preparatory synod in Rome in 680. Archbishop Theodore in England summoned a council at Hatfield in 679, and recorded the unity of the English bishops and teachers of the Faith in a synodical letter which was presented in Rome by Wilfrid. The relevant documents from Bede's Ecclesiastical History and Eddius' Life of St. Wilfrid are collected in Haddan and Stubbs (1871, III, 141-4).

It is possible that a visual expression of the orthodox position: was developed in response to these controversies and discussions. The early triumphal Christ on the cross has been seen by some modern writers as

Footnote p. 73.

I. 'Et quidem zelum vos, ne quid manufactum adorari possit, habuisse laudamus, sed frangere easdem imagines non debuisse iudicamus. Idcirco enim pictura in ecclesiis adhibetur, ut hi qui litteras nesciunt saltem in parietibus videndo legant, quae legere in codicibus non valent. Tua ergo fraternitas et illa servare et ab eorum adoratu populum prohibere debuit, quatenus et litterarum nescii haberent, unde scientiam historiae colligerent, et populus in picturae adoratione minime peccaret.'

Ewald and Hartmann 1899, 195 (letter IX, 208).

For a second letter to Serenus on the same subject, see ibid., pp. 269-72 (letter XI, 10).

2. This passage is also quoted in Bede ed. C. Plummer (1896, II, 360) where the words of St. Gregory and the similar views of St. Wilfrid are also collected.

itself heretical, a refusal to face the death on the cross. However, one might see it as attempting to assert both the historical fact of the Crucifixion (which includes the idea of the death of Christ as man) with the notion of Christ's Godhead, expressed by the non-naturalistic portrayal of a robed priestly figure. Certainly the eastern iconoclasts, who as monophysites denied Christ's human nature, did not see these images as representing their view, and attempted to ban the human figure altogether.

It seems also to have been as a response to the extremes of heresy that a clear statement as to the uses of pictures and images in church was developed. St. Gregory the Great, in a reply to Serenus, an iconoclastic bishop of Marseilles (595-600) stated:

We are of opinion, however, that you should not have destroyed effigies. A picture is introduced into a church that the illiterate may at least read what they see on the walls, though they may be unable to read the same in writing. You should, therefore, my brother, have preserved the pictures while safeguarding them from popular worship, that the illiterate might have the means of acquiring a knowledge of history whilst the people might be prevented from the sin of worshipping a picture (Martin, E.J. 1930, 227).¹

Bede clearly restates the full western orthodoxy, both as regards the depiction of the Crucifixion and the uses of pictures and images in general, in the following passage from his 'De Templo Salomonis':

Notandum sane hoc in loco quia sunt qui putant lege Dei prohibitum ne uel hominum..... siue rerum similitudines sculparamus aut depingamus in ecclesia.... Si enim licebat serpentem exaltari aeneum in ligno quem aspicientes filii Israhel uiuerant, cur non licet exaltationem domini saluatoris in cruce qua mortem uicit ad memoriam fidelibus depingendo reduci uel etiam alia eius miracula.....cum horum aspectus multum saepe compunctionis soleat praestare contuentibus et eis quoque qui litteras ignorant quasi uiuam dominicae historiae pandere lectionem?.....

Verum si diligentius uerba legis attendamus, forte parebit non interdictum imagines rerum aut animalium facere sed haec idolatriae gratia facere omnimodis esse prohibitum.²

¹ C.C.S.L. vol. CXIXA, 212-3.

²

This moderate view prevailed in the west: indeed in 731 a Council held in Rome attended by the Archbishops of Grado and Ravenna and ninety three Italian bishops is recorded in the Liber Pontificalis as having decreed that anyone who should stand forth as destroyer, profaner or blasphemer against veneration of the Sacred Images should be excommunicated (Martin E.J. 1930, 77). This decision was reaffirmed at later councils in the West. One should remember that by the third quarter of the eighth century there were many refugees from persecution by the Iconoclasts, especially in Italy. In c.766 or 767 an embassy sent from Constantinople to Pippin asking for his support for some Imperial claims to land seized by the Lombards, actually also brought to his attention two theological questions one of which concerned images. In 767 a Council of Frankish bishops met to debate these matters, but no record of their discussion has survived. The West's lack of real involvement in the problems of the East seems confirmed by the fact that only two papal delegates attended the 767 Council of Nicaea which brought the first Iconoclastic controversy to an end (Martin E.J. 1930, 81, 223).

Charlemagne took some interest in the image question, and so did Alcuin the Anglo-Saxon scholar who was invited to head the Palace School at Aachen: he may have had a hand in the Caroline Books which were sent to Rome in 792-4, and was certainly commended by Charlemagne as an advisor to the Council of Frankfort in 794. The attitude expressed both by the books and by the Council, and at the Synod of Paris held under Louis the Pious in 825 (after the outbreak of the Second Iconoclastic Controversy) specifically endorses the opinion of St. Gregory (above). Image worship is said to be wrong, but so is Iconoclasm: the function of pictures is decorative, and for the instruction of the ignorant (Martin E.J. 1930, 250-5). Interestingly, however, the Synod of Paris implies condemnation

for the superstitious regard of the contemporary papacy for pictures. The Western position therefore seems typically to have followed St. Gregory and therefore allowed complete freedom for the production of images, but with some powerful support in the direction of veneration rather than of Iconoclasm. Outbursts of Iconoclasm such as that by Claudius of Turin in Italy (c.825) seem exceptional. The moderate Gregorian view which seems to have been the authoritative one, went on being expressed by, for example, Walafriid Strabo and Hincmar of Rheims, throughout the ninth century (Martin, E.J. 1930, 270-1).

The influence of the doctrine of two natures in one Christ was profound and in the early period found expression in, for example, the doctrines of the Eucharist and the Atonement, as Aulen (1970) has shown: indeed, he believed what I have also suggested above, that the early triumph Crucifixions demonstrated the strength of what he defined as a 'classic' type of Atonement doctrine which brought the Incarnation and the Atonement into the closest relation. Unfortunately, he goes on to suggest that this iconography of triumph went on unchanged and unaffected by other interpretations of the significance of the Crucifixion until the later middle ages. Yet any student of the early medieval Crucifixion soon becomes aware that, whatever the state of affairs in the eighth century, by the eleventh century there had developed a multiplicity of variants and types of Crucifixion iconography, in some of which Christ is shown suffering and dead; moreover, the robed priestly figure has ceased to be the dominant type. It is necessary to turn to other sources for the explanation of this increased variety, and for a possible intellectual background out of which they could have arisen.

The work of earlier art-historians tended to support the view expressed by Aulen, that the change to the depiction of the suffering and dead Christ came very late. Grondijs (1948), for example, held that the change

occurred as late as the eleventh century in the East and the thirteenth century in the West. This view is no longer tenable. Martin, J.R. (1955), for example, has shown that in the eastern church the reaction to iconoclasm in the ninth century is the likeliest cause of the development, citing literary evidence in support of the date. He also shows how surviving representations from the same period, such as that on f.45v of the Chludov Psalter¹ clearly refer to the iconoclasts as defilers of the form of Christ akin to those who crucified him (Schiller 1972, pl. 335). The death on the cross is therefore the proof of Christ's human nature, and of his redemptive power.

Hausherr (1963) was concerned with the problem in the West rather than the East. He noted that there are, for example, surviving representations from c.830-50 in which Christ is shown on the cross with drooping head. These are few: the living Christ was still the dominant type, and between the two there was a large number of variations (Hausherr 1963:164). He concluded that the new image and its variants did not represent a change in Christology, which in the west continued to express Chalcedonian orthodoxy, but a change in the emphasis given to the image of Christ in devotion. He found evidence of such a change through a study of the exegesis of the biblical narratives of the Crucifixion from the early fathers through to the Carolingian period. His analysis is important, and has important implications for the study of the Anglo-Saxon Crucifixion, though it is possible that the case for the early ninth century as the seminal period is overstated.

Hausherr points out that, in their biblical exegesis, Anglo-Saxon

¹Moscow, Historical Museum, Cod. gr. 129.

scholars such as Bede, and even Alcuin (c.730-804) belong to the tradition of pre-Carolingian exegesis. For them, as for Fathers such as Ambrose, Hieronymus and Augustine, the significance of the death of Christ lies above all in the victory over that death. The suffering and death of Christ receive little emphasis when the theme is the power and victory of the Godhead. Alcuin in particular quotes from Augustine on the Crucifixion, almost verbatim. His pupil, Hrabanus Maurus, writing c.821-2, closely followed Hieronymus, Augustine and Bede, often quoting the first two in Bede's words. Even later in the ninth century, c.865, Christian von Stavelot was still transmitting patristic traditions, completely uninfluenced by works with quite a different slant which had been written in the intervening period (Hauscherr 1963: 181-2, 196).

These new interpretations appeared in the work of Candidus, a monk perhaps of Fulda, and of Paschasius Radbertus. Candidus, in his Opusculum de passione domini wrote the first western work of which the theme is exclusively the Passion of Christ, and the first which is not merely a restatement of patristic tradition (Hauscherr 1963: 183-4). He compared the Fall and the Crucifixion, the latter as the salvation of Mankind. The period when Christ was outstretched on the cross points to his future coming ⁱⁿ glory. He was recognised on the cross by one of the thieves; through his passion and death he fulfils the will of the Father. He suffers the most terrible death at the hands of the Jews: the inclination of his head signifies his meek acceptance. His death opens the veil before the mystery of God, manifest through the tearing of the temple hangings (Hauscherr 1963: 183-4).

Here the emphasis has changed from the theme of the victory over death to the significance of the passion and death in the salvation of mankind, and to the suggestion that the suffering too is part of God's plan. Radbertus too stressed the theme of the suffering on the cross, and that

bears the sins of mankind, for whom he died. Thus, Hausherr is able to suggest that as from this period two main explanations of the Passion existed side by side, so representations of Christ's suffering and death could appear in art alongside the still common iconography of Christus Victor.

The importance of the ninth century in the iconography of the Crucifixion is also suggested by a study of the doctrine of the Eucharist. Specific references to the Eucharist appear to be fairly rare in the writings of western theologians of the sixth to the eighth centuries, and again, as in their biblical exegesis, Anglo-Saxon scholars such as Bede and Alcuin follow closely the work of earlier authorities such as St. Gregory the Great, Isidore of Seville, and St. German of Paris (Stone 1909: 199-201). In neither Alcuin nor Bede is there any attempt at defining the nature of the presence of Christ in the consecrated elements, nor in what the sacrifice of the Eucharist consists (Stone^{D.} 1909: 193-202).

All this was changed in the work of Amalarius of Metz, a pupil of Alcuin who died in 850. He interpreted prayers and ceremonies of the mass as a symbolical presentation of the life, death, Resurrection and Ascension of Christ. He believed that at consecration the elements of bread and wine are made the body and blood of Christ and that these consecrated gifts are a sacrifice acceptable to God in Heaven (Stone 1909: 210-11). Controversy arose because some of his writings imply an actual division in the body of Christ, incarnate, dead and ascended. For this he was attacked at Councils in 835 and 838, and in the writings of Florus, a deacon of Lyons. He seems, however, to have been wrongly accused of heresy (Stone^{D.} 1909: 212-13).

The fact of the controversy itself, however, demonstrates the interest in the meaning of the Eucharist and its relationship to the suffering and death of Christ. It is this aspect - the relationship between the

body of Christ who was born, suffered and died, and the body of Christ really present in the bread and wine - which is also covered in the work of Paschasius Radbertus (see above). Other writers, such as Hrabanus Maurus, continued to express a more conservative view (Stone 1909, 223).

A modern liturgical scholar has said of the period 590-1073:

There is no real trace of any advance in the development of the Roman liturgy this period.....

The liturgical spirituality of this period was conditioned primarily by the fact that the allegorical interpretation of the rites and texts was developed in a decisive if not always very fortunate manner by Amalarius the Frank and despite passionate opposition on the part of the Deacon, Florus of Lyons, started off on the road to victory. At the same time, in accordance with the new type of popular devotion, the Christ of the Passion and the Christ of the Eucharistic Presence became increasingly prominent as a feature of liturgical piety.
(Klauser 1969, 46-7)

Here too the implication is that the ninth century was the important period in which there was a surge of interest in the significance of the Passion and Death of Christ as a means of salvation operating daily in the church through the sacrament of the Eucharist.

Certainly surviving examples of expanded Crucifixion image with the addition of many symbolic figures and elements seems to originate in about the second quarter of the ninth century (see chap. 9). The question that is raised, however, is whether it is right to see all changes in iconography as post-dating the period when all the new thinking had emerged fully into the writings of scholars. One is reminded that the Sacramentary of Gellone, which is certainly eighth century in date, already shows the blood pouring from Christ's side: in this miniature Christ is also shown in a loin cloth and not the kingly colobium, although he is also shown with open eyes (Schiller 1972, pl. 350). The beginnings of a visual link between the words of the mass and iconography were also noted in an eighth century representation of the Lamb (chap. 3).

Possibly the new thinking and its artistic expression were both influenced by the more popular tradition of taking the theme of the Passion as a frame for private prayer. This movement seems to have been eastern in origin. Certainly the earliest literary evidence for it comes from the East in the words of the Monk Dadisho, who died c.690 (Petersen 1945, 55). He asked his readers to:

Kiss Our Lord on His Cross, twice in the nails of His right hand and twice on the nails of His left foot. Make the sign of the cross on your mouth with the crucifix.

His words are interesting in view of the evidence for small personal crucifixes in the sixth to eighth centuries (chap. 6). This type of devotion must have been retarded in the East by the rise of Iconoclasm. There is some evidence that it went on in the West, however, perhaps influenced by refugees from Iconoclasm. There is, for example, a manuscript made for a Winchester nunnery (discussed in more detail in chap. 5) which possibly dates from the eighth century. The list of devotional prayers on the theme of the Crucifixion in this manuscript is lengthy and detailed. The practice of personal meditation on the theme of Christ's death and its meaning to the church and individual could possibly be seen as a background to the scholarly discussion of these themes in the next century. There is also evidence of devotions before altars and other stations dedicated to the Passion in monastic contexts dating from the very end of the eighth century. This too is discussed further in chap. 5. It is therefore possible that pictorial representations moving away from the purely victorious image at least slightly predated the scholarly discussion. The earliest surviving depiction showing an individual worshipper praying for forgiveness of his sins before an image of the cross, however, dates from the mid-ninth century. It shows a king, apparently Charles the Bald, accompanied by an inscription: 'Christ who hast atoned for the sins of the world, take away, I pray thee, all my

sins'. (Schiller 1972, 104 and pl. 354).

For the later pre-Conquest period, an understanding of the increase of liturgical piety from the eighth-ninth century is needed as a counter-balance to a view which stresses the importance of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries in the formation of images of the Passion. It is true that this later period also shows striking developments in the iconography of the Crucifixion: in the work of many schools Christ is shown dead and as having endured terrible suffering, with grossly distorted body. In some cases He is shown as having the appearance of a long-dead cadaver (Schiller 1972, pls. 483-7). His feet are usually fastened with one nail instead of two, a feature new to the period and which lent itself to the representation of a contorted, suffering figure. The beginnings of this contortion, however, can be traced from a much earlier period, and certainly influenced some of the latest carvings of the pre-Conquest period in England. It is therefore necessary, at both ends of the period, to guard against too much emphasis on the scholarly writings of particular periods: not least because our evidence of these too is partial.

Studies concerned with the development of the Arma Christi image have also tended to concentrate on the post-Conquest period, seeing its development as a consequence of the sack of Constantinople in 1204, which led to something of a boom in relics in the west (Berliner 1955, 38). Earlier appearances of the instruments of the Passion are treated as odd and isolated instances or are interpreted differently as signs of Christ's victory instead of his Passion.

The great emphasis on personal reactions to Christ's Passions which is associated with twelfth century writers such as Bernard of Clairvaux and in the next century with St. Francis and his followers undoubtedly did have an effect on the iconography of the Crucifixion, and indeed seem to

have succeeded where their ninth century predecessors had failed, in sweeping the old Christus Victor image out of western art almost altogether. Yet the fully developed Carolingian image in which Christ could be shown sometimes as a suffering and even dead man on the cross, and in many cases surrounded by figures and elements (drawing not only on the biblical narrative but on symbolic interpretations of the relationship of the event to church, individual and the cosmic order) are only less brutally explicit. The various attempts to express the link between Judgement and Redemption and the Crucifixion through the images of the Lamb and cross (chaps. 2 and 3) seem also to show that the more emotive images of the later medieval period were deeply rooted in the past, and not something wholly new.

C H A P T E R 5

Poetry, Devotional Literature and Historical Writings as
Evidence for the Development of the Crucifixion in
Pre-Conquest Sculpture

The point made in chapter 4 was that the iconography of the Crucifixion, viewed as an international phenomenon, was responsive to intellectual and pietistic movements which affected the Church, also as an international body. It was also suggested that over-concentration on the work of great writers and scholars could lead one to overlook the possibility that tentative approaches to new ideas might be made at a local or individual level before their acceptance by ecclesiastical opinion with a wider range of influence. It does not follow from anything said in the previous chapter that all regional schools or individual artists would have been affected at the same time or to the same degree by an important new development, but it did emerge that the representation of the Crucifixion was a matter of ecclesiastical concern. This must have been an important factor in areas or at times when the Church (or a particular religious establishment, or a secular patron in close touch with the Church) was an important patron of the arts.

The present chapter attempts to look more closely at writings which may be more revealing about the development of the Crucifixion theme in pre-Conquest England. The two types of written evidence brought together here are, however, of two different kinds. The first is a brief survey of Anglo-Saxon poetry or devotional literature which centres on or refers to the Crucifixion, to see whether the detail selected in this bears any resemblance to the choice of visual details represented in any of the sculptures. The second uses records of a factual nature, or which are represented as factual, which refer to actual monuments which depicted the Crucifixion theme in the relevant period. The evidence is drawn from later medieval (English) and continental sources since there are few from pre-Conquest England itself. The object of this section is

to understand the evolution of monuments specifically designed for the Crucifixion in the early medieval period.

Both types of literary evidence have to be considered together with some factual data about the actual remains. Handlists of figures and elements occurring in pre-Conquest sculptures^{of} the Crucifixion, and the monuments on which they appear, are provided in vol. II but where necessary this information has been summarised below to show at what points it connects with the literary record.

i Poetry and Devotional Literature

A full study of the treatment of the Crucifixion theme in pre-Conquest literature is outside the scope of the present study. Here I want only to consider some examples drawn from different types of literature, to see what relationship, if any, they might have with surviving representations, especially in sculpture. The discussion is therefore strictly concerned with the visual details referred to by poets and other writers, and not with the intellectual, literary or linguistic background which might have informed the writings themselves.

To some extent, of course, the intellectual background has already been discussed in chapter 4 (and to a lesser extent in chapters 2 and 3 in relation to the cross and the Lamb). Devotional, liturgical, and intellectual developments must have been equally available as influences on artists and writers at a period when the church was consistently the most important patron of the arts. However, as I also tried to show in chap. 4, it is not always possible to tie artistic and intellectual movements as closely as one could wish for dating purposes. The evidence is even more limited when neither poetry nor art can be precisely dated.

It is important to emphasise that literary descriptions are not necessarily related to visual expressions of the same theme, of any date.

The personifications Ecclesia and Synagogue, for example, had appeared as symbols in the exegesis of the Crucifixion centuries before they appeared in the expanded Carolingian Crucifixion image of the ninth century, for example in the writings of the Greek exegete, Ephraim of Syria (306-77). See Haugsherr (1963, 177-9). This is an example of a literary influence, but only after other considerations had made it important to stress the relationship between Christ's sacrificial death and the Church. The death of Christ itself, though disputed by heretical groups, was nevertheless accepted by orthodox Christians from the biblical period: but as we have seen, it was not represented in art until the ninth century, and not common until much later. Also, writers and artists were using the same sources - biblical, legendary, exegetical and liturgical - however these were mediated to them. In the case of such a central theme as the Crucifixion, this would account for many similarities. Writing, too, is a more flexible medium than art. A poet can mention the death of Christ and set it in the perspective he wants by making, for example, Christ in a Vision of Judgment look back on that death. A sculptor might have to use the image of the Lamb with cross and Apocalyptic imagery to approach the same idea as at Durham (see chap. 3); or could show Christ risen yet set before the cross and accompanied by the spear and sponge bearers, as in the Durham Gospels (Durham MS A.II.17: see below and chap. 6). Neither of these works shows Christ dead on the cross: the artist can only imply what the writer is able to say, and relies to a greater extent on sharing a common background of knowledge or understanding with the viewer.

With these provisos, however, it is interesting to look at pre-Conquest poetry which deals with or includes some account of the Crucifixion, and to see what details have been selected. All the surviving poems belong to the ninth century or perhaps earlier, and are

therefore of limited usefulness when it is considered that the bulk of the sculptured material belongs to the period stretching from the late ninth to the eleventh centuries (see figs. 1 and 2).

Two descriptions of the Crucifixion, for example, are included in Part III of the poem (or poems) known as Christ. Only part II of this poem is now generally accepted as the work of the Anglo-Saxon poet, Cynewulf (Sisam 1932, 310-11). Even if part III could be ascribed to him, however, this would still leave us with some problems of dating, since the work of Cynewulf has been ascribed to the late eighth and early ninth century, and to Northumbria or Mercia (Sisam 1932, 304-8).

Both descriptions emphasise the context of Judgment, but with considerable differences of detail. In the first mention, in lines 1081-1198, Christ and the cross are seen as they will appear on Judgment Day when they will be beheld with fear by sinful men. Part of the detail of the narrative of the Passion and Crucifixion is recounted to emphasise the suffering caused to Christ by men, and of which he still bears the marks. The piercing of the hands and feet and of the side are noted; then the spitting, mocking and scourging and the giving of the crown of thorns (which occur before the Crucifixion itself). The writer then goes on to contrast the grief of dumb creation at the event with the sinfulness of men: the sun and moon were darkened; the Temple veil was rent; the earth trembled: but also the earth gave up its dead; and Hell and all creation knew its Lord, as those who pierced Him will also know on the Last Day. Even the sea and the trees are made to acknowledge the Lord.

The scene here described is actually given visual expression in several images of the Crucifixion carved in a Carolingian milieu in the ninth century. An example is the ivory book cover of the Book of Pericopes of Henry II (pl. 83)¹. This and other related ivories, as Ferber (1966)

¹Munich Staatsbibliothek, cod. Lat. 4452. The book cover incorporates a ninth century ivory panel.

has shown, express a 'complex didactic Crucifixion exegesis' including personifications of Oceanus and Terra and a scene of the Dead arising from their tombs. Complex scenes including these and a variety of other personifications all drawn from exegetical sources form a unique group found only in ivories, and indicate the degree to which literary and oral traditions could influence art in the Crucifixion-conscious ninth century. In the poem Christ III, what we seem to have is the same exegetical tradition influencing Christian poetry and apparently at about the same date. Cook (1964, 195-6) indeed shows, for example, a possible source in the writings of St. Gregory. No visual representation attributed to an Anglo-Saxon artist reaches the same degree of exegetical complexity as the Carolingian ivories, so that it is not possible to posit such a clear relationship between art and current ideas as seems probable in the continental schools. Nevertheless, it does appear that in the ninth century at least a similar interest in the Passion and Death of Christ was influencing literature.

Later in the poem (lines 1428-58, Cook 1964, 53-4) Christ Himself describes His Passion - the mocking, scourging and spitting; the crown of thorns; the giving of the bitter drink; the hanging on the high cross; the piercing of the side. The choice of details should be compared with the prayers on the Passion in an eighth-ninth century manuscript discussed in chapter 4 and again below.

Andreas has also sometimes been ascribed to Cynewulf, but is possibly later, sometime after the mid-ninth century (Brooks 1961, xxii). It contains a similar 'flashback' to the Crucifixion to that contained in Christ III, lines 1428-58, again in the words of Christ seen in a vision. Here too the scourging, chaining and mocking are mentioned; the raising on the cross; and, sole detail of the event, the piercing of the side (Brooks

1961, lines 964-9, p. 31).

Christ and Andreas both differ from Doomsday, where, although Christ looks back on the Crucifixion from the Last Day, the only detail mentioned is the legend of the repentant thief. This detail is scarcely illuminating in the present context. The thieves make only one, doubtful, appearance in pre-Conquest sculpture, on a cross at Alnmouth which is certainly later than any of the poems and which shows strong signs of having been copied from an ivory of the Metz school; and which could have included either these figures or personifications of Ecclesia and Synagogue in the same position beneath the cross (see chap. 10).

The limited details selected in Christ III and Andreas; and the context implied in the (modern) title of Doomsday and also found in Christ are however interesting in the light of details chosen in some early Northumbrian and Mercian representations of the Crucifixion. In the Durham Gospels (MS A.II.17), for example, the theme of the Last Day is linked to the Crucifixion through many details: Christ is shown before rather than on the cross, dressed in the robes of the Risen and Ascended Christ; He is accompanied by inscriptions which link the two themes, and by the letters A and Ω which specifically relate to the vision of the Apocalypse (Revelations I, 8); He is shown with the spear- and sponge-bearers, both reminders of the torments endured by Christ: one in the act of producing the wounds by which He will be known on the Last Day, and on which sinners will gaze with fear. This manuscript must have been made in Northumbria, probably at Lindisfarne, in the early eighth century: its synthesis between a robed model of the Crucifixion and the Risen Christ, though occasionally found in earlier Byzantine art, seems to have been developed anew by the artist¹.

¹See my discussion of the image in the Durham Gospels discussed more fully below, chap. 6 and in Coatsworth (forthcoming) 'The art of the Durham Gospels' in T.J. Brown, ed. vol. of Early English Manuscripts in Facsimile. Copenhagen.

It demonstrates how early the Crucifixion was seen in the context of Judgment, in the thought of the Anglo-Saxons. There is nothing here, however, of the breakthrough of exegetical personification into art, such as we find in literature in the later poem Christ III. In the sculptures Hexham I and II and in the slightly later Auckland St. Andrews (which adds the mitigating figures of John and Mary) there is no trace even of the sun and moon to express the grief of all created things (chap. 6).

This last detail only appears with Ruthwell and Bradbourne - i.e. in the group in which Christ is also represented in the loincloth. Detail in the poetry, however, stops short of actual description, and in the three discussed there is in fact no evidence which would suggest contact with any actual image. Since neither poems nor sculptures can be dated with any precision, it is perhaps also fruitless to speculate on any putative relationship. Yet on Bakewell and Bradbourne II, as in the early Durham Gospels/Hexham group, the spear- and sponge-bearers are the only human figures chosen to accompany Christ, which could suggest that even in the new iconography with the near-naked Christ the Apocalyptic view remained popular¹. The figures beneath the cross at Ruthwell are too worn for identification, but the introduction of the sun and moon here and at Bradbourne (where they are certainly personified) might be an indication of the change of feeling which influenced Christ III and the expanded Carolingian image. Without the possibility of closer dating, however, it is impossible to say whether this new detail represents the movement towards such a change in the late eighth, early ninth century, or its culmination (see chap. 4).

Auckland St. Andrew (though related to the early Hexham group in its iconography of the dress of Christ); Rothbury; and Sandbach (which is probably very late in the ninth century) all have a more complex

¹See the description of the Durham Gospels miniature above.

iconography including John and Mary (Auckland St. Andrews; Sandbach); Evangelist symbols (Sandbach); and Passion symbols carried by attendant figures and angels (Rothbury). The figures of John and Mary possibly reflect a Mercian interest in Marian iconography (Cramp 1977, 210); but all these elements, especially the Passion symbols, reflect the changes which can more clearly be demonstrated in surviving Carolingian material. The Rothbury Passion symbols even relate the Northumbrian carving to the ivories with the complex exegetical programme defined by Ferber (1966) and discussed above in relation to the similar background of Christ III.

The most famous poem of the Crucifixion in early Anglo-Saxon literature is, of course, the Dream of the Rood. This poem written down in its surviving form in southern England in the late tenth century (Swanton 1970, 1-2) is especially interesting to the literary and art historian, since a few lines from an apparently earlier version of the poem appear on the Ruthwell cross, near though not accompanying a scene of the Crucifixion. There is a continuing argument about the date of this cross, and some possibility that the Crucifixion could be an addition rather than part of the original design (see chap. 9), although it has also been seen as fitting in with the complete programme. The poem fragment and the scene cannot therefore be shown to have a precise temporal relationship: but whether both were conceived as part of the overall design, or the scene was added later, the relationship between them has to be seen as an interesting one.

The poem is full of visual imagery, much of which has already been discussed in relation to the iconography of the crux gemmata (chap. 2 and Raw 1970). The picture of the Crucifixion which it represents is also particularly interesting. The piercing with the nails (though referred to the cross) and the shedding of the blood from the side are both mentioned. In this respect the poem is no different in its choice

of significant details from Christ III and Andreas - although the deep personal apprehension of the suffering and death of Christ both by the tree and by the individual Dreamer ought surely also to be seen in some sort of relationship to the emotional piety of Candidus and Amalarius of Metz (chap. 4). Immediately before this, however, there is an account of Christ ascending the cross, quite unlike the accounts of mocking, scourging and punitive treatment referred to in Christ, Andreas, and indeed the biblical accounts. In the Dream Christ hastens fearlessly to be raised on the cross, strips Himself and mounts the cross modig on manigra gesyhðe. The fragment on the Ruthwell cross refers to the same monument: here too he strips himself and is represented as modig - fearless in the sight of many (Swanton 1970, 90-91). Every allowance must be made for the influence of traditions of heroic poetry on these lines but early exegesis of Christus Victor also sometimes described Christ in heroic terms. The latin exegete Ambrose (339-97) describes Christ as ascending the cross as 'the Conquering Hero ascends the car' ('... curram suum triumphator ascendit'). It is, however, clear that elsewhere the poet was influenced by art, so that it might at least be wondered whether the representation of an upright, kingly - and near naked Christ crucified, was not also known to the author since there is a clear indication that Christ was stripped when he ascended the cross.

On the other hand, the little evidence that we can muster goes to indicate that in the early part of the eighth century only the robed Christus Victor was known in Northumbria and indeed throughout the whole Hiberno-Saxon area - just as it is clear that at this date it was also the most influential image in both the Eastern and Western Churches as a whole (chap. 6). There is a very little literary evidence which seems to support this view. At the beginning of the eighth century Bede in his Commentary on Revelations actually refers to the iconography of the

1. C.C.S.L. XIV, 376 (Ambrose on St. Luke's Gospel). The whole passage develops the theme of Christus Victor, with the cross as the sign of victory.

figure of Christ in lines which could imply that he is thinking of the figure of the crucified as well as of the Risen Christ. This occurs in a discussion of the word Poderis - the garment down to the feet (Revelations I, 13):

Poderis, which in latin is called Tunica talaris, and is a priestly garment, shows the priesthood of Christ by which he offered himself for us on the altar of the cross as a victim to his father¹.

Bede several times shows himself very interested in the picture of Christ crucified which Benedict Biscop brought back from his sixth visit to Rome to adorn his church at J a r r o w (below and chap. 6). Even without the knowledge that such a picture was available in Northumbria, however, Bede's remark is illuminating for a whole group of Insular depictions, including, the Durham Gospels (MS A.II.17) and the Hexham sculptures (see chap. 6). A new image of Christ in the loincloth might therefore have been seen as startling and could perhaps be seen as startling and perhaps as a source of inspiration in literature as well as in art.

Unfortunately there are considerable difficulties in understanding the development of the iconography of Christ in the loincloth in the period before it emerged into popularity in the ninth century and overwhelmed for a time the priestly robed figure. The very early (third to fifth century) examples with the loincloth detail are in many ways different. Some scholars have suggested a late eighth century Carolingian iconography of this type, including the sun and moon portrayed aniconically, (as apparently at Ruthwell) but which survives on the continent only in works of the late ninth century (see chap. 9). Neither the poem fragment on the Ruthwell cross nor the scene of the Crucifixion there provides a securely pre-800 background which could help to fill in the

¹The passage is quoted from Claude Jenkins (1935, 184).

gaps of the continental evidence.

The very traditional line taken by the poet and scholar Alcuin (see chap. 4) is perhaps rather against any very startling innovation having taken place in Northumbria before the end of the eighth century. It is only in the next generation of continental scholars that the new pietist approach becomes manifest.

A devotional work made for a Winchester nunnery in the eighth or ninth century (de Gray Birch, 1889) is interesting in the context of the present discussion but offers little indication of how the scene was represented in the south at such an early date, from where no example of its iconography has survived. It includes a group of prayers on Christ's Passion (de Gray Birch 1889, 67-78). The prayers could have been said as private devotions, and are not necessarily related to the stational prayers which we know had developed in continental monastic churches by the very end of the eighth century (see below). The details singled out in the prayers could be following a literary account only, and need have no relation to representations in art. They begin with the mocking, scourging and spitting; the crown of thorns; the mocking; the stripping (but this could be shown through the soldiers dicing for the robe at the foot of the cross even when Christ appears above in the robe which signified his priesthood - see *St. Maria Antiqua*, pl. 18); his neck (bowed in meek acceptance, cf. *Candidus*, chap. 4); his arms and hands; the gift of the Holy Spirit; the Passion; the Darkness; the vinegar and gall; the giving up of the Spirit; his eyes; his ears; his nostrils; and his wounded side. There are therefore sufficient physical details to suggest devotion before an actual representation of some sort, and one is reminded of the Eastern tradition of devotion to a crucifix exemplified by the monk Dadisho (above, chap. 4). It is in this tradition from the East that Mayr-Harting (1972, 187-9) sees this manuscript which he also

considers dates from the ninth century but by a scribe trying to copy an older hand. Such a tradition of pious prayer could be one of the sources of the movement which emerged fully into literature and art in the next century, but the prayers themselves offer no evidence for the state of iconography at the date at which they were written.

The evidence from the latter part of the period is mainly drawn from homilies, and adds very little to our understanding of contemporary iconography. This is not surprising however for by the tenth century the theme was everywhere more commonly represented. There is nothing in homiletic literature to illuminate the northern taste for the stone crucifix, and little in writings about the Crucifixion itself to show why the figures of John and Mary, or no accompanying figures at all, became more popular than the spear- and sponge-bearers. Visual details in homilies is often confined to a reference to the four nails (Aelfric, Sermon on the Passion: Thorpe 1844-6, II, 254-6); and the wound in the right side (Aelfric, De Sancte Trinitate: Pope 1967, 468-9). There is little actual narrative, and indeed the introduction of details is clearly moralistic and devotional rather than narrative. It is interesting that in a homily of Aelfric the legend that Longinus the spear-bearer repented, was converted, and became a Christian martyr, is given in preference to the earlier understanding of him as a torturer (Uplifting of the Holy Rood: Morris^{R.} 1871, 106). I have already noted (with reference to a group of crosses without the figure of Christ) the reference in the Blickling Homilies to Mary as the new Eve (chap. 2). These two details at least hint at developing and varied attitudes to the significance of the Crucifixion, perhaps reflected in the very mixed artistic response in the tenth and eleventh centuries as opposed to the early part of the period.

The ninth century, however, was the last great period of change in

the iconography of the Crucifixion before the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, so that in the intervening period we might expect to see some stereotyping of iconography, and changes in style (rather than in iconography and content) to become more important in discussing date and provenance. We might also expect to see the theme become everywhere more common, and to assume the development of more regional characteristics as it became commonplace. In England we might also expect such changes to become more marked under the influence of political and cultural changes, and in some cases more evidence of influence from the peripheries of Europe rather than its Christian and cultural centres. These questions, however, can only be discussed in the light of the sculptures themselves: there is little in the poetic or devotional literature of the latter part of the period to illuminate them.

ii References to Representations of the Crucifixion in Early Medieval Literature

References to actual representations of the Crucifixion are quite frequent in early medieval literature. Unfortunately they are usually disappointing in the amount of descriptive detail which they include and thus are of little help in illuminating developments in contemporary iconography. They do, however, provide some evidence of the dates by which certain types of monument with the theme had appeared and are thus important to a study which includes both free standing monuments (including crosses with the scene either on the shaft or on the head; and two (or possibly three) recumbent grave markers) and architectural relief sculptures (including both panels and more ambitious large scale monuments carved on more than one building stone and designed to be framed in an architectural setting). The corpus of pre-Conquest stone sculpture includes no sculptures carved fully in the round. However, one cannot conclude from this that such sculptures were not made even though hesitancy

was clearly still felt in some quarters as late as the eleventh century at the possibly idolatrous implications of such life-like sculptures. Bernard of Angers, for example, in a journey through Auvergne between 1007 and 1020 objected to cult images in the round with the interesting exception of the Crucifixion:

Nam, ubi solius summi et veri Dei recte agendus est cultus, nefarium absurdumque videtur gypseam vel ligneam eneamque formari statuum, excepta crucifixi Domini. Cujus imago ut affectuose, ad celebrandam Dominice passionis memoriam, sculptili sive fictili formetur opere, Sancta et universalis recipit ecclesia."

The Holy and Universal church permits that this image for the purpose of celebrating the memory of the Passion of the Lord in a pious manner, be fashioned in works of sculpture or the moulding of metalworking.

There are indeed surviving crucifixes from the continent, wooden ones on a large scale, from before this date which represent both the cross and the figure of Christ fully in the round (see below). Metalwork groups of the Crucifixion such as that presented by Earl Tostig and his wife to the altar of the church in Durham c.1060 (Symeon 1882, I, 95) must also have belonged to this category, and other stories discussed below provide evidence for free standing roods in Anglo-Saxon England, though not necessarily in stone. We are reminded again that stone sculpture in this case provides an incomplete record of both iconography and monumental typology in an ecclesiastical context.

Before considering the references to Crucifixion monuments in more detail it is necessary to look more closely at what has survived in sculpture. Seventy-three sculptures are discussed in the following chapters. A minority of these, especially of the architectural sculptures, are not certainly datable to within the pre-Conquest period; two (Durham IV and Winterbourne Steepleton) are almost certainly not Crucifixions. Fifty-four of the total are on free standing monuments - all but three on Bouville 1897, 47.

crosses. The crosses are divided among those which display the scene on the shaft (fifteen); empanel the scene on the cross head (two); treat the cross head as a crucifix (twenty-nine); and those which treat the whole cross as a crucifix (three). Two further fragments may belong to the final category but their crudity renders it impossible to be certain that they did not rather belong to the cross shaft group. Only nineteen are architectural sculptures, eight panels and eleven roods.

The development of free standing monuments will be considered below before that of architectural sculptures. The evidence for these two categories is very unequal since early references to those in the first group especially rarely mention their decoration, while references to the possibly liturgical functions of some stone crosses which might help to explain the development of the stone cross as crucifix, do not exist for England.

a. Free standing monuments with the Crucifixion

There are many contemporary and near-contemporary references to the erection of crosses for various purposes in pre-Conquest England (see below); none of which record the presence of a Crucifixion scene on any of them. The actual uses of particular free standing stone monuments therefore have to be deduced either from their archaeological context where this is known, as in the case of the Winchester grave slabs discussed in chapter 3; or from intrinsic qualities such as form and more doubtfully the appropriateness of their programme of decoration and figural carving for a specific use.

The only other source of aid are references to comparable types of monument in ecclesiastical records which were or may have been made of other materials. It is not, however, possible to be certain that stone monuments which by the nature of their medium could be made to stand outside even the environs of a church, are necessarily comparable in development to crosses which were used for instance, in liturgical contexts.

Free standing monuments as grave markers or Memorials

There is some documentary evidence for the use of crosses as grave markers or memorials. Symeon (1882, II, 33) says that the grave of Bishop Acca at Hexham was marked by two crosses one at the head and one at the foot. There is a much stronger Lindisfarne/Durham tradition that Bishop Aethelwold of Lindisfarne (721-40) set up a cross in memory of St. Cuthbert (Symeon 1882, I, 39). Of crosses with the Crucifixion, ^{only Alnmouth,} however, ^{Northumberland,} with its inscription to Eadulf, seems clearly indicated as a grave cross.

Only three free standing monuments, the hogbacks from Gosforth II, (Cumberland) and York II and the 'name stone' from Newent in Gloucestershire (which was found in a grave) represent types of monument which were unlikely to have been used in any other way. It is interesting to note that both Gosforth II and Newent, though very different in form, style, iconography and complexity have similar scenes of figural subjects: the Crucifixion on one face balanced by the figure of the Risen or glorified Christ on the other (see chaps. 12 and 13). The scheme therefore seems to look through the Crucifixion to the promise of salvation. The sculptures discussed in chapters 1 and 2 also seem to link a crucified and risen or ascended Christ, though through a different iconography. It would be interesting to see here a reflection of an evolution of subjects suitable for grave sculpture, especially in the latter part of the period - especially as several crosses, for example, those at Harmston, Lincs.; and possibly Penrith, Cumberland (Bailey 1974, I, 153 ff. and II, 213-4 and pl.) seem to have the combination of scenes found in the obvious grave markers at Gosforth II and Newent¹. So many sculptures are fragmentary however that a complete analysis of the

¹See also Brigham, York I, Lancaster II.

Crucifixion in relation to the full programme of a monument is impossible to follow through. One is also reminded by the existence of the Wirksworth slab, which is clearly the lid of a tomb, that a very elaborate programme was no bar to the use of a monument as a grave cover (see pl. 12a and b).

Crosses with other possible functions

The same difficulties arise from contemporary evidence for other functions of crosses. Bede for instance tells us that a Cross was set up by St. Cuthbert beside his oratory on Farne Island (Colgrave 1940, 272-3.); and St. Boniface, c.744, that worship at such crosses was being substituted by some people for attendance at church (Tangl 1955, III (no. 59)). This is a clear indication that some crosses were used as foci for worship - but again there is no contemporary evidence as to the decoration of such crosses. Hexham II, possibly the earliest surviving cross with the theme of the Crucifixion (chap. 6), has its figural programme confined to one broad face of the shaft. This arrangement would obviously be suitable for a liturgical use, if one took the figure carved face as the west face, which the congregation would see. It is also, however, the arrangement preserved on the later cross at Alnmouth, where the inscription suggests that it was a grave marker or memorial. The same arrangement is clearly suitable for the decoration of a cross which stood at the head or east end of the grave. It is possible to see, as will be discussed in later chapters, that crucifixes in metalwork or other media could have influenced the decoration of crucifixes on stone^{such} as those from Great Ayton, Kirby Hill I, North Otterington and Kirkburton (chap. 11). This, however, is very different from suggesting that all or any of these crosses could have fulfilled a similar function to that of a metalwork cross whether within a church or as an outdoor preaching centre.

There is, however, some interesting evidence from early though

post-Conquest accounts of the cross at Reculver in Kent. Leland in the sixteenth century saw this cross standing within the church between chancel and nave, and described it as having, among other scenes, a representation of the Crucifixion (below, chap. 9). Peers (1928, 250) also quoted earlier evidence drawn from Archbishop Winchelsey's Register, s.a. 1296, concerning an agreement between the vicar of Reculver and his parishioners

super oblaciones seu elemosinis in quodam trunco
juxta magnam crucem lapideam inter ecclesiam et
cancellum repositis.

Is it possible that this cross which clearly stood within the church from the thirteenth century to the sixteenth century was in its original pre-Conquest position? In excavation of the church site Peers and Clapham believed that they had found the base of the cross and that it was contemporary with the floor which they dated to the seventh century (Peers 1928, 250-1; Clapham 1930, 68). Taylor^{H.M.} (1968, 294) however, showed that the base discovered was more consistent with the remains of an altar, but pointed out that on the continent large crosses were apparently erected behind altars dedicated to the Holy Cross, which stood in the same position as the altar at Reculver, separating the nave from the monk's choir.

No other surviving stone cross, with or without the Crucifixion has been discovered in situ in such a position, but the lack of wear of an early cross such as Rothbury (chap. 9), and the fact that the same cross has sockets cut into the upper surface of its top and side arms which could have been used for candles, possibly indicates that it and perhaps some others were set up within a church¹. Such a cross, like any other cross, could have been used at festivals of the Holy Cross and on Good Friday. It is interesting too in the light of this possible liturgical

¹See for example the discussion of the Kirkburton staff crucifix, chap. 11.

use that the Crucifixion at Reculver seems to have been immediately below the head (as at Bakewell, Derbyshire) while Rothbury seems to be the earliest surviving crucifix-head among the sculptured remains (chap. 9). Could this development be related to the adaptation of the stone cross to a proper liturgical function within, not outside, the church building? Certainly there seems a distinction between an early group of crosses including Hexham II; Auckland St. Andrew; Ruthwell; Bakewell; Bradbourne I and II; and Sandbach (though the last especially overlaps with Rothbury in probable date of production) in which the Crucifixion appears as one of a group of scenes on the face of the shaft (perhaps indicating a primarily didactic function) and the crucifix group which starts with Rothbury and in which the Crucifixion scene, if not the only figural scene, is isolated from the rest in the head of the cross (see figs. 1 and 2). It is necessary to be clear, however, that the cross-shaft position in itself is not an indication of early date as Françoise Henry suggested for the Moone cross (Henry 1965, 150):¹ no one would claim that Aycliffe or Alnmouth were earlier than Rothbury on such grounds (chaps. 9 and 10). Such evidence as there is, however, seems to suggest that the development of the stone crucifix was a secondary development, and it may well be that this was related to the practice of setting up processional crosses behind altars and thus endowing them with a liturgical function (see below).

The origin of the three-dimensional crucifix in any medium has itself been much debated. Certainly small metalwork crucifixes for personal use, some of them reliquaries, had developed by the sixth-seventh centuries (Wessel, 1960; and see chap. 6 below). There seems however little evidence for the use of larger three-dimensional crucifixes with a liturgical function before the late eighth-ninth century. A later copy

¹See the discussion of the development of the Irish crucifix cross in chap. 7.

in leather of an early medieval crucifix has been dated to c.800 (Lasko 1972, 16-7, pl. 18 and fn. 21, pl. 261), but dating is dependent on whether it is seen as a gift from Charlemagne, Pope Leo III (795-816); or Pope Leo IV (847-55). This problem is raised again in the discussion of the iconography of this crucifix in chapter 9. Keller (1951) who collected documentary references to roods and three-dimensional crucifixes produced no contemporary references earlier than the ninth century, and most are later. The iconography of the Rothbury cross-head has its closest parallels in Carolingian miniatures and ivories dating from the second quarter of the ninth century: it seems therefore to have been a new departure both in iconographic detail and position (chap. 9). That it was influenced by the development of the large three-dimensional crucifix, however, can only remain an interesting possibility.

b. The evolution of architectural monuments with the Crucifixion

The evidence for representations comparable to relief panels in ecclesiastical contexts and even subject to liturgical use is both earlier and less speculative than that for the liturgical use of stone crosses. Bede, for example, reports in his history of the abbots of Monkwearmouth and Jarrow that Benedict Biscop brought from Rome paintings on canvas or wood to^u adorn the churches he had founded. These included a representation of the Crucifixion.

imagine^squoque ad ornandum monasterium aeccliamque
beati Pauli apostoli de concordia ueteris et noui
Testamenti summa ratione conpositas exhibuit; uerbi
gratia, Isaac ligna, quibus inmolaretur portantem, et
Dominum crucem in qua pateretur aequae portantem, proxima
super inuicem regione, pictura coniunxit. Item serpenti
in heremo a Moyse exaltato, Filium hominis in cruce
exaltatum comparauit.

(Bede 1896, I, 373)

Bede also answered doubts as to the propriety of such an image; and implies only a didactic use for pictures, for those who could not read (chap. 4) and elsewhere perhaps implies a detail of the iconography of this picture (above, part i). There is further evidence, from the very

end of the eighth century, for liturgical practices involving prayers at various altars and stations in a monastic church, in an order of worship of Abbot Angilbert of Centula (St. Riquier). Angilbert completed the building of Centula in 799. The daily circuit of prayers he prescribed implies eleven altars, including one to the Holy Cross before the chancel arch (interesting in view of the evidence of Reculver); one in the west work which was dedicated to the Saviour; and four liturgical stations including one dedicated to the Passion which seems to have been immediately behind the altar of the Holy Cross, which implies a representation set on the wall above the chancel arch (see Taylor, H.M. 1975^{48 and fig. 12}). There seems no account of the nature of these representations. Anscher, an eleventh-twelfth century abbot of St. Riquier only observes that they were

of wonderful workmanship made of plaster and gold and
beautifully set with mosaics and other precious colours.

A reference to an altar of the Saviour at the west work is however a reminder that the chancel arch was not the only position appropriate to a representation of Christ: though it is not clear from Angilbert's order of worship what the iconography of Christ the Saviour would be.

A reference to the external decoration of the tower of the New Minster, Winchester, implies another use of relief sculptures with the Crucifixion, as part again of a programme of architectural decoration both didactic and symbolic of the feasts of the church's year (Quirk 1961).

The only panel which certainly dates from earlier than the ninth century is represented by the fragments of Hexham I, which could be as early as the late seventh/early eighth century. It was not found in situ and its original situation and function are impossible to discover. If it is indeed so early it may well have had a decorative-didactic use such as Bede implies for the picture from Rome - which may indeed have influenced Hexham iconography (chap. 6).

1. Quoted in Taylor, H.M. 1975, 148, from Mabillon 1677, 127.

Very few panels have survived in situ. One carved on a building stone on a buttress at Ropsley, Lincolnshire (chap. 12), may be a humble reflection of an external programme such as that recorded for Winchester. One of the late sculptures from Daglingworth (II) which I now consider to be post-Conquest may also have been built into an external wall although the east wall of the chancel from which it has now been removed was rebuilt in the nineteenth century (Appendix B). Only one panel is in situ above the chancel arch of a pre-Conquest church, that from Barton on Humber, Lincs. This is almost certainly of the Crucifixion, but it is sad that only the head of a figure survives. It at least constitutes some sort of material evidence to suggest that the liturgical practices laid down by Angilbert were not unknown in Anglo-Saxon England.

The larger relief roods confirm this development. They possibly attest to the growing importance and popularity of liturgical prayers at stations but in the main they seem an elaboration of form rather than a new departure.

Several are or appear to be in situ: for example at Bibury, Bitton (above the chancel arch); Headbourne Worthy; Breamore; Walkern (above southern or western entrances to the nave). Both positions are implied in Angilbert's order. The evidence that Daglingworth I (which was found turned face inwards as one of the stones of a chancel arch) was found in its original situs is more doubtful, but as for Daglingworth II I now do not accept that this panel can be pre-Conquest (Appendix B).

There is, however, also some documentary evidence for large crucifixes or roods, not necessarily in stone, from late pre-Conquest England, apart from the gold and silver group presented by Tostig to Durham. A possibly large permanent rood, for example, seems implied by a reference in the Peterborough Chronicle, s.a. 1070. In that year the monastery was plundered by a Danish army led by Swein. The raiders went into the church and

Footnote p. 105.

I.

'...geodon into þe mynstre, clumben upp to þe halge rode, namen þa þe kynehelm of ure Drih't'nes heafod eall of smeate golde, namen þa þæt fotspure þe wæs undernæden his fote, þæt wæs eall of read golde;....'

(Clark 1970, 2).

climbed up to the Holy Rood and took the crown off Our Lord's head all of pure gold and then took the footrest that was beneath His feet, which was all of red gold.

Possibly Romsey II had a crown of some other material than stone (see chap. 13). The reference is most interesting however for its incidental information - that the rood was placed high up (and surely, with its gold accessories, inside the Church ?).

Brieger (1942) believed that roods were an Anglo-Saxon development, developing directly from the freestanding stone cross used to divide nave from choir, the evidence for which has been given in section a, above. In supporting evidence he notes that Beverley had a triumphal cross (not a crucifix) above the entrance to the choir between 1060 and 1069, given by Aelred, Archbishop of York, and that Winchester had a complete rood to be placed on a beam given by Stigand, the last Saxon bishop of Canterbury. Certainly the last of these references, like that from Peterborough, is important in ascertaining that the large rood had indeed 'arrived' in England by the mid-eleventh century, and apparently on a developed form. A rood to be placed on a beam sounds like a sculpture in the round rather than a relief carving. Finally Brieger also notes (1942, 86) that a change was made in the wording of the customs of Cluny by Lanfranc after he became the Archbishop of Canterbury after the Norman Conquest. Before him, a clear distinction was made at Cluny between the large permanent cross in the nave, behind the altar of the cross, and portable crosses and crucifixes used at Easter and the feast of the Exaltation. Under Lanfranc the words ante crucem with reference to the permanent cross are changed to ante crucifixum, which Brieger suggests indicates that this cross was a crucifix at Christ church, Canterbury. But we have seen that relief representations of the Passion and Saviour might have been in use from a very much earlier period on the continent, and that crosses behind the altar of the cross were also a continental

Footnote p. 106.

I. Est etiam ibidem alia crux antiquissima, quae olim in refectorio stare consuevit; de hac ferunt, quod cum die quadam Edgarus Rex ⁊ Dunstanus Archiepiscopus ad mensam sederent, in refectorio.....mirum dictu! imago Dominica ligno crucis affixa, toto se corpore excussit, ita ut motus impetu Diadema ejus inter Regum ⁊ Archiepiscopum caderet.

William of Malmesbury 1691, 304.

tradition. Schiller (1972, 141) notes that portable processional crosses were used as altar crosses in the tenth century. Continental documentary sources also report the existence of roods: there was, for example, one at Mainz in the tenth century. It had an over life-sized figure of Christ and held relics and was set up a beam on high feast days only (Schiller 1972, 140, See Keller 1951 for other references). There is also the physical evidence of surviving large wooden roods, some of which are dated to as early as the tenth century, such as the Gero Cross in Cologne (Hausherr, 1963).

Possibly the permanent rood is a relatively late feature: none of the continental examples which have survived need have occupied a permanent position. Some of them have cavities for relics, but by no means all, so this does not explain their use. Such a crucifix could however, have been brought into the church on appropriate occasions such as Good Friday. A story reported by William of Malmesbury might indicate a similar practice in Anglo-Saxon England. Speaking of Glastonbury, he says:

There is another very ancient cross there also which used to stand in the refectory. On a certain day King Edgar and Archbishop Dunstan were sitting down to meat in the refectory ... when, wonderful to relate the wooden image of the Lord affixed to the cross shook itself from head to foot, so that the jolt caused his diadem to fall between the king and the Archbishop. |
(trans. from William of Malmesbury 1691, 304).

Here the twelfth century historian is relating a story about a monument surviving in his day. However, it is not the only crucifix associated with Dunstan: a miracle story connecting him with a speaking Crucifix is retailed by Eadmer, Osberno, and William of Malmesbury all therefore in the post-Conquest period (see Stubbs 1874, 113, 212-2, 308).

The implication of the evidence is that large sculptured crucifixes were generally acceptable, certainly in the eleventh and probably in the tenth century. There is however insufficient evidence to show that the

permanent three-dimensional rood was pioneered in Anglo-Saxon England, though the Anglo-Saxon tradition of carving in stone might have lent impetus to the practice. It is probable, indeed, that it is only because of this tradition that any Anglo-Saxon rood has survived.

Conclusions

The evidence brought forward above reinforces the point made in chapter 4, that the Crucifixion was a matter of concern and interest among the educated and ecclesiastically-oriented groups in early medieval society. It was noted in section i, however, that the poetry and devotional literature while suggestive of an intellectual background which might have been shared by some sculptors and artists or their patrons, is scarcely illuminating of the vast mass of surviving sculpture especially that which dates from the ninth to the eleventh centuries (see fig. 2).

In section ii the written evidence for the development of Crucifixion monuments with or without a liturgical function, was also found to be incomplete, and dependent on sources from other areas and the post-Conquest period often dealing with objects in materials other than stone. Nevertheless it was suggested that the development of metal crucifixes and other depictions (painted, in relief or in the round) used in a liturgical setting could have influenced the treatment of the free standing stone cross as a crucifix and, more certainly, the development of stone panels and roods as part of the decoration of a church building. It was shown, however, that the probable function of most free standing monuments can only be considered in relation to their individual quality and other factors such as inscriptions or degree of wear, since a liturgical object could set a pattern which could be copied in stone for use as a grave marker or other non-liturgical purposes.

C H A P T E R 6

THE ROBED CHRIST FROM THE SEVENTH TO THE
EARLY NINTH CENTURIES

i The Continental Background

Three major variations of the iconography of the Crucifixion in which the figure of Christ wears a robe rather than a loincloth can be distinguished in European art of the sixth to the eighth centuries. All seem to have arisen in the sixth century. Collectively, these types seem to have virtually excluded the representation of the crucified Christ in the loincloth for a period of at least two hundred years: including the period in which the Anglo-Saxon peoples were converted to Christianity, and in which the Northumbrian church opted for Rome rather than the Ionan church.

Possibly the earliest surviving example of the first type shows Christ in the colobium, a long straight sleeveless dress, decorated with gold stripes (clavi) to show his sovereignty. This is in the Gospels of Rabula: a manuscript made in the monastery of Zagba in Mesopotamia in 586 and which contains several miniatures which are, however, insertions (Grabar 1957, 40ff.). This representation is interesting because it shows a very full Crucifixion scene (pl. 16). Christ is raised high on the cross with his bearded head nimbed and turned slightly to the right. The turn of his head means that a lock of hair falls on his left shoulder. He is nailed to the cross. On either side are the two thieves, and above, the sun and moon. The thieves are both nailed and bound to the cross. The spear-bearer, identified by name as Longinus, is in the act of piercing Christ's side, while the companion figure on the other side holds up the sponge soaked in the bitter drink which he carries in a vessel in his other hand. Three soldiers at the foot of the cross game for Christ's earthly garment, which they hold between them. On Christ's right stand Mary and John, and

on his left the weeping women. The scene is a 'narrative' illustration of the account in St. John's Gospel, XIX, 30-34. The piercing of the side takes place after Christ's death, however, so that Christ's open eyes have to be seen as symbolic of Godhead, and also perhaps of the conflation of several different moments during the event.

A Palestinian reliquary from the Sancta Sanctorum, Rome (seventh-eighth century) is closely related, although John and Mary have taken up the positions which became traditional for them, one on either side of the cross; and the sun and moon, the weeping women, and the gaming soldiers are absent (Schiller 1972, fig. 329). An eighth century icon from the monastery of St. Catherine, Mt. Sinai, follows the Sancta Sanctorum version in the position of John and Mary, but replaces the gaming soldiers. The thieves have their arms tied behind the cross bar, and paired half figures of angels support the head of Christ on either side (pl. 17).

This expanded narrative image was called by Reil (1904, 64ff) the 'Jerusalem' type; by Wessel (1960, 196-7) the 'Syrian' type; but more probably it originated in Constantinople (Grabar 1957, 40ff).

In addition to this complex image there was another which Wessel (1960, 198ff) considered originated in Ephesus. This type is exemplified by the Fieschi Reliquary (seventh-early eighth century). The Christ figure is the same as in the first type. The sun and moon are present on either side of Christ's head. There is a superscription above the cross, and a suppedaneum beneath Christ's feet. The major difference is that the supporting figures have been reduced to two - John and Mary (Schiller 1972, fig. 331). This three-figure image may have been devised for use on small devotional objects: it is often found on reliquaries and pectoral crosses, such as one now at Providence, Rhode Island (Wessel 1960, pl. 1). A less drastic reduction is however found on wall paintings such as that from Sta. Maria Antiqua, Rome (eighth century) in which the spear- and sponge-bearers also appear (pl. 18).

The arguments as to how these two images were related to one another - whether one is a simplification or expansion of the other - do not concern us here so much as the knowledge that both types (basically the same as regards the figure of Christ) were known in the West, at least in Italy, in the seventh and eighth centuries.

An important variation, which Wessel (1960, 197) includes under his 'Syrian' type, is on a silver bowl from Perm now in Leningrad, which has an inscription in Syriac (Schiller 1972, pl. 322). Here Christ wears a robe with long sleeves, not the colobium, and is bound to the cross like the thieves with cross-over bands, although all three are shown with their arms extended.

This long-sleeved robe, however, also appears on a group of pectoral and reliquary crosses (many of which could be called crucifixes) of sixth to eighth century date. Some of these crosses have been long known from Museum collections, others have been discovered more recently in archaeological contexts in Hungary (Barány-Oberschall 1953).

Berliner (1952) thought that the iconography of these crucifixes had developed as a further reduction of the three-figure 'Ephesian' type. Certainly one can see this as a step towards the development of the true crucifix in such pieces as the late sixth century pectoral cross now in Providence, Rhode Island (Wessel 1960, pl. 1). which Berliner was the first to publish. This shows Christ in the colobium on a cross which extends into shaft and side arms of the pectoral cross, and accompanied by the figures of Mary and John, who are reduced in scale and squeezed into the side arms.

Wessel (1960) however considered that the step to the true crucifix, in which the figure of Christ is represented alone, was influenced even more strongly by the brief appearance in Constantinopolitan art of a type of pectoral in which Christ of the Parousia (Second Coming) is represented

rather than the crucified. Only two examples with this theme survive, one in the Cairo Museum, and a second in the Dumbarton Oaks collection (pl.19). These crosses show Christ within the cross wearing the robe and pallium (the dress of the living Christ) swathed and tied at his waist. He holds out his hands, showing not the nails but the nail wounds: the wounds are also clearly visible in his feet. Above his head is a decorative element rather than a superscription, and beneath his feet an element which could be a cloud. At the end of each arm is a bust in a medallion, which Wessel identifies (1960, 101) as the Virgin Mary (upper arm); John the Baptist (lower arm); and possibly two witnesses of the Apocalypse (side arms).

The 'Parousia' image itself probably had a very short life, because it is so close to the crucifixion image: but several crosses survive which, as Wessel (1960) showed, clearly demonstrate a confusion of details drawn from the reduced 'Ephesian' image and the Parousia type with its long-sleeved dress. Such a mixture of elements is found on a pectoral cross from Sant'Agapito in the Vatican (pl. 20a). Here Christ is shown in the colobium but surrounded by the busts from the Parousia image in the upper and side arms of the cross, and the gambling soldiers from a Crucifixion scene at the foot. This cross is dated by Wessel to the first half of the seventh century by comparison with the style of the helmet of Agilulf in Florence (Talbot Rice 1965, pl. p. 163), and the Heraclian gold coinage. A seventh cross in the British Museum; the votive cross of Theodotus (a Coptic work of the late sixth-early seventh century); and a cross now in the Berlin Staatliche Museum, are representative of other forms of confusion between the two images (pls. 20-3).

There is some evidence for the westward spread of these small metal-work crucifixes, and of the influences of their iconography. There is for example a pectoral cross at Augsburg (pl. 24). This is a true crucifix, without accompanying figures: even the superscription has become a formal

pattern of circles above his head. His dress has become a long-sleeved, belted garment, with the classical folds of the pallium reduced to parallel folds in the skirt, and to two bands curving from the round collar outwards to the outer edges of the waist band. A very similar barbarisation of the dress appears to have taken place in the Durham Gospels (MS A.II.17)¹. (pl. 25). A further example from the Merovingian sphere could be the reliquary casket from Werden where Christ has no accompanying figures and on which the robe is reduced to a sleeved but knee-length belted tunic (Elbern 1972, fig. 2). These examples seem to show that some versions of the robed Christ were known in the West outside Italy, and in the seventh and eighth centuries were being adapted by local artists outside the classicising influences of the Byzantine sphere.

ii The Robed Christ in early Northumbria

Only four representations of the robed Christ in a Crucifixion scene survive from Northumbria in the seventh to ninth centuries: three in sculpture and one in a manuscript. None survive from outside this area in England, though the iconography is well represented within the Irish sphere. The four Northumbrian ^{examples,} however, if all can be accepted as showing this iconography and of this early period, are an interestingly high proportion to have survived from what is geographically a very small area.

a) Hexham I, Northumberland (cat. and pl. 26a and b)

The first example could well be the earliest surviving sculptured Crucifixion from pre-Conquest England. It is unfortunately incomplete and in fragments which have not in the past been considered to belong all together. The fragments are embedded in plaster of paris so that it is not possible to remove them for a complete new examination. In the following discussion, the pieces are referred to by the numbers which

¹ See Coatsworth (forthcoming) 'The Art of the Durham Gospels' in a forthcoming volume of Early English Manuscripts in Facsimile ed. T.J. Brown. Copenhagen.

accompany them in their display case (pl. 26a and b). The pieces unplaced in the present arrangement have been given the numbers 7 and 8.

Fragments 1-4, the remains of a robed figure (type 1), are discussed together. The robe hangs in deep U-shaped folds which appear to be curving out towards the top. The figure is edged with a moulded border (which can most clearly be seen on 3 and 4), which could be interpreted as outer parallel folds of a dress, or even (if this is the crucified figure of Christ) as a representation of the clavi, the stripes which signify sovereignty (see pl. 16). Pieces 1 and 2 have been partially defaced: the surface was probably originally smooth, like 3. The side edges of 3 are dressed smooth, but those of 1 and 2 are rather broken, and the moulded border or outward fold does not seem to continue upwards as a straight line. The slight extra width noted in the measurements (vol. II, cat.) suggest that the sides of the figure are in fact curving outwards. Taylor H.M. (1966, 49-60) considered these pieces to be the remains of a pilaster or vertical feature, unrelated to the Crucifixion motif represented by the other fragments. The detectable widening at the top, however, (where the figure seems to be thicker as well as wider) rather suggest the torso of a figure which has been broken off at the point where it would widen out under the arms. Unfortunately, the setting of these stones makes it impossible to examine the back and therefore to test the possibility that this could be proved to be part of a relief panel rather than a pilaster which is complete in width: all that can be stated is that neither the width nor the dressing of the sides is as uniform as Taylor implied.

Fragment 4 is, I believe, rightly assigned to its present position, though the border on the left is rather narrower than on 3: this piece will be discussed again below.

Fragment 5 has the foot of a cross with a straight shaft curving out to a wider, spade-like terminal (a combination of types B1 and A2). The remains of a pair of feet are placed side by side on the cross. This

fragment undisputably belongs to a carved panel representing the Crucifixion.

No. 6 has the tip of a wing, the feathers represented by deeply cut grooves. The wing touches a curved flat border, dressed smooth on the outside, and deep enough to suggest that it is indeed the border of a panel.

No. 7 is a corner of a panel, and part of the edge of a panel, both with a rolled border. In 7, the border scarcely rises above the inner surface of the panel. In 8, the inner edge of the border is deeper, but the border itself is also wider than on 7. Both differ from 6, which has a much deeper, flat-topped border (see vol. II, cat. for detailed measurements).

These differences do not necessarily suggest a number of separate panels. All could belong to one panel on which the frame widens and deepens (in relation to the inner surface) as it nears an arched top. A frame so reconstructed would have to be architectural in form, for it would need some kind of springing for the arch with its rectangular, not rolled, section. The frame would then be something like that which surrounds the Christ figure on the shaft of the Rothbury cross (pl. 27).

Several reconstructions of these fragments have been suggested. The earliest was made by the finders (Hodges and Savage 1907, 42-3) though no attempt was made to draw it. They thought they had found the remains of two terracotta plaques, one of the Crucifixion and one of an ecclesiastic in a chasuble. They describe the latter as 11 inches high (28 cm) which means they included fragments 1, 2 and 3, but not no. 4 which would have brought the total height to $15\frac{1}{4}$ inches. On the other hand they ascribe nos. 5 and 6 to the Crucifixion, and also a fragment which they considered had the upper part of the left arm of the cross, with the same shape as the foot. Fragment 4, however, could have been taken as a fragment of a cross arm of this shape, though only its edge would have been in relief: I do not therefore consider, with Taylor, that there is

an important fragment which has been lost since the original discovery.

Collingwood (1925, 72-3 and fig. 6) also described the stone as oolite, not of local origin. He suggested that the carving had been imported. His reconstruction used the same six pieces as did Hodges', but they are assembled quite differently (pl. 28). The draped fragments are incorporated into a long skirt, though whether of a loincloth or a full-length robe is left vague. The wing tip is placed on the right, reversed from its present position (pl. 26a) and with the enclosing border drawn as if it had a straight and a curved section. The reconstruction is therefore drawn as if there would have been a separately arched panel with an angel on either side of Christ's head: Collingwood compared this to the arches he incorrectly describes over the arms of Hexham II (see below). His reconstruction makes no attempt to show how the whole panel could have been bordered.

Hodges (1925^a, 133) once more mentioned the fragments, with the suggestion that the limestone could have come from Northamptonshire where St. Wilfrid had possessions.

H.M.
Taylor (1966, 53) also suggested a Northamptonshire origin, and for the same reasons. By this date the stones had been put away and forgotten; their rediscovery is due to Taylor's efforts. He reverted to the original suggestion of two panels, one of the Crucifixion, and one of an ecclesiastic (pls. 29 and 30). He followed up Hodges' original suggestion of an analogy with the Durham Gospels (Durham Ms. A.II.17, pl. 25) and, using fragments 5 and 6 only, drew his reconstruction on that model. He considered the 'lost' cross arm as additional evidence supporting this interpretation. The shape of the cross foot and the upside down appearance of the wing tip are exactly parallel (pls. 25 and 29). The arched frame produced in this position, however, gives an arched panel.

Fragments 1-4 he rejected as the dress of the crucified Christ on the grounds that robed Crucifixions of the Durham Gospels type did not have

drapery falling in deep U-shaped folds; and also because he thought the fragments reconstructed convincingly as a carved pilaster with the function perhaps of dividing two panels. He did not attempt to place pieces 7 and 8.

In my view, the relationship of these pieces to each other and to seventh-eighth century depictions of the Crucifixion requires further consideration. I accept the position of the wing tip suggested by Taylor, since this best fits the curve of the arch; and with him I accept that this position, turned up and out is an odd feature which it shares with the Durham Gospels (pl. 25), and with it alone. In a discussion of this feature in the manuscript¹ I have suggested two possible explanations for this odd feature. The first is that the wings of the angel in the model were in fact extended in flight, and that this was adapted wrongly to fit a frontal stationary angel such as we have in the the miniature and presume in the sculpture. I have noted paired attendant half figures of angels in an eighth century robed crucifixion from Mount Sinai (pl. 17). On the other hand, the creature in the Durham Gospels is actually a seraph: it has four wings and a feathered body (pl. 25). Arms are not certainly present, though they may have been meant to appear veiled. Their anatomical oddity, though not their detail or style, may be compared with seraphim in much later manuscripts (Schiller 1971, pls. 5, 6 and 8).

The artist of other Insular depictions also seem to have had seraphim rather than angels in mind. On the Athlone plaque (Irish, c.800) the angels have three wings, all springing from the front of the body (Henry 1965, pl. 46). A bronze plaque from Clonmacnois (also c.800) shows angels with only two wings, again applied to the front of the figure and not the back, and again with no arms (Henry 1967, pl. 8). Seraphim are not commonly found in association with iconography of the Crucifixion: it is interesting, however, that the earliest (mostly destroyed) image of the

¹Coatsworth (forthcoming) 'The Art of the Durham Gospels in a forthcoming volume of Early English Manuscripts in Facsimile ed. T.J. Brown. Copenhagen.

Crucifixion, on the wall above the apse at St. Maria Antiqua in Rome had cherubim and seraphim venerating the cross (Ihm 1960, 146f.). Even so, the wings on the Hexham panel and in the Durham miniature are wrongly turned outward, and the fact that they copy the same mistake argues a close connection between them.

In an article on the Hexham panel (Coatsworth 1974a) I agreed with Taylor that the shape of the foot of the cross, which is the same as that of the Durham Gospels miniature, and close to that of the Athlone Plaque (Henry 1965, pl. 46) was never found outside Insular art used as the cross of the Crucifixion. I would now point out more strongly, however, that the metalwork crucifixes I have discussed above in relation to the iconography of the robed Christ, are all contained in various forms of expanded cross though none is identical (see pls. 19-25 and the early cross forms discussed in chap. 2). These however are related in date as well as in iconography. Crosses from outside the Insular area, however, exhibit a considerable variety of form: the crux gemmata tradition had a wide sphere of influence. There is for example a twelfth century cross from Cologne and now in Nuremberg which is a latin cross (type A1) with terminals of the Hexham/Durham Gospels form (Schiller 1972, fig. 467). It is not quite the same, because it has boss-like projections above and below each arm, before the expansion. The foot of the Hexham cross cannot therefore be taken alone as clear evidence of date, or of connection with the Durham miniature.

The case for a reconstruction of a Crucifixion panel of late seventh-early eighth century date is strengthened considerably if the fragments of the robed figure are part of the same piece. Deep V- and U-shaped folds and straight vertical side folds are a feature of the colobium in many of the examples in which Christ is shown wearing this dress (see pls. 17-23), even where this dress has obviously been influenced by the Parousia image

and is shown with long sleeves. It is possible that models with the long-sleeved dress were known to Insular artists, since this seems indicated by other Insular representations such as the Athlone plaque (Henry 1965, pl. 46) and the St. Gall Gospels (Schiller 1972, pl. 349). It is not possible to show, however, whether the Hexham figure would have had a true colobium, or a long-sleeved version, or had this detail left unclear and therefore open to misinterpretation, as in the crucifix as illustrated in pl. 20a-c.

We know of one painting of the Crucifixion brought back to Jarrow from Rome by Benedict Biscop (chap. 5), and I have suggested that a comment by Bede possibly indicates that this had a robed figure - as indeed would be most likely brought back from that place at that time.

It is not possible, however, to completely reconstruct the full details of that or any other possible model. The evidence of Hexham, however, including the pieces with the figure, and taken in conjunction with the Durham Gospels miniature, suggests that a model of the 'Syrian' ('Constantinopolitan'), or the 'Ephesian' type was known in pre-Conquest England: possibly of the former since it seems to have included angels and the spear- and sponge-bearers rather than the 'Ephesian' reduction with John and Mary.

The relationship between the Hexham panel as I have reconstructed it (pl. 31) and the Durham Gospels miniature is very interesting, though it cannot be pursued fully here. It should however be said that the Hexham panel is very close in style and iconography to its presumed models, while the Durham miniature has not only returned perhaps independently to the Parousia theme but shows a greater 'Insularisation' of style. Possibly therefore the panel is the earlier of the two: the miniature is likely to date from very early in the eighth century¹.

¹See Coatsworth (forthcoming) 'The Art of the Durham Gospels' Early English Manuscripts in Facsimile ed. T.J. Brown. Copenhagen.

b) Hexham II (cat. and pl. 32)

In this sculpture, the Crucifixion scene has been adapted to a typically Anglo-Saxon (or Insular) medium, the panel on one broad face of a cross shaft.

Christ is extended on a cross of latin type, which quarters the panel, and of which the upper arm and the left side arm have expanded terminals (type B1). Collingwood described the panel as arched (see above). The upper border of the panel is in fact horizontal and the outer corners are squared: the only curve is in the splayed upper arm of the cross. The foot of the cross appears to extend below the lower border of the panel (which may just possibly once have carried an inscription) to reappear below in a smaller rectangular panel. If this is the foot of the cross, than it had an expanded foot.

The body of Christ is erect and frontal (type 1). His head is erect also, but is turned to his right without drooping. No features are distinguishable. His long hair falls on his left shoulder, and he is nimbed. His arms, which are short in proportion to his body, are outstretched horizontally. His hands cross the panel border, perhaps in an attempt to create an illusion of width. He wears a short-skirted ungirdled dress, apparently a tunic. There is some trace of a suppedaneum beneath his feet.

On the left, below the cross is a full length, half-turned figure with its large back-tipped head turned to the spectator and wearing a longish robe. He holds an implement tilted at a sharp angle at Christ's side, and is therefore most probably to be identified with the spear-bearer. The figure on Christ's left is more worn, but appears to stand in the same pose. The implement he holds up is much shorter and could not have reached to Christ's side. It is not clear whether it terminated in a cup or a sponge. The elbows of both figures encroach on the panel border.

The cross in this scene is clearly in the crux gemmata tradition

which would be consistent with an early date (chap. 2). Looked at in another way, it is the same as that of Hexham I, without its square extensions. The short unbelted tunic also suggests a model with a robed figure but here barbarised as seems to have happened in continental examples such as the Augsburg crucifix (pl. 24) and the Werden Casket (Elbern 1972, fig. 2). The large-headed figures of the spear- and sponge-bearers also suggest Insular influence. The details of large, tilted, and turned out head and the long robes are all found in early Insular depictions: the Durham Gospels (pl. 25); the St. Gall Gospels (Schiller 1972, pl. 349); and the Athlone plaque (Henry 1965, pl. 46). Only in the first of these is the spear-bearer on Christ's right, however, as I have suggested for Hexham II.

The turned head with its long hair on the left shoulder is a feature which could have been drawn from an original imported model of the types suggested for Hexham I (and which may indeed have been a feature of Hexham I itself). A model of this type in the background of the whole Insular group is also suggested by the St. Gall Gospels, where the hair appears on the left shoulder even though the head is frontal.

It seems probable that Hexham II is a copy or rather adaptation of Hexham I, or at least of a representation very close to it, only moving further along the road to a completely indigenous style. There is nothing on the cross to conflict with a date from the early to mid-eighth century, on either stylistic or iconographical grounds (Cramp 1974, 130-1).

c) Auckland St. Andrew (South Church, Bishop Auckland): (cat. and pls. 33 and 34).

The third example, which is from further south (though still in Bernicia) is very different in style, and presents a very compressed iconography with a disputed interpretation.

The two surviving fragments of the cross shaft represent respectively the bottom of the shaft fitting into the base (which survives though incomplete), and a second block with the Crucifixion which is placed in

the modern reconstruction very close to what must have been its original position. From the very extended archer figure on the side, it may be just a little too high. The Crucifixion panel, however, is at eye-level.

It has generally been assumed that the Crucifixion panel though damaged at the right hand side, is complete in height, since it like all other complete panels on this cross depicts three-quarter length figures. One figure in the bottom left hand corner is however represented only by his head. No panel border survives on the lower edge, but the small part of the bottom of this face which has survived is not enough to show whether it was a continuation or part of a different scene. What survives is a balanced composition as it stands, and I have treated it as if it were in fact complete.

Before discussing the Crucifixion scene itself, it is necessary to give some consideration to the scene above (pl. 33) since however this is interpreted it has some bearing on the identification of the disputed scene below. One interpretation of the upper scene has been that it represents Ecclesia led by an angel (Kurth 1943, 213-4). The figure of Ecclesia is not known to appear in or in association with a Crucifixion scene earlier than the first half of the ninth century, and Kurth (1943) cites no surviving examples which show Ecclesia led by an angel earlier than the eleventh century. The only example of the motif represented in a separate panel is an Italian ivory of eleventh-twelfth century date (Thoby 1959, pl. LI, no. 118). There is undeniable resemblance between these two scenes, in such details as the angel's hair style. The style of carving is very different, however, and there are two marked differences in iconography: Ecclesia in the ivory is not nimbed, nor does she carry a staff with a trilobed tip, described in Kurth (1943) as a lily.

This objection to the more usual interpretation of this scene as an Annunciation is the grounds that it is 'quite alien to Annunciation pictures

of the early Christian as well as later periods', both because the figures are standing, and because the contrast between the two figures is too close. A standing type of Annunciation appears as early as c.600 on Palestinian ampullae, however, (Schiller 1971, pl. 55) and also appears on the Ruthwell cross. John Beckwith has pointed out the very striking parallel to the Annunciation at Auckland St. Andrew, in both style and iconography to be found on the Genoels-Elderen ivory, which he assigns to eighth century Northumbria (Beckwith 1972, pl. 15). Here Mary carries a large trilobed staff recognisable as a distaff, and many details of the dress of the figures are the same. It is also reasonable to point out that on the cross all scenes have overlapping figures, and three pairs stand cheek to cheek: this was a feature of the sculptor's economical and highly individual style.

Ecclesia led by an angel would in some ways be an ideal proof of the Crucifixion of Christ interpretation of the scene below, but an Annunciation would also be perfectly proper in a cycle which included the Crucifixion, and as I hope to show, there is some degree of parallelism between these two scenes which argues a planned scheme of that sort.

In the panel in question, a crucified figure is shown superimposed on two attendant figures who stand behind the cross arms. The cross (type A1) reaches to the top of the panel, but not quite to the left side. The right arm is missing. The upper arm is inscribed with the letters PAS and the left arm with AND. The figure on the cross is portrayed as bearded, with head and body erect and completely frontal (type 1). He has a plain nimbus, and his hair is dressed in flat, round curls. His arms are tied behind the transverse beam of the cross and behind his back: the sculptor's intention in showing the projection of the figure's right shoulder over the beam is quite clear. He is fastened to the cross by a cabled rope which loops round the arm of the cross: the ends are then brought across his chest where they cross in the middle, at the point where the stone is broken, and presumably looped around the missing arm. The figure wears a robe which

is draped in folds which fall diagonally from his left shoulder to his waist at the right. Below the plain belt the skirt hangs in diagonal folds on either side of a central straight fold.

The figure on the left is clearly a male saint. He is nimbed and frontal, and stands with his left hand resting on his breast, his arm lifting the folds of his stiffly carved robe. The incomplete figure on the right has hair dressed in plain bands across the forehead, a detail paralleled in the figure of Mary in the scene above. Many of the identifiably male figures on this cross have curling hair and both parallelism and contrast suggest at least this was also intended as a female figure.

Below the cross arm on the left is a fragment of a figure which has been inaccurately described in the past as the head and wing of an angel (Hodgson 1899, 28-39); the object projecting above the figure's head has been described as the leaf-shaped terminal of the rope binding the central figure (Browne 1885b, 158-9). What is actually there, is, in the left hand corner, a bearded head which is thrown back to look at the crucified figure. Starting from the lower edge just in front of his beard is the end of what must be his arm, widening into a large clenched fist from which emerges a narrow stick-like projection which reaches to the side of the crucified, just below the cabled rope. These remains suggest a figure in the act of piercing the side. The corresponding area on the other side of the cross is completely missing.

Three interpretations of this scene are possible: i) that it represents the Crucifixion of Christ. ii) that it represents the crucifixion of St. Andrew. iii) that it is probably unidentifiable.

The third alternative was put forward by Okasha (1971, 53-4) on the basis of the incomplete and puzzling inscriptions, and the fact that the central figure does not have a cruciform nimbus, which in her view ruled

out the Crucifixion interpretation. A brief survey of early Crucifixion scenes, however, soon reveals the fact that Christ crucified could be portrayed with a plain nimbus, or with no nimbus at all: the absence of the cross is not positive evidence that the figure was not intended to portray Christ. The inscriptions are, however, more difficult. Mrs. Okasha accepts that they may represent the saints' names Paulinus, and Andreas, as Collingwood (1916-18, 37) had suggested, mainly because she rejects the Crucifixion possibility. Both elements are however incomplete or abbreviations, and are open to other interpretations. Hodgson (1899, 28-39) and Hodges (1905, 217-8) suggested that the letters in the upper arm were an abbreviation of 'Passus est'; Browne (1885b, 158-9) thought it might be an abbreviation of the phrase 'Passio Christi' or 'Christus Passus'. 'Passio Andreas' would however also be a possibility if the scene were interpreted as a martyrdom. It is worth noting that the letters in the side arm are more lightly incised and more sprawling than those in the upper arm: some observers recorded them as RIEL or NIEL, perhaps part of Gabriel or Daniel (Hodgson 1899).

It seems that interpretation of the inscriptions waits on the elucidation of the scene: in themselves they are too incomplete to be meaningful.

The martyrdom of St. Andrew as a possibility is in many ways very attractive. The church is dedicated to this saint, and this could be a very early dedication, as we know from St. Wilfrid's foundation at Hexham. St. Gregory founded the monastery of St. Andrew on the Coelian Hill in Rome, and St. Wilfrid stayed there: his special prayer asking the apostle to grant him the ability to learn and teach the Gospel message is recorded by his biographer, Eddius Stephanus (1927, chap. VI, p.13). The cult of St. Andrew was widespread in the sixth century and later, and his story is found several times in pre-Conquest literature, so that clearly it was

popular among the Anglo-Saxons. It is found for example in Andreas, a poem possibly of the last half of the ninth century (Brooks 1961, xxii) in which however his martyrdom is referred to glancingly as a 'death in battle' or a violent death' (Brooks 1961, 55); and in the poem Fates of the Apostles, generally accepted as the work of Cynewulf and therefore of late eighth, early ninth century date (Brooks 1961, xix). Here he is said to have died on the cross, but there are no details apart from a reference to the shouts of the crowd.

There are two Old English prose versions, one in^a manuscript of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, no. 198 (Goodwin 1851, 1-25); and Blickling Homily XIX (Morris, R. 1880, 228-49). The Blickling Homily (tenth century) deals only with the mission of the saint to the Mermedonians, and does not carry on to the martyrdom. The prose legend, also tenth century, deals with the same incident. The apocryphal legends surrounding the death of St. Andrew can be traced back to the early Christian period, but it is interesting to note that there seems to have been an increased interest in the ninth century, at the period when the theme first appeared in both Eastern and Western art (Peterson 1958).

St. Andrew was shown crucified on a latin cross (type A1) and not the St. Andrew's cross until as late as the eleventh century: he was also shown bound to the cross in the manner of the thieves (Aurenhammer 1967, 134). This detail originates from the Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles, in which the saint is ordered to be martyred by being tied to the cross by the pro-Consul Egeas. In all the examples I can find, however - and they are relatively rare - the saint is shown with his arms outstretched. In the Sacramentary of Drogo, for example, which dates from the mid-ninth century¹ he is shown on f. 98v wearing a loincloth and with his arms outstretched on the cross: the ropes in this case are not visible. Several figures accompany this scene, below the cross on the left, and above both arms of the cross. These are groups of people talking, however, none corresponding

¹Paris, Bibliotheque Nationale, MS lat. 9428.

to the iconography of the figures on the Anglo-Saxon cross. There was also an Eastern iconography of the martyrdom in the ninth century, of which the earliest surviving example is in the Homilies of St. Gregory Nazianzen, f.32v¹.

By the last quarter of the tenth century the portrayal of St. Andrew as a robed and bearded figure at his martyrdom may have become an established tradition: this is certainly how he is portrayed in the Fulda Sacramentary, f.166r (c.975)². Again however the arms are outstretched, tied with a rope which loops around the wrists. Here the saint is shown nimbed, but again the witnessing figures represent the crowd - seven on the left and four on the right (one waving a spear but not close to the saint's side) and all watched by the proconsul, sitting apart on a throne.

The evidence seems to suggest that St. Andrew could be portrayed as a robed figure or in a loincloth, like the Crucifixion of Christ, but bound to a latin cross with his arms outstretched: apart from the ropes the scene can only be identified by inscriptions, except when other figures are present: these usually take the form of a witnessing crowd, though the proconsul as a kingly figure seated on a throne may be present. There seems to be no surviving scene, at least from these early centuries in which the martyrdom could have been confused with the Crucifixion of Christ, through the presence of attendant figures parallel to John and Mary, or the spear-bearer.

The case for the scene on the cross at St. Andrew's Auckland is based on a consideration of all its elements in the light of the earlier discussion of the iconography of the robed Christ in general and as it was known in pre-Conquest Northumbria in particular, in the seventh and eighth

¹Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, MS grec. 510.

²Göttingen MS 231.

centuries. The development of long-sleeved and belted versions of the robe has already been mentioned. The variant of the 'Constantinopolitan' (Syrian) type on the silver bowl from Fero, in which Christ is shown with outstretched arms but tied with cross-over bands has also been discussed (Schiller 1972, pl. 322). Thieves bound with crossed ropes in the same group are very common: they are found with their arms tied behind the bar on an ampulla from Monza, c.600 (Grabar 1968, pl. 317); on an icon from Mount Sinai which has already been noted as having many of the features which can be reconstructed for the Hexham sculptures and Durham Gospels (pl. 17); and on a seventh to eighth century ivory of the Crucifixion now in the Musée Cluny, Paris, for which Beckwith (1972, pl. 19) has suggested a Northumbrian origin.

As a treatment of Christ (or indeed St. Andrew) the arms bound behind the cross is a unique feature, but the motive could well have been the restriction of lateral space imposed by the shape of the cross shaft. The three-quarter length figures, one superimposed on another in several panels on this shaft seem to demonstrate the response of an artist of considerable originality to this problem.

One could however see it as a response to the similar problem posed by the martyrdom, were it not for the other figures in the scene. The figure behind the cross on the left is very like, in detail, the three-quarter length figure of St. John the Evangelist on St. Cuthbert's Coffin: his hand placed flat on his breast there as on the cross (uniquely among the apostles on the coffin) in the familiar gesture of witness with which he is commonly shown in Crucifixion scenes (see Battiscombe 1956, pl. VIII). The tradition which placed St. John on the left and Mary on the right is found as early as the seventh century, but in the Rabula Gospels, for example (pl. 16) he is found with the mourning women on Christ's right. The sculptor may have been unaware of the tradition, or he may have wished

to place Mary directly beneath her representation in the Annunciation scene above: balance and parallelism are of the essence of this cross.

Neither a credible depiction of St. John balanced by a probably female figure on the other side, nor what seems clearly to be a representation of the spear-bearer below, suggest that this scene was intended as a martyrdom of St. Andrew: even allowing for the fact that the iconography of the martyrdom was for several centuries a simple adaptation of the iconography of the Crucifixion. The accompanying figures are not differentiated in any way from those one would expect to find in a scene of Christ crucified, and this being so, this interpretation seems the most likely. The inscriptions remain simply inexplicable to modern observers.

The treatment of the hair, eyes and nose, of figures on this cross, and the linear treatment of the drapery, stands in a Northumbrian tradition, from the St. Cuthbert coffin with which Collingwood (1932, 41-2) compared it; to the Durham Cassiodorus (Durham Ms B.II.30) to which it was compared by Hodges (1905, 217-8). The iconography of the Crucifixion scene, since it is related to an iconography which was widespread in the seventh and eighth centuries, does not permit a close dating: and it cannot be closely related to a particular manuscript, as were the Hexham pieces with the Durham Gospels. The very developed inhabited vine scrolls on the sides, however, suggest a date in the very late eighth or even very early ninth century, which suggests that this type continued to be venerated in Northumbria until quite a late date (Clapham 1930, 70; Kendrick 1938, 140-2). This is interesting, in view of the difficulty of dating the arrival in Northumbria of the iconography in which Christ is portrayed in a loincloth (chap. 9).

It is possible that on this cross the Crucifixion on the shaft was accompanied by the Lamb or Christ Majesty with Evangelist symbols in the head (chap. 3 and Cramp 1978b).

There is no certain evidence of the robed iconography from elsewhere in England at this early period. A very worn panel on a cross from Mercia (Bradbourne I, Derbyshire) just possibly had this iconography (chap. 9 and pl. 78). All remaining sculptured Crucifixions which can be dated to the pre-Viking period either clearly have Christ in the loincloth, or have details which relate it to the development of this iconography.

C H A P T E R 7

THE ICONOGRAPHY OF THE ROBED CHRIST FROM THE
NINTH CENTURY ON THE HEADS OF FREE STANDING CROSSES

Thirteen cross heads are discussed below, one, Durham IV, in a short appendix to the chapter. No two of the remaining twelve are identical, but on examination they reveal a complex of relationships which distinguish them both in iconography and in their approach to design from some cross heads I classify as representing either a continuance of Anglian traditions, or a mixture of traditions, in chapter 11. All twelve share some features in common, but even those characteristics which can be identified as belonging to sub-groups among them, only serve further to isolate them all from other developments which took place in northern England in the same period. Below, I have first described all the crosses in the sub-groups into which they fall.

Cross heads of group a

In the five cross heads of group a, the figure of Christ is set with his head low in relation to the upper arm of the cross. In all cases where the upper arm has survived the remainder of the upper arm is occupied by an ornamental motif. All make use of space filling devices below Christ's arms. The figures of Christ all have a proportionately large head, in four cases clearly broader at the forehead than the chin, and flat at the top where it meets the moulding or ornament above. Two (Sinnington and Kirklevington I) clearly have a flat topped hairstyle or nimbus. Three of the figures are clearly dressed in some form of robe, one is too crude for its dress to be determinable, and one appears to be naked.

Kirklevington I Yorkshire (cat. and pl. 35) is a cross head of type 11A with the arms joined by a ring ornamented with a step-pattern. The upper arm rises above the ring and is divided from the rest of the head by a

moulding. The carving in the panel thus formed is now very worn but was possibly interlace. Below, the lower arm the cross head has not survived, but the figure of Christ (type 1) apparently filled the remainder of the cross head. He has a long wedge-shaped head with a flat top, his hair or halo represented by a flat bar of which the ends curve down on either side of his forehead. He seems to wear a garment with a high collar which rises up to a point on either side of his chin, though a head sunk between high shoulders is also implied. The most likely interpretation of his dress is that it was a straight long robe, although the lower part is missing and the arms have been defaced by the modern inscription '1698 WS'. This inscription may have obscured an earlier inscription. There is a possible A (? Alpha) to the left of '1698'. There is no surviving trace of a corresponding Omega on the other side. The space beneath Christ's arms is occupied by a double strand twist. The features on Christ's face are distinct though simply incised. The figure is in shallow relief, without modelling.

From Brompton, Yorkshire (cat. and pl. 36) is a cross head which is a disc rather than a ring head of type 10B. Unfortunately the lateral arms are not complete but unless Christ's arms were very long he must have occupied the space formed by the centre of the head and the inner part of each arm. The decoration in the upper arm, is a simple interlace-like motif formed from two linked ovals. Christ has a large, wedge-shaped, flattish head with features more crudely incised than those on Kirklevington I. He is erect and frontal (type 1), and wears a long, tunic-like dress. A bar with upturned ends beneath his out-turned feet seems to represent a suppedaneum. The space beneath his arms is filled by an interlace or twist motif.

Conisholme, Lincolnshire (cat. and pl. 37) has an incomplete ring head with arms of type 11B. The head is more crudely carved even than Brompton

but as at Brompton the upper arm has a motif of two linked ovals. Below is a badly defaced figure (type 1), different from both Kirklevington I and Brompton, in that it is both thin and apparently naked. The head has been defaced, however, and what appears to be a penis need not have been part of the intention of the original sculptor. However, the figure even in its crudity is based on a more modelled style of carving than in the two previously described crosses. Even the little shelf-like suppedaneum is one step nearer to realism than the same detail at Brompton. Two bosses are used as infillers beneath Christ's right arm, but only one appears low on his left. The upper boss on this side could have been hacked off, but there is a faint trace which might suggest an attempt at a twist motif.

Thornton Steward III, Yorkshire (cat. and pl. 38) represents a different type of crudity. The head seems to be type 10B with the arms joined by an unpierced ring. An inner roll moulding defines a cross shaped compartment which excludes the upper arm but includes the lateral arms. The figure of Christ is completely out of proportion with large flattish head on which the incised features scarcely survive, and feet which seem to encroach on the edge moulding. His disproportionately large hands fill the side arms of the cross and seem too much for the tiny thin arms to support. His dress is lumpy but indeterminable. The compartment marked off in the upper arm is missing.

Sinnington, Yorkshire (cat. and pl. 39) has a head of type 10B which is however apparently free armed. There is an interlace-like twist in the upper arm. Below, Christ (type 1) has a large wedge-shaped head with a flat top, edged with a bar-like hair or halo of the type noted on Kirklevington I. His chin sinks between markedly large rounded heavy shoulders. His dress appears to be straight robe without a waist binding. Below each arm is an element which coils in a single loop and appears to terminate at one end in a snake-like head. Possibly it is a snake, but

it could also be a decorative device like those employed on the previously described heads (see, however, York I, chap. 11 and pl. 102).

Crossheads of groups bi and bii

The five crosses in groups bi and bii are distinct in layout from group a, in that the head of Christ is placed higher in the upper arm of the cross. This dictates a body type with a long neck or long sloping shoulders in order to bring the arms into position for the arms of the cross. The body and arms of the figure are also proportionately larger than in a and tend to fill the whole of the cross, thus eliminating any space below the arms for decorative motifs. The spread apart thumb is also a feature of the figural type of the whole group. Group bii is a variation in that the centre of the cross head is always marked in some way - either by incorporating a central boss or by an incised central circle. In four of the five cross heads Christ is clearly wearing a long sleeved long robe, and some form of tunic is probable for the crude Stanwick I.

Group bi

At Kirkcolm in Wigtownshire (cat. and pls. 40-1) is a large slab-like monument on each face of which is a cross with a head of type 11C with the exaggerated upper arm known as a 'hammer head'. The reverse (pl. 41) is decorated with plant scroll and interlace and is carved in a deeper relief and a more modelled style. Is it possible that the Crucifixion was originally a plain cross added to by a different sculptor?

Below the Crucifixion is a squat, ?seated figure with his hands clasped in front of him. On the right, below, is what appears to be a pair of pincers with above them an object probably thought by Collingwood to be a hammer since he speaks of a 'smith's tools' (Collingwood 1922-3, 216-7). It may be, but if the figure is seated, it could be part of his chair. On the left are creatures with bird-like heads but apparently with arms (though no hands are visible) extended to the central figure.

Collingwood (1927a, 92) resisted the temptation to identify this figure as Sigurd, on the grounds there was insufficient evidence to justify the explanation. The poor quality of the drawing makes it equally impossible for me to assert that a Christ in Glory was meant: perhaps no certain identification is possible.

The Crucifixion shows Christ depicted erect and frontally (type 1). His head reaches to the top of the upper arm and is nimbed, the nimbus being developed from the moulding which edges the lower arm of the head. His features are indicated crudely. Because of the position of his head, his neck is long and his shoulders slope markedly to bring his arms into position for the lateral arms of the cross. Across his neck is a collar-like double incision. His arms are outlined all round the shoulder joint: possibly this indicates arm-holes but it may only be an effect of crude drawing. His hands are spread open palm outward with the thumb forced apart from the fingers in an unnatural position. The lower part of his body is squeezed into the narrow neck of the lower arm of the cross head. Across his body at this level are two more incised lines, rather far apart, which might suggest a loincloth, but his legs are curiously joined by another incised line about half way down. The neck band and these other incised lines suggest a tunic or robe rather than a loincloth, but it is a very crude representation.

At Thornton Steward I, Yorkshire (cat. and pl. 42) there is a very interesting cross head. Although in flat relief rather than modelled, it is one of the finest sculptures considered in this chapter, both in quality of carving and in the amount of surviving detail. It is a ring head of type 10B. The head of the figure of Christ (type 1) reaches almost to the top of the upper arm. It is however surmounted by a bar-like feature which fits around the top of his head and is elaborated by three small hoops which suggest a crown or an elaborate halo. The head is long and oval, even egg-shaped since it is in higher relief than the rest of the body. It

is beardless. Although the features are stylised, and in a similar way to those on other crosses in groups a and b, with the eye line continuing into the nose, there is some modelling of the forehead, the bridge of the nose, and the eye itself. The flattened lower edge of the eyes rather subtly suggests that the eyes are closed. The mouth, however, is a simple horizontal incision.

The arms are extended horizontally, but the position of the head high in the upper arm has led to a long neck and sloping shoulders. Christ is clearly wearing a long robe, with long sleeves wider than his arms and edged with an incised border. A double band appears at each side of the neck and crosses the upper part of the figure diagonally to disappear behind him beneath his arms. The bands lace over and under each other as they cross (cf. Auckland St Andrew, pl. 34). The hands are held open palm outwards. The end of the arm is filled with a single meandering strand.

The opposite face is equally interesting, and appears to represent a seated Christ in Majesty (pl. 43).

Group bii

Although very crudely carved, Stanwick I, Yorkshire (cat. and pl. 44) a disc head of type 10B, is interesting because it is complete. It shows a figure almost as an incised outline, though the background is cut very slightly away. Christ is nimbed, his nimbus apparently an extension of the plain moulding which outlines the cross. His body and head are erect and frontal (type 1) with the head on which crudely incised features barely survive placed right at the top of the upper arm. This necessitates the very steeply sloping shoulders and upper arms of the figure, to bring his arms into the arms of the cross. The arms end in crude three fingered hands with the thumbs held apart at an unnatural angle. His legs are rather apart and his feet turned out. His dress is very difficult to distinguish but a line across his left arm suggests that the intention was to portray a tunic. A prominent feature is the umbilicus-like boss in the centre of the body, which is clearly the centre of the cross head, as on the opposite

face. It looks as though a head of some standard shape and design simply had further decoration, on this face a Crucifixion scene, fitted into the spaces left by the boss and the border.

Thornton Watlass II, Yorkshire (cat. and pl. 46) is part of a cross head of type 10B with a ring and unpierced armpits. It is outlined by a plain roll moulding. Christ's head is missing, but the steeply sloping shoulders indicate a position high in the upper arm. It can be assumed that the head like the type 1 body was upright and frontal. His arms end in large three-fingered hands with thumbs spread apart, as at Stanwick. In the centre of the figure and of the head is a large incised circle with a lumpier more roughly dressed surface than the figure. The edge of a long sleeve is visible on the figure's right arm. The lower part of the body gives an odd impression of a figure with very thin legs following the outline of the head. This must be an effect of the missing lower part of this arm, however. A more likely explanation is a long wide skirted dress with a double outlined skirt perhaps indicating a stylised fold (pl. 47).

A second head at the same site, Thornton Watlass I, (cat. and pl. 48) is of the same form. It is outlined by a roll moulding. The figure and of Christ are upright and frontal (type 1). The head head is set high in the upper arm of the cross, with the edge moulding curving outwards to accomodate it, and perhaps suggesting a nimbus developed from the moulding as on Stanwick I. The feet are just visible below the long robe, resting on the lower border of the head. His arms slope sharply down from the shoulders and are extended from the elbow. They end in a hand with three fingers and a thumb held apart. The depiction is a degree more naturalistic than on Thornton Watlass II or Stanwick I, however. The skirt of the long robe, though not so exaggeratedly wide, follows the shape of the lower arm as was suggested for Thornton Watlass II.

In the centre of the figure, but slightly off centre in the head, is an incised circle. Below the surviving arm of Christ a number of carved shapes can be seen. These may be space fillers as in crosses of group a.

However, they oddly suggest a second arm and hand - indeed the spread apart thumb of the lower arm is quite clear. Possibly the carver made a mistake in his proportions and had to start again, but it is possible that the whole face has been recarved.

Cross heads of group c

On the three faces of the two crosses of group c, the centre of the cross is completely dominant, in two cases consisting of a ring including prominent bosses. The heads are of different types and proportions from each other, and from the crosses in b and particularly bii. The robed figures in the Lancaster head must have filled the cross in the same way as in group b, however. Brigham is unique in England in the omission of the body, but the large and high plated head is also reminiscent of group b.

Lancaster II (cat. and pls. 49-51) is a small fragment of a cross head possibly of type 11B. It is not clear whether it was meant to be free-armed or part of a ring head. If it was the former then it was not finished because the armpits on either side are not completely hollowed out (pl. 49). Another odd feature is that there appears to be a Crucifixion scene on both faces: this is not unknown but is rare. The bottom of the stone is smoothly dressed, with no indication as to how it could have been affixed to a shaft. The most prominent feature of each face is the centre of the head. On face i (pl. 50) this takes the form of a circle outlined by a roll moulding inside which five bosses are arranged symmetrically in a cross shape. Taylor, H. (1903, 53) suggested that these represented the five wounds of Christ. Below appears the lower part of a figure in a long robe, with turned out feet resting on the lower, slightly convex border. The beginning of the outstretched arm of the figure is visible on the right.

On face ii the centre of the head appears to have been a large, circular, rather flat boss, but it has been somewhat defaced. Below appears the lower part of a figure in a knee length skirt, whose legs do not reach

the bottom of the arm. The turned out feet are carved with a heel and instep as on the other face, which suggests that the same sculptor was responsible for them both. Below the feet is a sloping strand-like feature incomplete on the left, but looped or hooked on the right. Taylor, H. (1903, 53) suggested that this was a representation of the pincers used to remove the nails in deposition scenes, but a simplified representation of a snake below the cross cannot be ruled out and indeed seems as likely an interpretation, if it is not to be regarded as merely an ornamental space filler, or even a slightly askew representation of a suppedaneum.

It may be that both faces of this cross head did once carry depictions of the Crucifixion scene. That on face ii with a figure with dangling legs and a snake or ?suppedaneum was almost certainly one, even though the extended arm of the crucified on the right is not entirely clear. There are differences in the dress of the two figures, however, and apparently in the treatment of the centre of the head. If the five bosses on face i do represent the five wounds (see also below), their depiction would be consistent with the depiction of the risen or ascended Christ or with the Christ at the Second Coming, as well as with the crucified. I have noted that the Crucifixion is associated on other crosses with scenes of Christ in glory or as a judge. The fact that on both faces the central feature of the cross head is more prominent than the figure seems to be a development from the treatment of this theme in group bii.

At Brigham, Cumberland (cat. and pl. 52) is a crudely shaped cross head possibly intended to be type 11B. In the centre of one face is a large raised circle almost overlapping the armpits: the moulding is a flat band type. Within are seven bosses, six arranged in a circle around a central one.

The side arms show no trace of the arms of a figure, but are filled with interlace patterns. In the upper arm, and very crudely carved, is a

human face. The face, which is also worn and damaged, is shaped somewhat like a blunt-ended wedge.

Summary and date of groups a-c

On eight of the twelve crosses Christ is depicted in a robe (nine if Stanwick is included). In one his dress is indeterminable, and in one the body has been omitted altogether. Only at Conisholme is there clearly a naked figure. The detail of the robe, therefore, is a factor which links all groups. Within this broad category, however, the subgroups are formed by the disposition of the figure of Christ and by some details of his depiction, by the presence or absence of subsidiary decorative motifs and their position, and by the presence or absence of a circle at the centre of the head, applied to or obscuring the figure of Christ. All treat the head of a free standing cross as a crucifix. Eight of the heads have some form of ring or disc, which has long been recognised as associated in England with sculpture of the Viking period^(Collingwood 1927a, chap. XIV). The precise form of the (?unfinished) Lancaster head is uncertain, but Collingwood (1927a, 102-3) clearly believed it to be late in its mixture of a decorative and representative intention; to which could be added the evidence of the technique of carving in a shallow and unmodelled style. The squat proportions of the two free-armed heads at Sinnington and Brigham, though based on the form of earlier Anglian heads, have been shown to have developed in Yorkshire and the north west in association with ornament of the Viking period (Bailey 1974, 202 ff). The development of the upper arm to form the subtype known as the 'hammer head' as at Kirkcolm has also been noted in connection only with late and sometimes debased ornament (Collingwood 1927a, 90-1).

The iconography of groups a-c

The representations of the robed Christ discussed in chap. 6, the latest of which is unlikely to date much after 800 (if it is as late) were confined to part of what had been the kingdom of Bernicia, in what is now

Northumberland and Durham (fig. 5). The one manuscript miniature with the Crucifixion of this early period in Durham Gospels (MS A.II.17) is also associated with this area; and one ivory carving with a related iconography has also been connected with the same area (Beckwith 1972, pl. 15). Such a limited distribution of a particular iconography is not necessarily surprising if it is seen as associated with the very active monastic communities of Monkwearmouth-Jarrow, Lindisfarne, and Hexham, with their well documented links with each other; with other parts of the Hiberno-Saxon area; and with continental centres in Gaul as well as Rome. It is not possible to be certain it was so confined, however, and there is, for example, some doubt about the iconography of Bradbourne I (chap. 9).

It is, however, interesting that the iconography of the robed crucified has no surviving successors in the area of its early dominance later than Auckland St. Andrew (chap. 6). Durham IV (below, appendix) though associated with a revival of Anglian sculptural traditions in the eleventh century, is different in iconography and is probably not a Crucifixion at all. Possibly from the eighth century, and certainly in the ninth century, sculptors and their patrons in eastern Northumbria preferred the iconography in which Christ is portrayed in the loincloth (chaps. 9-11), and it is with this iconography that the earliest development of the stone cross as a crucifix in England seems to have taken place, before the mid-ninth century (chap. 9).

The distribution of the twelve cross heads of the present discussion overlaps in Yorkshire with cross heads which follow the Anglian tradition, or which represent a development from it or even a mixing of different traditions. On the other hand, it does not overlap at all with the area from which the early robed Crucifixion on the cross shaft and in architectural sculpture has survived (figs. 5 and 6). With no coincidence in date or distribution, there is not even a prima facie case for seeing the one as a development of the other. It is necessary, therefore, to look for new sources of inspiration from outside Anglo-Saxon England. The distribution

of the twelve cross heads does, however, coincide with areas of Scandinavian settlement, though of various dates and sources. This, which supports the evidence of the head types, is clearly a factor which must be taken into consideration, and may be a pointer to the source of the development.

Certainly possible external influences of the right date are, on examination, quite severely limited. The robed Christ clearly went out of fashion in ninth century Carolingian art, for example, though it possibly had more influence on the development of the Carolingian iconography with the loincloth than has been acknowledged (chap. 9). It was not lost: a few examples continued to be produced with elements added from the complex symbolism of the Carolingian image, as can be seen on at least one ninth century ivory (Goldschmidt 1914, pl. LVII, no. 132a) but such reworkings of the old iconography are rare. From the tenth century the robed image had something of a revival in Ottonian art (see chap. 8). The fact that German Christian missions were active among Scandinavian peoples from as early as the ninth century (Foote and Wilson 1970, 14-5) suggests Ottonian art as a possible source of influence for Scandinavian artists, but could be too late to allow for the influence of Scandinavian artists on the development of the robed crucifix head in England. Indeed, the earliest depiction of the Crucifixion certainly made in Scandinavia, that on a carved stone at Jelling, is unlikely to be earlier than c. 960-85 (Wilson 1978, 136) though attempts have been made to suggest a slightly earlier date. It is interesting that this carving has been seen as showing Ottonian influence (Holinquist 1951). The Ottonian representations themselves, which are described more fully in chap. 8, are commonly more elaborate in dress and in surrounding motifs and detail than the northern English examples, and are associated usually with crosses of the simple latin type (A1). Although influence from Ottonian sources either directly or through Scandinavian (or other) sources at later stages cannot be ruled out, it is necessary to consider other, nearer, sources as primary.

In fact, few areas of the British Isles and Ireland offer any closely comparable material. In Wales, only one incomplete crosshead approaches in form and iconography that described here as belonging to group b. This is the crosshead from Llanfachraith (Nash Williams 1950, pl. LXIX, 6). From Scotland the only sculpture which shows clearly the same characteristics has been included in the discussion as falling within the area defined in chap. 1 (Kirkcolm).

In Ireland, however, it emerges very clearly that in one area very similar developments in iconography and design did take place. This is in the group of granite crosses from Leinster in south-east Ireland, confined to a small area west of the Wicklow Hills.

At Castledermot in Kildare, for instance, we find a Crucifixion confined within a cross-shaped compartment at the centre of the head of the South Cross. The upper arm contains two figure panels, of which the lowest contains three frontal figures (pl. 53). The side arms also contain panelled scenes: David as harpist on the left, and the sacrifice of Isaac on the right. The figure of Christ is frontal, and wears a long robe which is girdled at the waist. The heavy rounded shoulders are clearly the result of having to show his arms bent at the elbow in order to fit them within the confined space. He is accompanied by the spear- and sponge-bearers, uncomfortably fitted in against the curve of the cross arms, and by two small figures above his shoulders, one on either side, clearly attendant angels.

On the North Cross from the same site (pl. 54) there is on the east face a somewhat cruder rendering of the same iconography. Again the Crucifixion is confined to a cross shaped space left by the panelling scenes in the upper and side arms: in this case all have three frontal figures. Christ has rounded, hunched shoulders as on the South Cross, but the details of the face are more crudely carved and the halo or hair has been flattened to fit against the top of the panel: it is a horizontal bar

turned down and curling at the ends.

At Ullard, Kilkenny, the east face of the head (pl. 55) contains the same cross shaped compartment, and the panels in the side arms repeat those of the Castledermot South Cross. The representation of Christ, though more worn, and with the subsidiary figures reduced in substance, is the same as on both Castledermot crosses.

At St. Mullins, County Carlow, the same iconography has been further simplified (pl. 56). The three frontal figures in the upper arm panel have been retained, but those in the surviving arm panel have been reduced to a single standing figure. The iconography of Christ is the same, with the robe, hunched, rounded shoulders, and bent arms. He has the flat cap-like hair or halo with down curling ends. His body is larger in proportion to the central space, however, so the figures of the spear- and sponge-bearers have been squeezed out altogether and are replaced by their implements, while the figures above his shoulders have been reduced to heads.

On the Ballyogan cross at Graiguenamanagh, Co. Kilkenny, the process of simplification has been carried further (pl. 57). Here the cross shaped central compartment has been lost, surviving vestigially only as two frontal figures above the head of Christ. The heavy rounded shoulders of the Christ figure have survived, now also clearly influenced by their relations to the curve of the armpits. The flat-topped head is still also a feature. There is no room for figures or ornament above the arms, but attenuated figures of Longinus and Stephaton are squeezed in below.

The Aghailten cross at the same site looks like a crude reduction of the same design (pl. 58). The figures in the panel above Christ's head have been replaced by an interlace or twist set horizontally. This is separated from the centre of the head by a rather loose ill fitting inner moulding which continues around the side and lower arms of the head. Christ is a somewhat attenuated figure with long thin arms bending in over

large hands, and with legs set rather far apart. His dress is uncertain in type but appears to be short. There is a trace of some element squeezed in on either side of the figure in the lower arm.

All these crosses were considered by Henry (1967, 147-8) to represent a gradual disintegration, starting in the ninth century, of the programme of the cross at Moone, which she placed in the eighth century (Henry 1965, 150). Is Moone however so certainly the fore-runner? Henry (1965, 150) considered that one of the marks of its early date was the Crucifixion on one face of the shaft. It also has a crucifix on one side of the head, however, (pl. 59) which could be seen as a further reduction of the type established at Castledermot as we have it at Ballyogan, Graiguenamanagh (pls. 53-4, 57). Henry elsewhere sees the crucifix head as a ninth century development in Ireland, as I do with a different iconography in England (chap. 9). The Moone cross could therefore be much later than Henry suggests, on typological grounds.

The quality of the majority of the Irish cross heads, as well as their form (all are pierced or unpierced ring heads) leave little doubt as to their primacy if they are regarded as related to the Scottish and English material, although it is possible that the development from type a to b could have been independent in all areas since it is the logical outcome of the reduced proportions of the cross heads and the loss of subsidiary panels, especially in the upper arm.

Of the English cross heads in group a, that at Kirklevington I (pl. 35) conforms most closely to the Irish crosses both in the form of the head with its extended upper arm and the decoration of the ring (cf. Castledermot, North Cross, pl. 54 and the Ballyogan Cross at Graiguenamanagh, pl. 57); and in the retention of a distinct panel above Christ's head, though this seems to have been ornament as on the Aghailten cross rather than a figural scene. The flat cap-like hair or halo here and at Sinnington on an indigenous but late form of cross head (pl. 39) is also an obvious parallel.

The chin suŋk between heavy, rounded shoulders is also a feature of Kirklevington I, Sinnington and Brompton (pls. 35-6, 39). The interlace or twist space filler dictated by the space in the upper arm left by the placing of Christ is retained by the whole of group a, and seems a parallel reduction to that which took place in Ireland on the Aghailten cross (pl. 58). The ornamental space fillers beneath the arms in the Yorkshire crosses seem to be a purely local development, but it is possible that they replaced actual figures in a lost original, just as these figures were also squeezed out in the Irish development towards a true crucifix. Two cross heads which possibly show a mixing of features of Anglian and Irish/Scandinavian origin, Finghall and Hart II, actually seem to have these figures replaced by their implements as on the St. Mullins cross (pls. 56, 97, 108 and chap. 11).

It is possible, as is suggested by the Ballyogan cross (and Moone) that the influence of the Irish iconography (which looks with its choice of a robed figure accompanied by angels and the spear- and sponge-bearers like a conservative continuation of the Hiberno-Saxon tradition discussed in chap. 6) was felt over a long period from the late ninth to well into the tenth century. This would not be unlikely, through both trading and political contacts between Scandinavian groups at this period. A length of contact would be implied whether one saw the Moone cross head as a fore-runner or culmination to the Castledermot group (and I prefer to see it as the latter) - and a lengthy period of development would have to be allowed for even if one saw group b in Yorkshire, if not at Kirkcolm, as an indigenous and independent development. On the other hand, those of group a closest to the Irish crosses (Kirklevington I, Sinnington and perhaps Brompton) already show various forms of local influence or development such as in the form of the cross head or the introduction of subsidiary decorative motifs below the arms. The iconography is reduced to a mere formula of layout in Thornton Steward III and at Conisholme: one might

therefore have to see a new external influence to produce the head filling long necked figure of group b. This is likely to have been the case at Kirkcolm, where crosses of the group a type have not been found.

The cross-over bands or binding of the figure of Christ at Thornton Steward I, however, are not easily explained as a development or simplification. The cross shaft at Auckland St. Andrew seems not too far away: is it possible that it became influential again in the new impetus given to the robed iconography from Irish sources? The robes on the Irish cross heads are now very worn, but were more elaborate than they now appear, and the variations on the robed formula could still be very elaborate in the tenth century, as we see from a miniature in the tenth century Irish manuscript in St. John's College, Cambridge (Henry 1967, pl. 45). Geometrically folded robes could perhaps be formalised as rigid bands, and the down-curving flattish halo at Thornton Steward I still looks like a relation of the Castledermot 'flat cap'. Apart from a purely individual contribution by the sculptor, the only other possible source for this feature would seem some influence from the variations of the wrap around robe of the Ottonian schools though this could have come through a southern English source (see chap. 8). The source for this detail remains entirely speculative, however. Meanwhile, the overall effect of the iconography and layout, and even the flattish style, are enough to suggest that the Irish continuation of the Hiberno-Saxon robed tradition was the main source of inspiration.

The distinctive element of groups bii and c, the emphasised centre of the cross head also deserve further discussion. Brigham seems to me clearly related to the rest, although because of the absence of the body of Christ it has hitherto been considered in isolation from them. It has however been discussed in relation to a group of Irish and North British monuments which have been given the name 'face crosses'.

The original grouping was made by Roe (1960) in an article which attempted to trace the origins, in Palestinian and Coptic iconography of the sixth

century, of a distinctive iconography in which the head of Christ is dominant and the body sometimes dispensed with altogether. In East Mediterranean art and Coptic art there did appear a type of 'face cross', in which the head of Christ surmounts a cross, for example on some of the ampullae or pilgrim flasks brought as souvenirs from the Holy Places in Palestine, and also on textiles and apse mosaics (Roe 1960, figs. 5 and 6). Among the examples cited by Roe as Irish or created under Irish influence, only that from a slab from Kilbroney, Co. Down is near to these putative originals (Roe 1960, fig. 1a). Others such as a slab from Killoran, Colonsay (Reaskbuie) do have a body represented in a very stylised way, while f.291v of the Book of Kells and a bronze mount from Hovstad, Norway, also show hands appearing in the extended Crucifixion position on either side of a composition which obliterates the body (Roe 1960, figs. 1d, 4). Roe (1960, 192) defines the group as 'characterised by the representation of the disembodied head of Christ set above what appears to be an ornamental breastplate'. She considered the whole group to be confined to the period from the sixth to the mid-eighth century, with the latest example that from the Book of Kells.

The breastplate she regarded as having arisen from the iconography of Aaron and Melchisedek, in which the latter, giving the offering of the bread and wine foreshadowing the Eucharist (Gen. XIV, 18), and was shown in a long robe and an embroidered cloak fastened at the neck with a large round brooch. These details of high priestly dress are drawn from Exodus, XXVIII, which includes a reference to the 'breastplate of Judgment'. Christ was of course considered the true High Priest (see Hebrews, VI, VII, IX; and attitudes to Christ crucified, chap. 4).

Bailey (1963; and ibid. 1974, 202 ff.) pointed out that the Brigham cross head fulfilled the criteria defined by Roe, but that the shape of the cross head, and other features of for example the interlace patterns,

precluded a date earlier than the tenth century. He suggested that the dating criteria applied by Roe were too narrow for the whole group, but also considered that the Brigham iconography could have been brought to Cumbria by settlers from the Western side of the Irish Sea.

Thomas (1971, 130-1) noted the extension in distribution and dating put forward by Bailey, and pointed out that similar iconography was known in the Merovingian sphere, on a slab from Faha near Trier. He accepted the possible Coptic or Palestinian origin of the motif, and its possible dissemination on portable objects such as ampullae and textiles. But also entered the caveat that one might have to consider that expression of similar ideas might call forth similar responses from different peoples living far apart and at different dates.

Given the Irish connections of groups a to c it is probable that there was some link between Brigham and the Irish and North British examples: although it is not impossible that there may have been an independent attempt to portray the same idea: the High Priest idea can never have been far away from the depiction of Christ crucified in the robe (see chap. 6). On the other hand, while only Brigham satisfies Roe's criterion of the disembodied head it seems to me impossible to divorce it from the Lancaster head and indeed from the Yorkshire cross heads of *bi*. The forms of all the central roundels, however, could have been influenced from earlier Anglian crosses rather than from any external source. This feature may have been utilised as a brooch or breastplate, but on a cross head such as Stanwick I it appears as though a design feature has simply been incorporated into a figural scene (pls. 44-5). An encircled centre containing figural scenes and ornament was a striking feature of some late schools reviving earlier Anglian ideas as on the Chapter House cross heads from Durham (see pls. 14-5, 89-94); and at Hart II it certainly appears that this motif was too strong to be ignored on another version of a Crucifixion scene there (chap. 10 and pl. 97), though its relationship to the figure of Christ is somewhat different. The roundel enclosing bosses was also known on ninth

century Anglian crosses, such as that at Northallerton, where five bosses arranged as at Lancaster are elaborated with interlace (Collingwood 1927a, fig. 30). The difficulty of associating this form of decoration with devotion to the five wounds of Christ was discussed in chap. 2. Such a theme might, however, have been considered appropriately adapted to either a Crucifixion scene or a depiction of the risen and ascended Christ as perhaps at Lancaster II (pl. 50).

The arrangement of seven bosses as at Brigham is also found on an Anglian cross head of possibly ninth century date from Heysham in Lancashire (Collingwood 1927a, fig. 128). It is not possible to say whether this suggests that the form taken by the roundel at both Brigham and at Lancaster was merely decorative.

On balance, it seems most likely, as Bailey (1963; and *ibid.* 1974) suggested, that there is a link between the Brigham iconography and that found in parts of Ireland and North Britain. The possibility of such a link is borne out by all the factors which link groups a to c with Irish-Scandinavian sources. The elaborate 'breastplate', whatever its ultimate origin was clearly an Irish or western variant of the robed Hiberno-Saxon iconography: see for example the Athlone plaque (Henry 1965, pl. 46); and the very interesting robed Crucifixion from the Calf of Man (Kermode 1907, pl. XVI). Such a tradition could only have been reinforced by Anglian traditions of carving cross heads with a strongly emphasised central zone, or even of an iconography of the five wounds.

Appendix to chapter 7 Durham IV (cat. and pl. 60)

The lamb on one face of this cross head has already been discussed in chap. 3 (pl. 15).

The opposite face has in the upper arm a backward turned beast biting its own tail and separated from the rest of the head by a horizontal band

of plaitwork between two roll mouldings. Below, the centre and side arms are treated as one area. In the centre of the head a figure is depicted frontally, apparently dressed in a garment with long sleeves, but with the skirt draped somewhat like a loincloth. The figure could be standing, but the proportions and the drapery over the knees suggest a seated figure, though this could be an unintentional effect. The feet rest on a suppedaneum. The arms are outstretched horizontally and the hands are crossed by interlacing bands which spring from the tails and hind legs of two animals with backward turned biting heads which fill the ends of the lateral arms. Above the figure's shoulders are creatures with the bird- or beast-like heads. If beasts, they are crouching with fore- and hind-legs tucked beneath them. The interlacing bands frame rather than tie down the central figure so that any comparison with the Crucifixion on the Jelling stone might be rather misleading (Holmquist 1951, fig. 1).

The layout clearly has some points of comparison with cross heads of group a (pls. 35-9), in the ornament above the head and in the position and possible dress of the central figure. It is perhaps more likely, however, that it represents, not the Crucifixion directly, but Daniel flanked by lions - one pair above, one pair on either side, which he grasps - as an Old Testament type of Christ. This scene appears in Ireland in the centre of the Kells Market Cross (Henry 1967, pl. 102). The similarity in composition to 'Daniel' scenes in Ireland may be seen by comparison with Henry 1967, fig. 26. The programme of this cross, which is different in several ways from the other three in the Durham group (see pls. 14-5; 89-94 and chaps. 3 and 10) could be that of Daniel and the Lamb, as types of sacrifice.

Nevertheless the interlace is parallel with those crosses for which I have suggested an Irish/Scandinavian source. The 'Daniel' interpretation could also point to a similar source. It is interesting to find on this one cross head signs of the intellectual and artistic revival of Anglian art which led to the late Durham school (chap. 3 and 10); and links with an iconography which must have developed in England among communities of Irish/Scandinavian origin.

CHAPTER 8

ARCHITECTURAL SCULPTURES IN WHICH CHRIST IS
PORTRAYED IN A LONG-SLEEVED ROBE

The three sculptures which form the main material for discussion below - Langford II, Oxfordshire; Bitton, Gloucestershire; and Walkern, Hertfordshire - are all, unlike those in chap. 7, major works which have attracted considerable attention from students both of art history and architecture. All are from sites in southern England (fig. 5) and all are from churches in which at least some fabric thought to be pre-Conquest survives; one and part of another are in fact still in situ within that fabric. All three represent problems for the student of the iconography of the crucifixion, either as to their reconstruction (Bitton, Walkern); or their date. In particular the date of the iconography represented by the Langford rood is among the most disputed for all early sculptures.

A fourth sculpture, a panel from Barton-on-Humber, Lincolnshire, is discussed in a short appendix to the chapter. Its links with the first three are slight (and may even be considered tenuous) but are closer than with any other group. Its position (it also survives in situ) and its geographical location (fig 5) nevertheless makes it of major importance in any discussion of the development of the Crucifixion theme in architectural sculpture.

Langford II and Walkern are entirely different in style and technique: but if Walkern is accepted as a Crucifixion it is so close in iconography to Langford II as to justify a rigorous examination of the evidence for its date provided by its architectural setting. The fact that a fragment of the robed rood at Bitton is also in situ has also been accepted by some writers as providing evidence for a possible pre-Conquest date for Langford II. It is necessary therefore to examine carefully the two, or more probably, three fragments from this site to see if a reconstruction need be at all close to the Langford II type, as well as again to look closely at the

architectural evidence. Each sculpture will therefore be discussed in turn, with these questions in mind, before the problem of the Langford iconography is considered in detail.

Langford II, Oxfordshire (cat. and pl. 61).

The cross is of the latin type (A1). The foot of the cross terminates in a forward sloping ledge or suppédaneum. Near the end of each arm and crossing it vertically is a moulding of triangular section against which Christ's hands lie. These mouldings push the hands forward and thus were an aid to the modelling and undercutting of the hands and sleeves.

The figure of Christ which is in deep relief and is almost complete except for the head, is depicted frontally and erect, with the arms extended horizontally. There is no trace of the head on the upper arm which however appears to be of the same stone as the rest, and which has also very little apparent trace of damage. If the head was very deeply undercut, possibly only a relatively small portion of it would have been attached to the cross. The straight neck suggests an upright head with no turn or sideways inclination. There is nothing to suggest it inclined forwards. The arms are not bent but have the slight curve natural to an extended arm, and end in drooping finely modelled hands turned palm outwards. The thumbs are partly missing, but the stumps suggest they were folded into the hand along the line of the index finger. The feet are placed slightly apart, and though damaged clearly rested straight on the sloping ledge without turning outwards.

Christ's robe is cut straight across at the neck. The sleeves cling at the top and front of the arm and droop below the wrists where they are deeply undercut. Almost the full circle of the sleeve is shown at the wrist. The body of the robe is almost straight, smooth at the front, with some modelling of the legs beneath and is drawn into four fine pleats or folds at each side. It is tied at about waist level by a loose girdle tied with a circular knot at the centre front: the two ends of the girdle hang loosely

side by side from the knot.

There is no architectural evidence for the date of this sculpture; further discussion of its iconography will be left until after the examination of Walkern and Bitton.

Walkern, Hertfordshire (cat. and pls. 62-3)

The head of the Walkern sculpture, though damaged, has partly survived (pl. 63), but unfortunately the body of the figure is incomplete at what may well be a (literally) crucial point (pls. 62-3). It seems clear however that the head and lower part of the body are a continuous composition¹. The head is carved in higher relief and in a more modelled style than the body. Above the head are the remains of four vertical strips. These are carved on a stone which is separated from the stone below by an irregular break, but which is clearly part of the same composition as is shown by the vertical square cut edge moulding common to both surviving carved areas, though here it survives only on the right. This feature is difficult to see from ground level, but is undoubtedly what Taylor, H.M. and Taylor, J. (1965⁷⁸, 630) refer to as possible traces of lettering above the sculpture. The strips are clearly fingers, and are therefore part of a Manus Dei above the figure. The head is unfortunately damaged and the moustache and beard seen by some observers may be an effect of this! The very shape of the head from nose to chin is in some doubt. It looks as if it narrows sharply towards the chin, but if the chin (and even more, a beard) were even as modelled and undercut as at Daglingworth (Appendix B and pl.175) the removal of a large flake from the lower half of the face would have a very odd effect. The hair fits closely round the head somewhat like that of the Daglingworth figures, but though also parted in the centre it is not as stiffly formalised

¹The sculpture may have been made from two blocks of stone since there is a clear horizontal break across the skirt. There is no trace of such a break between the head and body, however, either in the photographs or when viewed from ground level.

into separate little curls as in the Gloucestershire church. Walkern has been compared with Daglingworth because of the girdle around the robe of the Christ Majesty and the figure of St. Peter there (Brown^{G.B.} 1925, 483; Taylor, H.M. and Taylor, J. 1965⁻⁷⁸, 630), but again the type of stylisation and the technique of carving are not the same. Moreover the eyes of the Walkern figure are more finely modelled than in any of the Daglingworth sculptures (pls. 175-8) with lids as well as eyeballs, and the nose too has more of a bridge and is more undercut to show the modelling of the nostrils. The ears though set high, again as at Daglingworth, are also more naturalistically modelled. There is no trace of a nimbus behind the head. Traces on the damaged portion of the upper part of the carving imply steeply sloping shoulders, but are perhaps not to be trusted, since they occur below the point at which the stone is damaged and cut back from side to side, as can be seen from the damaged mouldings.

Below the damaged portion appears the lower part of an erect frontal (type 1) body, from just above waist band to feet. It is dressed in a long robe, dressed flat for most of its width but cut away towards the edges as if chamfered, as can be seen from the depth of the sharply angled hem seen from below. Folds or pleats drawn to the side are implied by incised lines, and the angular hem seems like a crude attempt at the undercutting seen used more competently on a sculpture such as Langford II. A model with this detail in some three dimensional medium is therefore implied by the unmodelled carving at Walkern. The smooth folds which imply the shape of the legs under the robe at Langford, however, are here rendered as six incised lines, of which the two inner lines are roughly diagonal and meet each other slightly off centre above the hem. The incised lines which reach the hem are clearly related to the legs, as they appear at the sides of the feet, but without any modelling of the figure they appear meaningless. The attempt at representing undercut drapery is again reminiscent of the slabs

at Daglingworth with their inch thick stone loincloths and robes (pls. 175-8), but the flat surface of the robe at Walkern looks like a completely independent attempt at producing a modelled original in stylised form. The sculptures at Walkern and Daglingworth do not therefore have to be considered as necessarily linked in dates.

The girdle at the waist of the Walkern figure (pl. 62) incorporates two mistakes by the carver. It appears to pass under a fold of the skirt on the left; and the knot is not related to the waist band. Instead a separate strip has been drawn, of which each end has been looped through the girdle and then passes under itself: the two loose ends (which conform very closely to the Langford girdle) have then been joined by an incised line rather like the V-shaped end of a tie. (Alternatively this could be another V-shaped fold in the skirt.) This girdle is very obviously an elaboration and a mis-understanding of the Langford II girdle type, and this detail alone implies an important model of Christ to which both relate. The figure's feet are straight and placed slightly apart as at Langford. Here, however, they have been cut off by the alterations to the arch below (see below).

In spite of differences in style and technique, it is clear that if Walkern could be shown to be a Crucifixion beyond doubt, it must be very close to the iconography of Langford II. The presence of a Manus Dei at least does not forbid such a possibility, since this was a common feature in Crucifixion iconography from the ninth to the eleventh century (and later in some areas). It was most common in Carolingian and Ottonian schools in which Christ is portrayed in the loincloth, but is also found in some Ottonian representations of the first half of the eleventh century in which Christ is portrayed in a long-sleeved long robe. See for example an ivory in the Musée Cluny, Paris (Thoby 1959, pl. XXVII, no. 63); one in the Musée du Cinquantenaire, Brussels (Thoby 1959, pl. XXVI, no. 58); and one in Berlin (Schiller 1972, pl. 379). The robes in each of these ivories is of the type with no visible girdle (see discussion of Bitton below). In each of them also the hand clearly holds a crown over Christ's

head. The area between the damaged and incomplete hand and Christ's head at Walkern is also damaged, so that it is not possible to say whether it had this feature. The Manus Dei was popular in late pre-Conquest depictions of the Crucifixion, however, where it occurs six times with Christ in the loincloth (see hand lists vol. II) and was also an increasingly popular symbol of God in symbolic representations such as those discussed from southern England in chap. 2. The appearance of the Manus Dei at Walkern, therefore, could be explained as an adoption of a motif popular in southern England, although it is also clear that the iconography of the robed crucified in the West was modified from the ninth century by the addition of symbolic elements in line with developments first associated with Carolingian types in which Christ is shown in the loincloth. (See for example Goldschmidt 1914, pl. LVII, no. 132a; and chaps. 9 and 13 below).

The presence of the Manus Dei however does not offer final proof that the sculpture was of the Crucifixion. The symbol of the presence of God could occur in other scenes in which God's acceptance of Christ as His son was important, for example in scenes such as the Presentation in the Temple (Schiller 1971, pl. 235). More important from the point of view of Walkern, it could appear in association with the Transfiguration, (Schiller 1971, pl. 412); and the Ascension (Lasko 1972, pl. 70). It also seems to have become linked with the representation of Judgment or the Second Coming in late pre-Conquest images with the empty cross (see chap. 2). It could therefore perhaps be linked with the figure of Christ in Majesty. It thus becomes important to see whether the figure at Walkern could be reconstructed in any way other than with outstretched arms.

If the raised border is carried straight down from the head part to the body part of the carving, it is difficult to see how the figure of Christ could be reconstructed with arms at a proportion consonant with the length of the body. Even if they were clasped on the breast they would have had to be exceptionally puny for the width of shoulder and upper arm

to be contained within the panel. The technique of carving is flat and unmodelled, but there is no suggestion of this type of distortion. Clearly the body has been dressed back at this point for some purpose, perhaps to make a seating for a roof-plate as Taylor H.M. and Taylor J. (1965⁻⁷⁸) have suggested (see below). The outstretched arms would also have had to be dressed back if this had indeed such a practical purpose: or perhaps if they were carved on separate stones as commonly in pre-Conquest roods (see Langford I and chap. 13) they could have been removed altogether. The present plastering of the wall prevents any examination of the surrounding fabric.

Crucifixion crosses outlined with a raised square cut moulding are found in late pre-Conquest architectural sculpture at Breamore and Headbourne Worthy (chap. 13 and pls. 144-9). If the mouldings were turned at Walkern to outline the cross arms, as seems the most likely explanation if this figure had arms at all, then this like the Manus Dei could be considered to demonstrate the influence of a period and regional taste affecting works of a different iconography (though see the discussion of robed figures in relation to Bitton below). Though final proof of the pose of this figure is lacking, it does seem most sensible to see it with outstretched arms, and therefore as a Crucifixion or just possibly as a Christ Majesty or Christ of the Second Coming. This idea we saw was close to the meaning of the early robed Crucifixions discussed in chap. 6, and cannot easily be distinguished: as we shall see similar ideas have been held to influence the Lucca type (below, discussion of Langford II). The architectural evidence for the date of this sculpture is therefore of central importance.

The sculpture stands in the south face of the south arcade, and therefore in what Taylor, H.M. and Taylor, J. (1965⁻⁷⁸, 628-30) considered was the original external south wall of the pre-Conquest church. The evidence of date is based partly on factors such as the thinness of the walls (Brown, G.B. 1925, 483), and partly on the presence in the eastern jamb of the western arch of the arcade of an impost of a different character from that in the

western jamb of the same arch and in either jamb of the eastern arch.

This impost is a through stone returned along the south face of the jamb but not on the north and decorated with convex mouldings incised with diagonal lines to give an impression of cable moulding (Taylor, H.M. and Taylor, J. 1965, fig. 319; *ibid.* 1966, 10-11). Taylor, H.M. ^{and Taylor, J. 1965-} (1978, 1053) has reiterated their belief that such mouldings (here called 'double wheatear') are distinctive of pre-Norman architectural sculptures. A very similar decoration is found at Daglingworth, also a period C church (Taylor, H.M. and Taylor, J. 1965⁻⁷⁸, 188, fig. 81).

The Taylors' explanation of the architectural oddity at Walkern was that this impost and its jamb formed the east side of the original south door of a aisle-less church which were left in position when the arcade was cut through the wall. The position of the sculpture which would have been centred over such a door and which has had its feet cut off by the arch of the arcade is supporting evidence that this sequence of reconstruction was followed. The damage to the upper part of the figure then falls into place as seating for the roof-plate for the roof of the Norman aisle, which was narrower than the present one. The aisle is thought to have been added in the early twelfth century (RCAM 1911, 224), a view supported by H.M. and J. Taylor by reference to its proportions so that it seems reasonable to suppose that the original wall with its sculpture had been built some time before, though probably late in the pre-Conquest period. With the Taylors, I find it difficult to believe that the original wall with what is after all quite a prestigious piece of sculpture was set up and then defaced by Norman builders and rebuilders within a very short space of time. If Walkern is accepted as a sculpture on the Langford pattern, and the post-1100 date for roods of the Volte Santo I type is also accepted (but see below), then one would have to see this sculpture as having been put up and destroyed within a very short space of time indeed. The iconography of this sculpture is discussed again in connection with Langford II (below).

Bitton, Gloucestershire (cat. and pls. 64-6)

Three fragments of one or two roods are preserved at Bitton, of which only one (a) is in situ.

Fragment a (pl. 64), really two blocks of stone set one above the other, is built into the original east wall of the nave, resting on the square cut string course which is also a surviving detail of the pre-Conquest east wall. Taylor, H.M. and Taylor, J. (1965⁻⁷⁶/₂, 74) are convinced that the original Saxon chancel arch itself was replaced only in 1843, and that the original walls must have risen to at least the level of this string course, c. twenty seven feet from the floor. It seems likely in this case that it was the alteration of the roof line which led to the destruction of the rood.

The blocks are therefore in the same relationship to the fabric of the church as the defaced figure at Bibury (chap. 13 and pl. 155). See also Taylor, H.M. and Taylor, J. (1965⁻⁷⁶/₂, 74). It seems reasonable, therefore, to assume for them the same date as the church, which the Taylors place in their period C (950-1100).

The upper of the two blocks has a sloping suppedaneum almost triangular in section except for a small square cut projection beneath the toes. This ledge stands out from the wall to a considerable depth. On it rest a pair of feet, very slightly turned out. On the lower block is the head of a snake in deep relief, rearing upwards with open jaws and protruding tongue. It is in profile, and one bulbous eye can be seen. The head rises from what is now an almost indeterminate mass. Taylor, H.M. and Taylor, J. (1965⁻⁷⁸/₂, 74) thought the waving lines possibly represented the waves of the sea but that the stone was too worn for certainty. They could represent the defaced coils of the snake.

Fragment b (pl. 65) is the left arm of the crucified stretched out on the cross. It is bent slightly at the elbow. The fingers are large and clumsy, with the little finger almost as long as the rest. The thumb is missing but would appear to have been alongside the fingers. The hand rests

on a deep roll moulding which crosses the arm vertically. Beyond the moulding the cross arm which is of the squared latin type (A1) is stepped, rising to a square cut fillet at the end. Taylor, H.M. and Taylor, J. (1965⁻⁷⁸, 74 and fig. 264) compare this termination to the moulding beside the pre-Conquest west door of the church at Sherborne, Dorset; but the sections are not identical: that at Bitton is in effect two separate mouldings, not one roll moulding with a step. As they also point out, however, the hand crossing the moulding is closely comparable to this feature on Langford II, and a similar detail is found at Headbourne Worthy (chap. 13). This detail is also comparable to the use of mouldings and stepped terminals on smaller roods and panels in which Christ is shown wearing the loincloth. See the discussions on Breamore, Langford I and Stepney, chap. 13.

Christ's arm is sleeved but the sleeve is closer fitting than on Langford I, especially at the wrist.

Fragment c (pl. 66) is a sculptured head which was dismissed by Taylor, H.M. and Taylor, J. (1965⁻⁷⁸, 76) as not being of pre-Conquest date because it is in the round, and unlike other pre-Conquest heads known to them. It is apparently of the same stone as b. It is not in fact completely in the round. The flattish back of the head is at an angle to the face, so that one side of the head is thicker than the other. If the head was attached to the block of stone at the back, then this would give a head in deeper relief at the (spectator's) right than the left, which would be consistent with a head in relief shown turned to its right. This is consistent with another oddity of the stone, that is that if held upright with the nose as a vertical, the eyes still slope down to the figure's right. The position implied for the head by these two features seem to me conclusive in suggesting it as the head of Christ on the cross, while the proportions suggest it was the head of the same rood as the fragments a and b (see pl. 67).

The head is in deep relief and finely modelled, the modelling extending even to the very marked division of the upper lip and the down drawn corners of the mouth. The hair is thick, standing out from the head, and is without a parting. The surface of the hair is very worn, but there may be traces of curls at the edge. The left ear and a lock of hair behind it are quite distinct. The eyes are either closed, or the upper lids are lowered so that they are looking down to its right.

Each detail of these fragments will be discussed separately before any reconstruction of the whole figure is considered.

The sloping ledge of the suppedaneum is too widespread to be diagnostic of iconography or date, but it can be noted that it is generally found in those ninth to eleventh century depictions which also have the snake wound around the shaft of the cross. The snake first appears in this position in the ninth century and is a clear reference to the fall and to the Adversary of God defeated by Christ's expiatory death on the cross: 'And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shall bruise his heel'(Genesis III, 15). It fulfils the same function as the skull or head or body of Adam sometimes placed beneath the shaft of the cross (see chap. 2). The snake commonly appears as possibly it does at Bitton, coiled about the shaft with rearing head and open jaws. In some examples the reference to the Fall is made quite explicit by having the protruding tongue touch Christ's foot. None of the twelfth-thirteenth century robed crucifixes with which Langford II is most commonly compared have this feature, which belongs to the expanded Carolingian crucifixion image which was carried on into Ottonian art (see also chap. 9 and 13). Within these periods the girdled robe and the snake did appear together, for example in an ivory in the Victoria and Albert Museum, no. 266.67, dated by Goldschmidt (1914, pl. LVII, no. 132a) to the ninth century. Other examples are a pen and ink drawing, c. 1000, or earlier

from Abdinghof, now at Kassel (Schiller 1972, pl. 382); an eleventh century ivory in Berlin (Thoby 1959, pl. XXVI, no. 59); and a Gospel Book from Echternach, c. 1050 (Schiller 1972, pl. 387). In two of these examples the snake has open jaws, one with the protruding tongue.

It is not certain that the head was not bearded, but the hair line and lack of moustache suggest it. The beardless head predominates among robed Christs crucified of the ninth to the eleventh century, and is found in each of the four examples quoted above with the snake. The bearded head predominates in robed crucifixes which have been linked to the Volto Santo at Lucca, and therefore to Langford II (see below). However, an Ottonian model can also be suggested for the surviving details of the head. The deeply indented, emphasised upper lip and down drawn mouth are paralleled in the head of Christ on the late tenth century cross of Gero, Cologne, which can be studied in detail in Wesenberg (1972, pl. 5). The very deep arch of the brow, very wide at the point where it meets the bridge of the nose, is also a feature of both carvings. Unparted hair pushed behind the ears is another common characteristic which both also share with the Ottonian robed Crucifixion in manuscript miniatures described below. The same features are repeated again and again in Rhineland carvings in both wood and stone of the late tenth and eleventh centuries (Wesenberg 1972, pls. 18-21; 25-8; 34; 49-89).

Another important point is that the form of the robe at Bitton does not conform in its one surviving detail, that is the close fitting sleeve, with the robe of Langford II. Few other details can be compared directly, since the head has not survived at Langford, though it was probably erect and frontal. We do not know whether Langford II had any accompanying motifs at all (pl. 61). At Walkern the head is frontal, but is not certainly moustached and bearded. At Walkern too the area below the feet is missing, but that above the head partly survives with the Manus Dei (pls. 62-3). We do not know whether Bitton would have had this detail too. On the other

hand the arms of Langford II are clearly not flexed, even to the slight degree that they are at Bitton. The conclusion seems to be that while both Langford/Walkern and Bitton are robed, they are not necessarily of exactly the same iconographical type, and perhaps should not be reconstructed on exactly the same lines.

None of the robes in the continental parallels mentioned in connection with the snake or indeed with the Manus Dei has the same simple, straight outline with an obvious, centrally tied girdle as at Langford II and Walkern, though most either wrap in elaborate folds about the waist or, interestingly, are tied at the waist by a concealed girdle. The pen and ink drawing from Abdinghof mentioned above, for example (Schiller 1972, pl. 382) shows Christ on a tall cross with a suppedaneum with a snake beneath. His nimbed head is turned and bent to Mary on his right, the position suggested for Bitton. His robe is wound around his waist and falls in complicated fluttering folds at his feet. His legs are visible beneath his robe. The sleeves are quite full but follow the curve of the bent arm without drooping at the wrist. A similar robe and posture can be seen in an eleventh century ivory in the Musée Cluny, Paris (Thoby 1959, pl. XXVII, no. 63).

The eleventh century ivory with the snake (Thoby 1959, pl. XXVI, no. 59) again shows Christ with a beardless face, and down-bent, turned head. The sleeves are similar to the Abdinghof manuscript, but the robe falls more conventionally and is caught in at the waist by a girdle which has however no visible loose ends.

In the eleventh century Gospels from Echternach of c.1050 (Schiller 1972, pl. 387) Christ again is beardless with his head tilted and turned to his right. The sleeves of his robe are not loose at the wrist, but his arms are relaxed rather than bent. The robe is wound about his body as in the Abdinghof manuscript but falls more simply to the feet, and had a slit neck line.

The Reichenau and other schools in the tenth and eleventh centuries

produced several miniatures with a distinctive robed Christ. These robes all have a V or slit neck line. In some there is a trace of a draped or tied waist, others fall almost straight. All have relaxed or bent arms and close fitting sleeves, and all have bent or tilted heads, often beardless (Schiller 1972, pls. 392-4; cf. also Thoby 1959, pls. XIX, no. 41; XX, no. 42; and no. 400). Interestingly many of the crosses in these scenes have a wide border which could have appeared in a three dimensional sculpture as a flat or raised square moulding, although there is no surviving trace of such a feature at Bitton (see Walkern above).

The links of southern English art in the tenth and eleventh century with centres of Ottonian art have been well attested in connection with other material (cf. Parsons ed. 1975, passim): it is not necessary here to consider all the documentary as well as stylistic and iconographical evidence. There would however be nothing surprising in seeing Bitton based on an Ottonian model. Unfortunately too little has survived to indicate how the complete figure should be worked out: the robe, for example could have been based on any one of the variations described above. The position of the head and the turned out feet imply the less erect and more drooping posture common to many of the Ottonian examples which have been cited. A reconstruction with this type of figure is suggested in pl. 67, though it should be emphasised that there is no evidence of the treatment or dress details of the body. Its importance in relation to Langford II, therefore, lies mainly in the fact that it indicates a form of robed iconography which was certainly present in southern England probably before the mid eleventh century and perhaps as early as the late tenth. Before the development of the Langford type of robe is discussed, there remains as well only the fact that the Manus Dei and square cut border at Walkern might indicate some link between the Ottonian iconography and the straight girdled robe type, which has hitherto commonly been denied to continental versions of the Volto Santo type with which Langford II is clearly related.

Langford II and the Volto Santo type

A number of monuments, all large three dimensional roods usually of wood, found in Spain, France, Italy and Germany are usually held to follow the establishment of Lucca (Italy) with its famous crucifix, the Volto Santo, as a pilgrimage centre. In this context, Langford II often appears as an isolated and outlying example. The most detailed modern argument for the dating of the Volto Santo, or rather of Volto Santo I - for the complicated iconographical argument involves the replacing of the original crucifix by that which still exists (Thoby 1959, pl. LXX, no. 160) in the thirteenth century - is contained in a long article by Hauscherr (1962). He divides the surviving robed crucifixes in Europe into two groups: those which have archaic features which are copies of Volto Santo I (and of which Langford II is an example), and those which follow the thirteenth century replacement.

Hauscherr (1962, 137-9) discusses fully the legend of Lucca, that the crucifix was carved by Nicodemus using the impression of Christ's body in the shroud and was miraculously brought to Lucca in the year 742. The tradition that Nicodemus was a sculptor cannot however be traced back before the ninth century, and the legend as we have it cannot have been written down before the twelfth century. The earliest references to a crucifix at Lucca, in both Papal and Imperial documents, are no earlier than the early twelfth century, and as the crucifix is frequently mentioned thereafter as an object of pilgrimage this could be taken to imply that it was first set up only at the very end of the eleventh century.

There are references which suggest its presence there at an earlier date, but again the earliest of these were not set down until the twelfth century. Such are two references from English sources. These are from the writings of Eadmer and William of Malmesbury who both refer to William II (1087-1100) swearing by the Volto Santo. That from William of Malmesbury¹

¹William of Malmesbury seems to have misunderstood the oath.

was probably taken from Eadmer, who was writing c. 1112 (Rule 1884, 39; Stubbs 1889, 373). This clearly does not push the dating of the Volto Santo back very far into the eleventh century, though perhaps one ought to consider the possibility of some lapse of time for the crucifix to become well known by 1100 - or even by 1112.

A third reference dating from the late twelfth century is dismissed by Hausherr, as too late to be reliable evidence. This is from the Liber Albus of Bury St. Edmund's.¹ It states (James 1895, 139):

The altar of St. Peter in the front of the church at the feet of St. Edmund was dedicated when Baldwin was prior, but it is not known by whom. But the Holy Cross which was set up in that place is very holy and ancient. Some say it was there before the monks' time; others that Abbot Leofstan, when he went to Rome, had it made, according to the measure of the cross at Lucca.

This information was provided in a record of changes in the church made by Anselm in 1189. Leofstan's visit to Rome was in 1049-50. Clearly the writer of these lines was himself uncertain of the date at which this cross had come into the ^{possession} of the Abbey, but it is interesting that the only alternative he suggests is that it was even older than Leofstan's time. Interestingly, the next abbot, Baldwin (1065-97), also visited Lucca on a visit to Rome (Arnold 1896, 68). This was recorded in an account De Miraculis Sancti Eadmundi by Hermannus the Archdeacon, written at Baldwin's request but shortly after his death. There is no mention of the crucifix in connection with his visit, but one is entitled to ask what was the attraction of this centre to a succession of visitors from Bury St. Edmund's in the eleventh century, if the famous crucifix was not set up until c.1100.

Hausherr (1962, 141) himself admits that the argument based on the silence of surviving records before c.1100 is a dangerous one. Nevertheless he comes down strongly in favour of the view that Volto Santo I could only have been set up within a few years of 1100. The evidence for the building of accommodation for pilgrims c.1070, he suggests, can only be accepted as

¹ Buxist Library MS. Hanley 1005.

evidence for the existence of the Volto Santo by this date if the legend of its arrival in Lucca is accepted in toto (Hausherr 1962, 140).

His evidence for the unreliability of the Lucca legend, in the form in which we have it, must be accepted; but neither silence nor lack of contemporaneity in other documentary records provide any sure ground on which to base a firm dating c.1100 for the original of the Volto Santo. Dating arguments drawn from style are perhaps equally doubtful when the original is missing, since style and technique can vary according to local taste and the medium chosen, without transforming the iconography out of all recognition. Local taste and the use of a comparatively soft stone such as chalk could account for the treatment of Walkern without necessarily removing it far either from Langford II or, indeed, some of the continental representations of the same iconographical type.

There are, however, two arguments involved in Hausherr's theory: the first is that Volto Santo I cannot be dated earlier than c.1100; the second is that it is the first of its kind, a famous cult object which became the model for every other rood of the same type. In this he differed from Durliat (1956) who saw a possibility that an originally Catalan iconography influenced Lucca, though some of the force of this argument is lost if one accepts that the present Volto Santo is a replacement. Schiller (1972, 144, n.109), however, notes a communication from Gottfried Edelman also implying difficulties in dating some of the works outside Italy if Hausherr's arguments are accepted. Hausherr did not see Volto Santo I as a development of an existing tradition since he considered that there was nothing between it and the eighth century to explain it. He believed it was based not on a revival of an ancient theme but on a new vision of the cross based on the important part played by the Vision of St. John in the spiritual life of the eleventh and twelfth centuries. The priestly garment with its belt is thus seen as drawn directly from Revelations I, 13:

Et in medio septem candelabrorum aureorum similem Filio hominis, vestitum podere, et praecinctum ad mamillas zona aurea.

Some support for this relationship comes from the crucifixes in Spain, which are actually called 'Majestats'.

The inspiration of the Apocalyptic Vision, however, is not peculiar to this late period. Bede's exegesis of the same passage from Revelations was discussed with reference to the Hexham sculptures and in the same chapter the influence of images of the Second Coming on the early development of the robed type was pointed out (chap. 6). The interest shown in the Apocalyptic vision in the late tenth, early eleventh century is exemplified by the Durham cross heads (Coatsworth 1978 and chaps. 3 and 10). It also seems to emerge again and again in the iconography of the Lamb and the cross with other symbols in the late pre-Conquest period (chaps. 2 and 3). It is certain also that some Ottonian schools revived or carried on the theme of the robed crucified: the work of the Reichenau school with all its differences of style is particularly clearly a return to an earlier iconography with the colobium or sleeved robe as can be seen from its adoption of the thieves with their arms fastened behind the cross bar (Schiller 1972, pls. 392-4). With this background in mind, it seems to me more likely that the c.1100 date for Volto Santo I is most reasonably regarded as a terminus ante quem this iconography had developed, rather than as a terminus post quem.

The figure at Walkern is important here as it suggests that the theme of Christ in a long robe tied with a girdle with a central knot had appeared before 1100 and probably before the end of the pre-Conquest period. In considering how this development took place, I (following Talbot Rice 1966) would give more weight than Haussherr (1962) to the existing traditions of a long sleeved belted robe both in the period before 800 (chap. 6) and in Ottonian art of the tenth and eleventh centuries (above). I would especially note that a process of simplification of the elaborate robe was going on already in this period in the work of some Ottonian schools. (See for example,

Thoby 1959, pls. XIX, 41; XX, 42; and no. 400).

In Ireland, forms of the simple long sleeved robe, some like Castle-dermot South Cross with traces of a waist binding (pl. 53), seem to be a continuation from the Hiberno-Saxon tradition without any discernible break. This is certainly the implication of the miniature in St. John's College Cambridge manuscript and the Dungannon plaque in the Edinburgh Museum both of the tenth century which seem merely further to represent developments in stylisation of the iconography discussed in chap. 6. (Henry 1967, pls. 8 and 45). The influence of the continuing Irish tradition in parts of northern Britain was noted in chap. 7.

Even more interesting is a small bronze plaque in the Dublin Museum (pl. 69). It is probably part of a book cover. Its provenance is unknown, but it has been compared in some of its details with St. Molaise's shrine (Henry 1967, 123 and pls. 54, 58-9). The simple style of dress is however not quite the same. It is also closely related to the Irish cross heads discussed in chap. 7 by the flying figures above Christ's arms and the semi-crouching figures of the spear- and sponge-bearers below (see pls. 53ff). It is not certain whether this Christ is bearded, but he has hair which fits closely like a cap, curling up at the ends. He wears a long robe with close fitting sleeves and a long, slightly flared skirt. This is tied at the waist by a double stranded girdle tied at the centre front by an interlacing knot of which the loose ends are clubbed as in manuscript interlace of possibly earlier date. The treatment of this interlace knot should be compared with that of the interlacing curls of hair in a Christ portrait in the Book of Kells (Henry 1967, pl. 27). The single large curl in the hair of all figures on the Dublin plaque should however be compared with the treatment of the hair in tenth century Irish manuscripts such as the Book of MacDurnan and the Southampton Psalter at St. John's College Cambridge, mentioned above (Henry 1967, pls. 36, 42, 45). I have already noted that the

Book of MacDurnan was taken to southern England in the tenth century (chap. 2) so that direct influence from Irish sources can by no means be ruled out. Indeed, the curious fact that the Walkern sculpture is carved with a modelled head and incised body might suggest that one thread in the revival of what is generally known as the Volto Santo type was metalwork, perhaps Irish. Fully modelled heads with a flatter treatment of the body is a feature of the shrine of St. Molaise with which Henry (1967, 123 and pls. 58-9) compared the Dublin plaque (pl. 69). The modelled head and flatter body was also noted on Thornton Steward I (chap. 7 and pl. 42).

The evidence of the Manus Dei from Walkern, together with the Irish evidence, suggests that the iconography of the Volto Santo at Lucca could have had a long and complex history, and that whatever the date of its arrival or setting up at Lucca it would not have been without fore-runners or parallels elsewhere. To my mind this is also the message of some of the Volto Santo types from France, such as those from Belpuig and Llagonne (both of which have girdles of the Langford type) which are on very archaic looking crosses with expanded terminals (type A3, see Thoby 1959, pls. LXXI, nos. 162-3).

The dating of Langford I, however, remains enigmatic. Its links with roods of the Volto Santo I type, such as those from Belpuig and Llagonne mentioned above, and the Catalan examples (Hausherr 1962, pls. 8 and 9) remain strong, as far as consideration of the iconography which they share is concerned. But the very acceptance by the Langford sculptor of a rigid iconographical convention which extends both to pose and considerations of dress almost precludes comparison with such matters as drapery styles and exaggerations of posture which could be related to either eleventh or twelfth century schools of carving. A static figure was not unknown in early Winchester art: see for example a manuscript of Bede's Life of St. Cuthbert made before 937¹; and one of Rabanus Maurus' De Laude Crucis²,

¹Cambridge Corpus Christi College, MS 183.

²Cambridge Corpus Christi College, MS B,16.3.

mid tenth century (Temple 1976, pls. 29 and 48). Interestingly, in both of these the static drapery incorporates narrow panels of fine pleats. The very graceful sleeves of the Langford figure, wider at the wrists than the elbow, are a peculiarity not shared by either Irish or continental parallels. These could both be regarded as touches of Winchester lightness in the sculpture. The partiality of English artists for wide sweeping graceful sleeves can be seen in many manuscripts and in its most dramatic form in a Crucifixion scene in a Gospels which belonged to Judith of Flanders and is dated to the second quarter of the eleventh century¹ (Temple 1976, pl. 289). That there was a possibly influential model available in southern England in the late pre-Conquest period seems reinforced by the evidence of the dress of Walkern, which seems to reproduce the same iconography in a different style. It is also Walkern, rather than Bitton (with its more positive direct Ottonian links) which points to conservative areas such as Ireland as a possible source for the development of the iconography known as the Volto Santo type.

¹New York, Pierpont Library, 709, f. 1v.

Appendix to Chapter 8

Barton on Humber, Lincolnshire (Cat. and pl. 70).

The slab at Barton-on-Humber may not properly belong in this chapter, since all that survives of the figure of Christ is the head. It does not clearly belong with any other group, however, and it is interesting and important in its own right since it has been preserved in situ above the chancel arch of a pre-Conquest church. The fabric in which the carving is set has been dated by several architectural historians to the late tenth century (see Taylor, H.M. and Taylor, J. 1965⁻⁷⁸, 56).

The slab is set above the hood mould of the eastern arch of the tower, in the west face. The tower space seems to have been the nave of the Saxon church. The slab is now very poorly lit and difficult to see from ground level. It is probable, however, that in the pre-Conquest period the wooden ceiling separating the present first floor from ground level did not exist: in that case the nave and the carving would have been comparatively well-lit by the double windows which now light only the first floor (Clapham 1946, 179-81; Taylor, H.M. and Taylor, J. 1965⁻⁷⁸, 55).

The carving consists of a rectangular slab without a frame, of greater height than width, projecting from the surrounding walling stones and placed centrally over the chancel arch. Centred near the top of the slab is a carved head described by Clapham (1946, 179) as in relief. This description is slightly misleading since the outline of the head is deeply sunken in the surface of the stone and the face hardly seems to project at all. The face is quite crudely carved with deeply outlined oval eyes, a straight rather squared nose, and pointed chin. The face is flat with little modelling except for the downward curving mouth or ?moustache. There is some sort of bearded outline to the head, though whether intended for hair or nimbus is impossible to say.

Varah (1936) and Clapham (1946, 179) suggested that the scene was a

Crucifixion with the body painted or stuccoed on the smooth stone slab. The slab looks rather as though the central part has been dressed away: this is especially clear on the right of the head, below. On the left there appears to be the ghost of an extended arm, bent at the elbow, the faint outline of a shoulder, and a straight line from below the arm to the bottom of the panel which is very little on which to suggest that this might have been a robed figure. The only supporting evidence that this is a Crucifixion at all is its position (see chap. 5). Nevertheless it compares interestingly with Walkern in its suggestion of a fashion for figures with relief or modelled heads and bodies that were only incised (and perhaps also painted). Possibly this is also a trace of Irish influence, cf. Thornton Steward I, chap. 7. In the event, however, Barton-on-Humber serves only as a reminder that the distribution of iconographical types and architectural sculptures from the surviving evidence could be completely misleading.

Summary of conclusions, chapters 6-8

It is difficult to summarise the development of the iconography of the robed Christ crucified in pre-Conquest England, since there is no overlap in the geographical areas covered by the three chapters, and apparently no overlap between the sculptures discussed in chap. 6 on the one hand, with those in chaps. 7 and 8 on the other. Indeed, there is only a possibility of an overlap in date between southern and northern manifestations of this iconography if the architectural arguments are accepted for Bitton and Walkern; if Walkern is accepted as a rood; and if the arguments for a considerable backward extension in time for the development of the Volto Santo type of iconography are also accepted. It seems to me very clear, however, from the peculiarities of distribution in both time and space, that much evidence in the form of manuscript miniatures and small portable objects, if not also in sculpture, is missing.

Nevertheless it has emerged that an iconography with a long-sleeved long robe, related in its early stages to early Christian and Byzantine types with the colobium, but also showing influence very early from types influenced by representations of the Second Coming, became very strongly established first in Hiberno-Saxon art, and more lastingly in Irish art. The reappearance of the iconography in its developed Irish form in parts of northern England and south-west Scotland must be related to the presence of Scandinavian settlers in these areas and in Ireland. Even here, however, we are faced with the possibility that the regional tradition could have been influenced by the slightly different developments of the robed iconography in Ottonian art.

In southern England the situation is more complex, or at least more difficult to analyse, partly because all arguments concerned with the development of the long sleeved girdled robe in the Crucifixion scene have centred round the dating of the Volto Santo of Lucca which may have been

(but in my view was not certainly) set up as late as c.1100. No representation of closely allied type from a continental centre has been dated earlier than the twelfth century. The evidence from southern England, however, in spite of the paucity and incompleteness of the remains, makes it possible to suggest that a variety of influences might have come together in the formation of this type. At Bitton (which has the only figure of Christ which might have not been the erect and frontal type 1, but perhaps was slightly contorted as in type 2, see pl. 67) there are interesting traces of Ottonian figural styles which link this sculpture with tenth-eleventh century works of Ottonian origin in style as well as iconography. At Walkern, in the Manus Dei, there is some evidence for an overlap between the Ottonian treatment of the robed figure, with details of dress which link it with the Volto Santo type. Irish influence, which can at least be surmised from the known movements of manuscripts such as the MacDurnan Gospels into southern England, cannot be left out of account here, since in the Dublin Plaque there is an iconography very close to the Volto Santo type which yet must have developed by the tenth century. The effect of Scandinavian settlement in parts of England, and at one time Scandinavian rule of the whole of it, might be considered as providing circumstances in which an Irish-Scandinavian iconography could have fallen together with an Ottonian/Anglo-Saxon iconography to provide two such stylistic variants of the same iconography as at Langford and Walkern. Or, indeed, such a background could have led to a ready acceptance of a Volto Santo type of iconography from a continental source. It is impossible to ascertain how this relates to the development of the Volto Santo type on the continent. To my mind this has left an open question, since in fact we do not know with any real certainty at what date this iconography appeared in Lucca, nor what its relationship would have been at that date with other representations elsewhere. It may be that the importance of the Lucca legend lies not in its attempt to provide a circumstantial background for the arrival of the sculpture in Italy, but in its affirmation of a twelfth century belief that it was a

very ancient and venerable work.

C H A P T E R 9

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE ICONOGRAPHY OF CHRIST IN THE LOINCLOTH:
THE CONTINENTAL BACKGROUND AND PRE-CONQUEST
REPRESENTATION TO c.850

1. The Continental Background

It is not easy to trace the development of the loincloth as the dress of Christ crucified before the ninth century. This is an unfortunate fact which creates difficulties in the study of the earliest appearances of this type in pre-Conquest sculpture. Examples dating from the centuries before c.800 have survived, but they are few in number and very varied in type. The increase in the number of surviving representations post c.800 is quite dramatic and it is only from about this date that several types can be distinguished clearly, and convincingly related to interesting developments in Christological and Eucharistic thinking (see Chapter 4).

The earliest representations of the unrobed Christ crucified are on a number of gems which have survived from the second and third centuries. The precise date of these gems and their connection with orthodox Christianity is a matter of dispute (chap. 4). One now in the British Museum (Schiller 1972, pl. 321) and another in Rome (Thoby 1959, pl. I, no. 5) both show Christ among the twelve apostles. This grouping is rare in later centuries. In the British Isles and Ireland, only one example survives in which a Crucifixion scene is shown near such a group, that is on the cross at Moone in Ireland (Henry 1965, pl. 68). There, however, the two groups - Crucifixion and apostles; - are confined in separate panels; and the figure of Christ is clearly represented in a long robe. In both gems Christ is shown stiffly erect and frontal (type 1); in the British Museum example the arms are bent at the elbow and appear to be suspended below the cross arm; in the second the arms are rigidly horizontal and the head is nimbed. There is too little detail to show the exact form of dress.

A third gem (Thoby 1959; pl. I, fig. 3) shows Christ without the cross, and in a contorted position (type 3) which does not seem to be found again

until the ninth century in any surviving example. Christ is identifiable by his position and a cruciferous nimbus but in so simple an engraving there is no indication of dress, if any. He appears between two figures, that on the spectator's right clearly female, in a long dress and with veiled head, and probably therefore Mary. The figure on the left is half crouching or kneeling and holds his hands up in front of his face. He may be praying - there is no trace of a spear or vessel. There is no indication of dress, and it is uncertain whom the figure represents.

There are two representations from the fifth century which have been thought to indicate the development of an iconography of North Italian origin. The first, now in the British Museum, is carved in an ivory box (Schiller 1972, pl. 323). Christ here is rigidly frontal (type 1) with his beardless head erect and his arms outstretched horizontally. He wears a simple form of loincloth consisting of a narrow waist band folded over at the centre to form a narrow strip which either hangs apron fashion or passes between the legs. The spearbearer (who has lost his spear) appears on his left; Mary and John are grouped together on his right, between Christ and the hanged figure of Judas. At this stage there was clearly no strong tradition either about the choice of accompanying figures or their relative position.

The second from this period is carved on a door panel from the church of Sta. Sabina in Rome (Schiller 1972, pl. 326). Only the ends of the cross arms are depicted, extending beyond Christ's nailed hands. Christ is bearded, his head frontal but his body slightly turned, and his arms are bent sharply in a manner reminiscent of the orans position. The only element which compares exactly with the British Museum ivory is the loincloth, which is of an identical type. He is accompanied by the two thieves on a smaller scale and beardless, but similarly dressed and posed. The group is displayed

against an architectural background.

In spite of the similarity of dress, the only possible deduction from these two scenes is that by the fifth century there was no settled, widely accepted, iconography of this scene, either in grouping or choice of subsidiary figures, or in the pose of the figure of Christ. Moreover, there is some evidence from the sixth century that scenes with this minimal dress actually fell into disfavour. At the end of this century St. Gregory of Tours had a Crucifixion in the church of St. Genesius (Narbonne) covered by a veil after a series of visions to a priest, in which Christ objected to appearing naked (Liber in Gloria Martyrum, Arndt and Krusch, edd. 1883, 501). Incidentally, of course, this story provides some evidence that the unrobed type was a little more widely known than the surviving representations would indicate. A buckle plate from Creil (Ouse) now in the British Museum gives the same impression if it is correctly dated to the seventh century (Salin 1959, 358 and fig. 150). It shows an upright type 1 figure with arms raised from the shoulder and wearing what is clearly a short skirt-like loincloth.

From the sixth to the eighth centuries a considerable number of examples survive but the evidence is mainly of the robed type, (chap. 6). This increase may not be an accident, but was perhaps due to the development of a formula (or formulae) acceptable to all but the iconoclasts, in which the robed Christ represented the theological point that he was both God and Man, Victim, Victor and High Priest (chaps 4 and 6). There can be little argument that this iconography found its way into Hiberno-Saxon art in the late seventh early eighth century, nor that it continued to inspire Irish and continental artists in later centuries (chaps. 6-8). It is impossible to know, however, whether the loincloth type ceased to be represented entirely for at least some of the early part of this period. It seems likely that more than the very few examples of which we know were still visible.

When the iconography of Christ can again be studied in a greater number

of surviving representations it shows signs of being influenced by the developed robed type. It is difficult to say whether this means that the two versions of Christ's dress had developed side by side for some time previously, or whether the loincloth in the eighth century constitutes a revival or new departure based perhaps on an emerging new attitude to Christ crucified, but which was expressed at first in terms of the by now traditional iconography of the robed type. The earliest surviving example of this new group is a miniature in the ^{Sacramentary} ~~+~~ of Gellone, a Merovingian manuscript of the third quarter of the eighth century (pl. 71). None of the historical figures from the biblical narrative accompany this depiction. Two full length angels fly down towards the broad latin cross (A1) with its jewelled surface, one on each side of Christ's head. There is a superscription, and Christ's feet rest on a suppedaneum. His legs appear to hang weakly, with turned out knees, but he is of the upright frontal type 1, and has rigidly extended arms. His upright head is nimbed and bearded. He wears a knee length skirt-like loincloth, longer at the back than at the front, and with a bungled attempt at a central tie. Blood spurts from his right side but there is no spearbearer, and no chalice to catch the blood. Possibly this is an early attempt to relate the Crucifixion to the Eucharist, but the hovering attendant angels and bleeding side had also developed in the iconography with the colobium, as in the early eighth century icon from St. Catherine's Mount Sinai (pl. 17).

The influence of the robed tradition can perhaps also be seen in a crucifix in Rome which now survives only as a sixteenth century copy in leather. The original was in silver (Lasko 1972, pl. 18). It is uncertain when the original was made. The evidence that a large crucifix existing before the sack of Rome (1527) was donated by Charlemagne is very late (Elbern 1965, 124). Lasko (1972, 16-7 and fn. 21, p.261) supports the view that the Vatican copy could have been as early as c.800, though he notes

that other art historians have accepted it as a gift either of Pope Leo III (795-816) as indeed is said in a sixteenth drawing made before its destruction¹, or of Pope Leo IV (847-55). The gifts of both Popes are recorded in the Liber Pontificalis.

It is interesting in view of its possible early date that the iconography of the copy is not typical of the productions of the ninth century Carolingian schools, while betraying no trace of Renaissance intervention². The figure of Christ is erect and frontal (type 1) with horizontally outstretched arms. The nails are clearly visible in the palms, the thumbs slightly separated from the hand. The feet are nailed to a suppedaneum. The loincloth is wrapped around the body from the waist to just above the knee and is knotted centrally. Below the knot the two edges of the loincloth fall in rigid zig-zag folds. The head is inclined to Christ's right and falls forward slightly. Long hair falls on the shoulders, and the face is bearded. There is a plain nimbus. The cross is of the latin type with square expansions at the terminals (type A2) with a raised border. The terminals are used as panels for half and three quarter length figures, identified as the risen Christ with orb and sceptre above; Mary and St. John to Christ's right and left respectively; and below two nimbed and bearded figures holding objects, one of which looks like a sword. This layout is reminiscent of the use of busts and half figures in medallions in pectoral crosses with the robed Christ (see chap. 6 and pls. 19-23). It is possible therefore that this iconography was developed at a period when the robed type was still predominant.

A later example of this presumably Western type of Christ is found on the book cover of the Lindau Gospels which is eighth-ninth century in date

¹Ms. Barb. lat. 2733.

²Lasko (1972, 17) considers it could have been made by pressing the leather around the original as a mould.

(Lasko 1972, pl. 59). Here, however, the Christ is beardless and shows the influence of later Carolingian developments in the presence of the sun and moon as weeping human figures. It is also found in an illumination of the second half of the ninth century in the Coronation Sacramentary of Charles the Bald, where Christ is bearded and his head is inclined slightly to the right, in which direction he gazes although no other figures are represented on the same page (Schiller 1972, pl. 362). The wounds in the nailed hands and feet bleed rather than the side wound (which is however depicted) but apart from this, and allowing for the difference in style, there is no essential difference between the iconography of Christ here and in the eighth century Merovingian Sacramentary of Gellone or the leather copy of the possibly eighth-ninth century crucifix. It does however have features which cannot be paralleled in surviving Carolingian works dated before the ninth century, in the accompanying decoration, and also in the presence of the snake beneath Christ's feet, and in the sun and moon as human busts in medallions above.

In the Basilica dei Martiri at Cimitile in southern Italy is a damaged fresco of c.900 which could be a development of the western pre- or early Carolingian type of the iconography in which Christ wears the loincloth (pl. 72). Christ is shown bearded, with open eyes, his arms slightly flexed rather than bent. He looks down towards the figures of Mary and the spear-bearer, on his right. He wears a loincloth knotted in the middle. No sun and moon are visible, but the fresco is much damaged. The gestures of John and Mary are slightly more dramatic than in the robed image from Sta. Maria Antiqua (pl. 18) but the grouping is very similar: this seems to suggest the development of two closely related images in which only the dress of Christ was different. The evidence of the ^{Sacramentary} Genesio of Gellone (pl. 71) suggests that this development had taken place as early as the eighth century in the West.

There is no comparable evidence of the loincloth from the East until the full ninth century (see Belting 1962). From then, however, it can be seen that the Byzantine image (which however became increasingly stereotyped) had much in common with the pre-Carolingian image which has been suggested for the West, although by then also the dead Christ had made its appearance in response to the need to demonstrate the orthodox belief that Christ was man as well as God and died on the cross. In the Byzantine image the arms are bent slightly and the thumbs point upwards, held apart from the fingers. Christ is bearded. The loincloth is knotted in the middle. The pose of death becomes more dramatic towards the eleventh century but the basic type is clear (Schiller 1972, pls. 339-43; see also pl. 73). The differences between this type and the Western type are discussed in Belting (1962).

Personifications of the sun and moon are present in the robed Crucifixion image from the sixth century, in exceptional cases: on a small and inconspicuous scale they are present as human heads on for example one of the lead ampullae from Monza (Schiller 1972, pl. 324). Features are drawn on the sun in the sixth century Rabula Gospels (pl. 16). In Byzantine depictions of the tenth and eleventh centuries faces, busts and sometimes even more developed personifications occasionally appear, both in images where Christ wears the colobium and in those where he wears the loincloth (Schiller 1972, pls. 335, 337, 339 and 342). They are often very small and neither so frequent nor on such an impressive scale as in the Western images of the late Carolingian are often small and inconspicuous (pl. 73). These later appearances of the sun and moon period and later. Even the personified sun and moon could have been due to the influence of western depictions in which these elements were conspicuous: the evidence from the sixth century, however, suggests that these then minor elements existed in a form which could be taken up and developed by Carolingian artists in their more symbolic treatment of the image.

Carolingian art of the ninth century is notable for its development of the Crucifixion image, both for new types of Christ and in the addition

and elaboration of various types of symbolic motif. The proliferation of images of the Crucifixion (of which quite a considerable number have been preserved in wall paintings, ivories, metalwork objects and miniatures) must be closely connected with the new interest on Christ's Passion and death and the meaning of the Eucharist in the life of the individual and the church found in the writings of Alcuin's pupils and later theologians, but of which there is little trace at the date at which Alcuin himself was writing (see Chapter 4). The earliest of these new images have been ascribed to the schools of Metz and Rheims, in the reign of Louis the Pious (814-40).

The first distinctively Carolingian type of Christ to appear is a young, often beardless, figure with outstretched, sometimes slightly bent arms with nailed drooping hands: the thumb is not separated from the rest of the fingers. The loincloth is knotted at the side so that the wrapover folds tend to be diagonal rather than vertical, and the garment tends to be shorter at the knotted side rather than at the centre front as in the centre-tied version. The wall painting at S Vincenzo al Volturno, is of this type (pl. 74). The Carolingian wall painting in St. Johann at Mustair also has this type of loincloth - that is all that survives of the Crucifixion image. At St. Maximin in Trier, the head of Christ is missing, but the drooping hands are present (Schiller 1972, pl. 347). Other examples of this type occur in the Prayer Book of Charles the Bald, made between 846 and 869; in the Utrecht Psalter, c.830; and twice in the Stuttgart Psalter, c.820-30. The centre and side-tied loincloth could however appear in different illustrations in the same manuscript as in the Stuttgart and the Utrecht Psalters. In some of these representations Christ is bearded (Schiller 1972, pls. 354-8).

It seems impossible to demonstrate that this new late Carolingian type occurred before the first quarter of the ninth century was well advanced.

The death of Christ on the cross also began to be shown about this

time. This would seem to be particularly closely associated with the new ideas and attitudes to the death of Christ discussed in chapter 4. Its earliest appearance in the West is in the Utrecht Psalter, and seems to have been an internal development of the Rheims school (Schiller 1972, pl. 357). In this type for the first time the figure of Christ is shown hanging from the cross, his body sagging heavily on one side (type 2); his head turned and bowed to the side or sagging forwards on the breast; and with his arms dragged up from the shoulders or with an even more exaggerated drooping of the hands. Other early examples include an engraved rock crystal, of later in the ninth century, and now in the British Museum; an illuminated initial in the Sacramentary of Bishop Drogo, now in Paris; and one on the ivory cover of the Book of Pericopes of Henry II, in Munich, which is mid-ninth century in date (Schiller 1972, pls. 360, 364-5). The sagging of the body does not give the exaggerated curve of later centuries (type 3) in which the knees were also drawn to the side, but preserves the frontality of the body. Christ's eyes are clearly closed in several examples of this type.

A marked sway of the body, causing the legs to sag at the knees (type 3) seems to have arisen in the late tenth century in both East and West. A Byzantine ivory in the Metropolitan Museum, New York, shows Christ held upright on one leg, while the left leg is bent (Thoby 1959, pl. L, no. 114). The Christ on the wooden crucifix of Gero sways slightly to the left without turning but hangs heavily from the hands and has markedly bent knees (Wesenberg 1972, pl. 1). It was perhaps still more common at this date, however, to show Christ's body still frontal and with straight legs but with the hips sagging to one side (type 2). This is found for example in the late tenth century English manuscript, B.M. Harley 2904, f.3v (Temple 1976, pl. 142); or in the Sacramentary of St. Gereon in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris (Thoby 1959, pl. XIX, no. 40).

The type 3 sideways swing with bent knees is found in late tenth century Ottonian robed Crucifixion such as the Egbert Gospels, Trier (Schiller 1972, pls. 393-4). On the gold cross of Lothar (c.980) Christ's head slumps forward and to his right, and his body sags from clearly straining shoulders with a marked swing to his right and with bent, sagging knees (pl. 76).

The earliest surviving English manuscripts to show this exaggerated swing is the Arenberg Gospels of the end of the tenth century (Temple 1976, pl. 171); but there are several examples of the eleventh century including a small figure in an initial in an edition of Bede's Historia Ecclesiastica; and two full page miniatures, one in the Gospels of Judith of Flanders and one in British Library Ms. Arundel 60. (Temple 1976, pls. 261, 269; Talbot Rice 1952, pl. 79a). Even at this period, however, it was still more common in Europe generally to show Christ, with bent arms and bowed head perhaps, but with an upright, frontal, type 1 body.

My discussion has concentrated on what is known of the development of the pose and dress of Christ from the eighth into the eleventh centuries. It is clear that much is doubtful about the early part of this period, which is transitional between a time when the robed type predominated, to a time when the loincloth type not only became the more popular but the theme was also portrayed with greater frequency. The figure of Christ is not the only element in Crucifixion iconography, however: the grouping and choice of subsidiary figures also have to be taken into account, as well as the appearance and type of symbolic elements and figures. In pre-Conquest sculpture, and even in English ivory carvings and manuscripts of this period, additional figures and elements tend to be few and in sculpture especially the figure of Christ alone (or without subsidiary figures which have survived) are the majority among surviving remains. The more detailed discussion of subsidiary elements is therefore left to be considered in

relation to the relevant monuments and in the general discussion of the monuments in chap. 14.

ii Pre-Conquest Representations of the loincloth type to c.850

The only evidence from this period survives from Northumbria and Mercia, almost a parallel with the distribution of the early robed type (chap. 6 and figs. 5 and 6). There is however a strong possibility that the iconography with the loincloth might have been more widespread originally. Leland (1906-10, 59-60), a sixteenth century description of the cross at Reculver, Kent (cat. and chap. 5) observed a Crucifixion on the cross he saw before the chancel arch:

In the enterynge of the qyer ys one of the fayrest, and the most auntyent cross that ever I saw, a ix. footes, as I ges, yn highte. It standith lyke a fayre colunne. The base greate stone is not wrought. The second stone being rownd hath curiously wrought and paynted the images of Christ, Peter, Paule, John and James, and I remember. Christ sayeth Ego sum Alpha et Ω. Peter sayeth Tu est Christus filius Dei vivi. The saing of the other iii wher painted majusculis literis Ro. but now obliterated. The second stone is of the Passion. The iii. conteineth the xii Apostles. The iiii. hath the image of Christ hanging and fastened with iiii nayles, and sub pedibus sustentaculum. The hiest part of the pyller hath the figure of a crosse.

If the fragments of the round shafted cross which is thought to have come from Reculver is identifiable with the cross seen by Leland, then no fragment recognisable as a Crucifixion has survived on it (Peers 1928; Taylor 1968). However, it seems clear from Leland's description that the Crucifixion he saw was in the same position as at Bakewell, at the top of the shaft but not in the head (below and pl. 80). There is nothing in the description inconsistent with a ninth century date, which is probable for the surviving fragments (Taylor, H.M. 1968). Had the figure of Christ been robed, one might have expected this in itself to be sufficiently unusual in the sixteenth century to have been remarked by Leland, who certainly noted the four nails rather than the three more common from the thirteenth century. Schiller (1972, 145 and fn. 110A) records that in Germany in the later middle ages the

great robed crucifixes such as those discussed in chapter 8 were not always recognised as depictions of Christ, but were identified with St. Kummernis, a woman who was crucified by her father because she was so ugly.

It is sad that this Crucifixion has not survived, but Leland's evidence provides at least the presumption that there were developments in the ninth century in the southern kingdoms parallel with those for which we have more evidence in the north.

The small group from Northumbria and Mercia, however, presents many problems of which the main one is the date at which an iconography of Christ in the loincloth had become known to Anglo-Saxon artists or had been developed by them.

At Ruthwell, Dumfriesshire (cat. and pl. 77), the Crucifixion area is quartered by a plain latin cross (1A) which probably had a raised border: traces of this can be seen on the right, the best preserved side. The cross had a suppedaneum on which Christ's feet rest.

The figure of Christ has to be built up from traces. It is clear that his body was erect, without marked sagging, but there are signs that his position was not of the simplest erect, frontal, cruciform type 1. His left foot, for example, is turned out at an angle, but his right foot may be straight or turned to a much lesser degree. The degree of modelling which has survived on the legs also seems to confirm this suggestion, for the left leg is slightly turned out and slightly flexed at the knee, while the right leg appears to be more frontal.

The line of Christ's neck on the observer's right has survived, and is consistent with his head being turned to the right, with at least a slight downward inclination. It was clearly not fully turned to the right as appears to be the case on Hexham II (chap. 6 and pl. 32). A line parallel to the neck and shoulder suggests long hair. It is not possible, however, to say whether he was nimbed or bearded, though a beard has several times been stated to be present (see, for example, Swanton 1970, 19). His trunk is

very badly damaged, but the outline seems to show that the upper part of His body is slightly turned to the right, which would be consistent with the head position and the flexing of the right leg, bringing the lower half of the body to a more frontal position. This position would throw the left hip out slightly which does in fact seem to be the case. It therefore seems to conform to type 2 rather than to the rigidly frontal type 1 (cf. pl. 74). His dress is above knee length and close-fitting and is higher on his left leg than on his right, which suggests a loincloth tied on his left side (cf. pl. 74). The legs and feet have already been mentioned: they give the clearest idea of the modelling and depth of relief of the scene in its original condition.

The treatment of Christ's arms is interesting. I have already noted the difficulty of setting out the Crucifixion scene on a cross shaft (see Hexham II and Auckland St. Andrew, chap. 6). Here the difficulty is even more marked because the height of the figure in relation to the available width makes the outstretched arms impossible without the grossest distortion. If one examines Christ's left shoulder, which is clearly visible, and follows it along the cross arm, the arm seems to be extended to the elbow and then to curl back over on itself, with the hand also curled in at the wrist, and the fingers curled into the palm. An earlier observer also noticed something odd about the arm. Hewison (1914, 30) observed that

the left arm extending naked from a well moulded shoulder, seems to be tied to the tree at the elbow, or to pass through the very transom.

The tie and the piercing of the cross arm are not evident, but there can be no doubt that the position of the arms is unusual. I can see no sign of the arm twisting behind the transom, but it may have done so. If it did it suggests a similar sort of adaptation to that at Auckland, since it would be borrowed from the iconography of the thieves.

Above the right arm of the cross is a worn disc in relief, representing either the sun or the moon. It is not possible to say whether it was ever more than a plain disc. The corresponding space opposite is completely defaced.

Below the cross arm on each side is a figure which is now virtually impossible to interpret. In Cook (1912, pl. 8) it looks as though these could be the two thieves with their arms tied behind the transverse bars of the cross - especially the figure on the spectator's right. They have been described, as Brown^{G.B.} (1921, 141) noted as the thieves, SS Mary and John and the spear- and sponge-bearers; and Hewison (1914, 31) even saw the veils of the Temple edging the scene. They are in fact beyond interpretation, as most observers have admitted.

A complete reconstruction of the iconography of this scene is impossible, because the subsidiary figures have to be left out of account, as have details of Christ's nimbus and face. We are left with a bordered latin cross (type 1A), a figure of Christ in a loincloth tied on the left, and with a body which seems to have been slightly flexed and turned to the right rather than completely upright and frontal, and of which the arms are in an unusual position and one which may be unique. In addition, the sun and moon were prominent features, but we do not know whether they were personified.

The cross is not helpful either in dating the scene or establishing its iconographic links. A bordered latin cross is found in association with the pre-Carolingian type in which Christ wears the loincloth in the miniature in the Gospels of Gellone (above and pl. 71). It is also found in later Carolingian and Ottonian scenes of all types, and in all media (see chap. 8).

The figure of Christ is much more interesting, but it may not be much more helpful. It has been said that the figure is of an early Eastern type and that this supports an early date for the cross (Swanton 1970, 18-9). The evidence for such an early type can only be those representations cited above: the gems of early Christian though imprecise date; the ivory box in the British Museum; and the Sta Sabina door panel, both fifth century.

None of these early surviving examples is a likely model for the Ruthwell scene. The gems are in some ways too simple, and show no trace of a similar grouping of figures and elements. The ivory box and the door panel both portray Christ clearly in a loincloth of a different type, and both show Christ in different poses both from each other and from what can be worked out for the Ruthwell figure. On the other hand both one gem (Thoby 1959, pl. I, fig. 3) and to a lesser degree the Sta. Sabina door suggest that it was possible to represent Christ in a pose that was not simply cruciform at a very early date. Neither the ivory box nor the door has the sun and moon, and both have a different selection of subsidiary figures. If it was possible to know what the Ruthwell attendant figures were - if, for instance, they were certainly the thieves - then it might be possible to suggest that the Sta Sabina type had some parallels which might help to bridge the chronological gap. There is for example a fragment with the two crucified thieves from the crypt of Mellebaude, Poitiers which could possibly date to the seventh century (Elbern 1961). Unfortunately the figure of Christ is missing and is as likely to have been robed at this date (chap. 6).

The real problem is to know what happened to the 'unclothed' type of Christ crucified between the fifth and late eighth century (see part i, above). The continental evidence for a pre-Carolingian type of Christ crucified in a loincloth built up from the late eighth century ^{Sacramentary} of Gellone and other later depictions, shows a figure in some ways different from what can be deduced from the Ruthwell figure - for example a loincloth tied at the centre front rather than at the side, and an upright unsagging cruciform pose (type 1, cf. pls. 71-2). It is difficult to know whether the sagging pose of ninth century works should be regarded as a revival of an earlier iconography which is really attested only by a second or third century gem or as an independent departure from established traditions. In either case the change would seem to have been influenced by a new emotional and pietistic emphasis on the suffering and death of Christ in relation to the Eucharist and personal devotion. The full development of such an attitude is certainly

of the ninth century and nearer the middle of that century rather than the beginning (chap. 4). The evidence from pre-Conquest literature does not contradict this view (chaps. 4 and 5).

There is nothing diagnostic about the position of the head, however, so far as it can be reconstructed. It could be the same as that depicted in the early robed type, as for example the Rabula Gospels (pl. 16). The treatment of the arms, which must have been unusual however we interpret them, could have been an individual solution to the problem of space exactly as at Auckland St. Andrew. Sculptors in other regions showed themselves capable of this sort of adaptation: Irish sculptors who carved the scene on the central space of the cross head sometimes put Christ's arms at a wholly improbable angle, sloping down from the shoulders, in order to fit them in (for example Henry 1967, pl. 87). As at Auckland St. Andrew, the influence on the Ruthwell treatment of the arms could have come from depictions of the thieves which were often shown with their arms tied behind the cross in early robed versions of the scene (see chap. 6 and pl. 17; and Schiller 1972, pl. 325). It is possible that the Ruthwell scene included the thieves (above). Arms bent back at the elbows and twisted behind the transom would be unusual for Christ at any date and are unlikely to have come from a model.

The sun and moon must have been a dominant feature of the Ruthwell scene, however they were depicted. These elements were present in depictions of the Crucifixion on which Christ was fully clothed, though not usually on a large scale (above, part i). They were not taken over into the three Anglo-Saxon examples with the robe nor their closest parallels (chap. 6 and pls. 25-6, 32 and 34). Its appearance at Ruthwell and in others of the group discussed below, suggests the influence of a new iconography in which these elements had an important place. This could have been the pre-Carolingian type deduced from ninth century works (above) but it would also be consistent with a ninth century date.

The evidence from the scene itself is slight, but if it had been found separately from the rest of the cross I believe that many art historians

would unhesitatingly have placed it on the ninth century.

There is a possibility that the scene was not part of the original programme of the cross. It is set at the bottom of the south face of the cross as it now stands. This lowly position has been seen as evidence of early date (Henry 1965, 150) and indeed has been seen as evidence of an early hesitancy in portraying the scene at all (Stone, L. 1972, 10-11; Huppé 1970, 103). Such hesitancy if any were felt had been overcome in Northumbria in the late seventh, early eighth century (chap. 6). If the cross were set in a base the scene would actually be at an observer's eye-level as on Hexham II and Auckland St. Andrew (pls. 32 and 34). The scene went on being placed in the same relative position until well into the period in which it was also placed in the cross head, as at Alnmouth and Aycliffe (chap. 10 and pls. 84, 87). On the other hand this position does not in itself imply that the scene was added as an after thought, and indeed its position below an Annunciation, as also possibly at Auckland St. Andrew, means that it is in this way also both appropriately and perhaps conventionally placed (see below).

There are difficulties about its position, however. It is below that part of the south face which is framed by inscribed borders; and indeed retains no evidence of any borders at all. On the sides the vinescroll carving also ends in a root at a level about the top of the Crucifixion panel¹. Above the Crucifixion scene the shaft narrows slightly as if in preparation for the carved faces. The fact that the Crucifixion is carved in what was the wider base of the shaft may be clearly seen in Hewison 1914, pl. XIV. One vinescroll face clearly also retains traces of a

¹This point was first made in conversation by Professor Cramp.

carving of a plant scroll on the base distinct from the continuous scroll above. So few early crosses survive in anything approaching a complete state that it is impossible to generalise from them whether such a wider lower portion would have been more likely left plain or carved originally (cf. Collingwood 1927a, figs. 37, 39, 45, 52, 60). There is, however, at least a possibility that the lower portion was utilised at a different date. It is difficult to compare the figural style of the Crucifixion panel with that of the carved figures above, because of the damage sustained by the base of the cross.

In a recent publication Ó Carragáin (1978, 131-4) has put forward arguments based on liturgical innovations accepted in Northumbria by the early eighth century, to show why Annunciation and Crucifixion might have been juxtaposed as part of the original plan. These arguments are based on the association of the Feast of the Annunciation (25th March) with the traditional date of the Crucifixion. Later Ó Carragáin (1978, 140-1) stresses this association of ideas as part of the background to the Dream of the Rood, emphasising the heroic nature of Christ's act in the Annunciation as well as the Crucifixion. This seems to me a very important and illuminating association of ideas, but it does not solve the problem of dating the cross, since presumably the force of these ideas if they were felt strongly enough to inspire the erection of the cross, could have been felt over a considerable period. Indeed the proximity of the same two scenes was noted at Auckland St. Andrew which is unlikely to be earlier than the end of the eighth century; and will be noted again in Bakewell and Bradbourne below, both likely to be of the early ninth century. Moreover it is at least possible to consider that the programme of the shaft without the base is complete in itself: in this case the Annunciation scene would itself have been the remainder of the Crucifixion; and this would have been reinforced by the runic inscription from a poem related to the Dream of the Rood, and the form of the whole monument.

To put it in another way: there are difficulties in accepting the Crucifixion as of as early as the first half of the eighth century in which current opinion is inclined to place the cross as a whole (Mercer 1964; Cramp 1965a; Farrell 1978). These difficulties are partly the lack of material evidence of an 'unclothed' iconography of Christ in this period, which must be set against the fact that a considerable number of robed representations have survived from the same period, several from Northumbria (chap. 6). Partly, however, they are also that comparable material does survive from the continent but only from the ninth century. If the early to mid-eighth century date for the cross is accepted, then two possibilities are open. The first is that the Crucifixion was carved at this date. In this case it was a very startling innovation for which neither contemporary literature on the subject of the Crucifixion, nor the surviving representations from sometime before and after, prepare us. This cannot be ruled out as a possibility since it is clear that the development of the loincloth type in the eighth century is largely speculative. The elements of sun and moon, though not on a prominent scale were already present in the clothed image. The Dream of the Rood stresses the distress of creation at the death of Christ: if its forerunner did also this might have provided an impetus for the further development of this motif. Interestingly too, both the Dream of the Rood and the fragment of poetry on the cross refer to Christ stripping himself before ascending his cross. On the other hand the terms in which Christ is described suggest a more heroic pose than is found on this carving (see chap. 5).

The second alternative is that the base of the shaft was left blank at this period and added to later under the powerful emotional and pietistic changes of the ninth century. This would account for the type 2 pose, the side-tied loincloth, and the prominent sun and moon which are too worn to show whether they were personified. It is difficult to see how this problem can be resolved, given the strong arguments in favour of the development of the image in the ninth century; and the lack of convincing parallels at

an earlier date, unless some such explanation is accepted. Even if the date of the whole cross were reconsidered, however, the problem as to whether the Crucifixion is primary would remain.

Bradbourne I and II (cat. and pls. 78-9)

Bradbourne I is not certainly a Crucifixion scene (pl. 78). Both scenes appear on what has been reconstructed as a single cross shaft in the churchyard at Bradbourne. There is some doubt in my mind, however, about the correctness of this reconstruction apart from the possibility that it might have two Crucifixion scenes. The upper and lower parts of the shaft were not found together and all three fragments have been reused: none is in situ as some nineteenth century scholars believed of the lower (see cat.). The reasons for doubting the present reconstruction are given in the catalogue. Both scenes are on the south face of the cross as it now stands in the churchyard.

Bradbourne I, the probable Crucifixion, is the second scene from the top on this face (pl. 78). It is complete with an arched frame above, but in very worn condition. It seems always to have occupied some sort of mid position, with at least one scene above and at least two below. In the Derbyshire County Records Office, Matlock, are preserved a number of old slides, including several of the shaft/shafts at Bradbourne. Routh (1937, 21) refers to one of these slides to support his identification of this scene as a Crucifixion. The whole of the south face appears from slide number 26 or 21 (number not clear) in much better condition than it is now. The scene above, for example, seems to have a frontal or half turned figure on the left with its left hand raised to a less distinct figure on the right. The close proximity of scenes of the Annunciation and/or Visitation have been noted at Auckland St. Andrew (chap. 6); and on the Ruthwell Cross (above). The scene itself, again from the slide, seems certainly a Crucifixion, with the arched panel quartered by a plain latin cross (.1A).

Only the division between Christ's feet is visible and there are slight traces of a figure on either side. There was no sun and moon.

It is impossible to discuss this scene further: its iconography is irrecoverable. There are some points which should be made, however. There is, for example, no reason why this scene should not have been an example or variant of the robed types discussed in chapter 6. The style is not the same, but the iconography of this whole section of shaft has much in common with the Auckland shaft, including the paired three-quarter length figures. Indeed, the lack of the sun and moon, though a slender clue, points to the earlier tradition. Whether we have at Bradbourne one shaft with two Crucifixion scenes, or two separate shafts, there are a number of pointers to a school of carving which functioned for some time and which was perhaps already in operation when new influences on the iconography of the Crucifixion made themselves felt.

Bradbourne II (pl. 79) appears to have been set low on the shaft, and is quite possibly the lowest scene on its face. The lower border of the panel does not survive, the upper edge is arched. The vertical edges of the scene have the rolled border which edges the whole shaft, but no inner border like the other panels, except at the top right. It would seem from this that a border was intended, but abandoned by the sculptor, presumably in favour of additional width.

The cross is a plain latin cross (1A), extending the full width and height of the panel, with a sloping ledge-like soppedaneum which supports Christ's feet. Christ's body and legs are straight (type 1), his feet side by side. His left arm appears to be straight, his right arm to be extended from the elbow with the short upper arm flexed or pressed close to his side. His head is nimbed and possibly inclined to his right, but is very worn. His dress is indistinct but clearly very short, most probably a loincloth.

Above the cross arm is, on either side, a circular object in relief, enclosed in a semi-circle in relief on Christ's right, and in a full circle in relief on his left: the sun and moon, probably as framed heads or faces.

Below on Christ's left is the spear-bearer, his feet turned to the cross but the upper part of his body swinging away, three-quarter turned to the spectator. His spear is held across his body, the top touching Christ's side. The sponge-bearer on Christ's left is more worn but has either the same stance or is rather more turned to the cross. The sponge/vessel is not distinguishable.

The bent arm and hands with closed thumb; and the sun and moon which were almost certainly personified are consistent with Carolingian developments of the early to mid ninth century. This is in line with the date which has been suggested for the group of crosses to which Bradbourne belongs (Cramp 1977, 218-24).

Bakewell, Derbyshire (cat. and pl. 80)

The Crucifixion scene at Bakewell in Derbyshire is set at the top of the west face of the churchyard cross as it now stands in the churchyard. In fact it extends into the neck of the shaft or the lower arm of the head, though not into the head itself. The scene is much more worn now than it appears on an old photograph reproduced by Routh (1937, pl. IIb).

The top and most of the right hand side of the scene are missing so that the figure of Christ, the cross, and the figure below the cross on the right^s are all incomplete. The cross is of a broad-shafted type, probably a latin cross (1A). The figure of Christ is rigidly frontal and erect (type 1). His downward pointing feet are not supported by a suppedaneum. There is no clear evidence of the position of his arms or hands. Although one arm of the cross has survived, it is very weathered as well as broken. He wears a brief garment, quite clearly looped up on his right side, which must be a loincloth. On his right and filling the whole space beneath the

cross arm is a full length figure, most probably the spear-bearer. To a casual glance he appears to be completely in profile, which would actually be a very unusual stance, thrusting upwards from the shoulder with his right arm. This is not in fact the case, for the outline of both his arms is visible, both on the photograph and to the naked eye (see pl. 80). His body is only slightly turned to the cross, and he holds the shaft of his weapon in both hands: the shaft is visible in front of his body. He wears a short skirted garment. The figure on the other side of the cross also wears a short tunic, and his legs are also in movement towards the cross: they could be in profile, or also suggest a partly turned figure, like his companion. Probably the sponge-bearer, although in fact the individual identity of these two figures cannot be established with certainty.

Below the scene is a semi-circular canopy-like feature, supported on pillars which spring from the framing of the scene below, and which is filled with squarish billets. The shape has clearly been adapted as a stylisation of Calvary but is also a stylised roof and part of the iconography of the scene below. This scene is most probably the Annunciation, or perhaps the Visitation, for either of which an architectural background is entirely appropriate, although such frames are common in ninth century sculpture generally - see the Rothbury Shaft (pl. 27); and Collingwood 1927a, figs. 52, 55, 88, 89). There is no evidence of what elements, if any, were set above the arms of the cross.

The figure of the spear and sponge-bearers are essentially of the same type as are found in robed Crucifixions of the sixth to the eighth century such as in the Rabula Gospels and at Sta Maria Antiqua (see pls. 16, 18). There is, however, no trace of the large-headed Insular stylisation of this type in which the legs are seen in profile and at rest, while the body is completely frontal. This type we saw appeared in the Durham Gospels (Ms. II 17) of the early eighth century and in Irish metalwork and manuscripts, and its influence was felt at Hexham II (chap. 6 and pl. 32).

The same basic type, however, with the movement restored to the figure and a more natural version of the stance, is found widely in ninth century Carolingian representations, and exactly this type appears at St. Maximin in Trier (Schiller 1972, pl. 347). Such features as have survived therefore do not point to an eighth century date so clearly as to one in the early ninth century. Bakewell is more advanced in the stylisation of its vine-scroll than Bradbourne I and II and is on that ground unlikely to precede it. Not enough detail has survived of either to show that Bakewell was a copy of Bradbourne or used exactly the same model. There is however no suppedaneum at Bakewell where the canopy/calvary might however have replaced it. The spear- and sponge-bearers are of the same type which however was a common one at this period.

Another interesting feature is the position of the scene at Bakewell, at the top of the shaft and indeed almost in the head. This raising of the scene possibly points to its growing importance, but at a stage before it became common to place the scene in the cross head. It is noteworthy that the position of the Crucifixion at Bakewell obviates the difficulty of setting the scene in the restricting space of the cross shaft, since the widening of the neck provides greater width relative to the height of the scene. It may therefore represent a practical solution to the problem of adaptation as well as a sense of its importance.

Rothbury, Northumberland (cat. and pls. 81-2)

The presumption that the crucifix head post-dates the appearance of the Crucifixion on the cross shaft is based on a number of factors. The first is that the earliest form of iconography which can be shown to have been known to the Anglo-Saxon sculptors, and which is certainly pre-Carolingian: is found only three times: twice on a cross shaft, and once on an architectural panel (see chap. 6). Not too much can be made of this evidence, since so little has survived: however, the earlier rarity of the theme also accords with the view that the Anglo-Saxons, like their continental

contemporaries, underwent a change of attitude to the theme, most probably at the same time. That the cross shaft position was the earliest can also be supported by reference to the position of the scene at Bakewell and Reculver (above), for although a practical reason involving the use of space can also be suggested at Bakewell, this could not apply to the round shaft at Reculver: the arrangement suggests a rethinking as to the relative importance of the theme, but a hesitancy to abandon the already established tradition of laying out the figural scenes on the shaft.

The possibility that the development of large crucifixes for use in churches was a source of the new development has been discussed in chap. 5. Most important, however, the earliest surviving head with a figural Crucifixion has a number of features which preclude a date before the mid-ninth century. This is the cross head from Rothbury, Northumberland (pls. 81-2), one of three fragments of one of the most finely carved of all of Anglian, pre-Viking sculptures.

The head of this cross is unfortunately incomplete, but enough survives to show that it was of distinctively Anglian type (9D) with curved arm pits and splayed arms with a double curve along each side. The face of the head, both sides, is edged by a double roll moulding. One face is used as the cross of the Crucifixion (pl. 81). The figure of Christ filled the head: the lower arm, of which enough survives to show it was both wider and thicker than the others, can be reconstructed to allow for a figure of Christ with human proportions. There is no question of it having extended into the top of the shaft, which has also survived in good condition (pl. 27). Only a fragment of Christ's head and nimbus survive in the upper arm. His head could have been erect and frontal, or very slightly turned and inclined to his right. His nimbus is dish shaped, and is cruciferous, the arms of the cross being represented by three incised lines. Nothing of his body, legs, or left arms has survived. His right arm is finely modelled and slopes

slightly without bending from the shoulder. His hand droops from the wrist and is fixed to the cross by a large, round-headed nail. His thumb is held close to his fingers. In the upper arm, above his head, a robed flying angel flies down and grasps his halo with his right hand. A narrow vertical feature on the right looks like a shafted implement which he is holding, but unfortunately his other hand has not survived. There are unlikely to have been any accompanying figures in the head, for lack of room. There was no sun and moon.

The opposite face of the head is also interesting (pl. 82). The circled central medallion is almost totally defaced, except for a narrow apparently cabled feature sloping down towards the left. A bust of Christ in a medallion is possible, but contained by the medallion and not extending ^{beyond} it as at Hoddon (Collingwood 1927a, fig. 51). An Agnus Dei is a second possibility. A reference to Christ there must have been, because of the symbolism of the other figures on this face. The frontal figure in the upper arm may be, but is not certainly, winged: its iconography is discussed in more detail below. The figure in the arm on the right holds an instrument in each hand: a circlet in his right hand and an object with a straight and a curved section in his left. These objects can be identified without much difficulty as the crown of thorns and the scourge. Only the head and one hand of the figure in the lower arm survive: he holds a bunch of four rod like objects of equal size, which at least suggests the four nails: indeed it is difficult to think of any other explanation for them.

Little of the crucified figure itself has survived, but there can be little doubt that it was wearing the loincloth. The sleeveless robe, the colobium, is not a feature of the Western figure of the Crucified Christ, either in the ninth century or later, and as we have seen (above chaps. 6-8), the long sleeved robe seems to have had a wider distribution in the northern and western regions of the Christian world, even at an earlier period. The Ottonian artists returned to the use of the long sleeved robe in the tenth

century, but the colobium did not make a similar return to popularity in the West, though it had a longer history in the Byzantine sphere. There is no evidence of Irish or other Celtic influence at Rothbury, and no secure evidence that the crucifix head existed in Irish sculpture before the ninth century: even then the only group of true crucifix heads has the long sleeved robed iconography (chap. 7, pls. 53-9). It therefore seems reasonable to assume a loincloth for the figure at Rothbury, though it is impossible to speculate about its type. The closed, drooping, nailed hand is entirely consistent with late Carolingian types of ninth century date (see part i, above).

The cruciferous nimbus with its incised lines is found outside the Carolingian sphere in for example St. Augustine's Gospels of the sixth-seventh centuries, and now at Cambridge (Schiller 1972, pl. 11). It is, however, a simple type of cruciferous nimbus, examples and variations of which both Eastern and Western art of all periods provide examples. See for example a late tenth century relief of uncertain origin, perhaps from Milan or Reichenau, and now in Munich (Schiller 1972, pl. 227).

More certain evidence, however of the context of this Crucifixion scene is to be found in the objects carried by the small figures which fill the arms of the cross on the opposite face of the head, and the space above the head of the Christ.

This last figure, an angel flying down to Christ and placing his hand on the nimbus in a gesture which suggest both attestation and perhaps service or protectiveness, appears to be carrying a long staffed object (pl. 81). Only one figure in the other face, that in the top arm, might be an angel, though if so the wings are very worn. This figure, which stands frontally, grasps two long vertical features, one in each hand: these seem to join at the bottom and to continue to form a twisted corkscrew-like element which fills the rest of the space (pl. 82). Three explanations suggest themselves.

One is that the figure grasps a two handled object , perhaps the pincers for removing the nails. In view of the other instruments of the Passion, this is a possible interpretation, for which, however, no parallels are forthcoming, though the pincers do make an appearance in a Byzantine image of the Deposition scene in the ninth century, in the Homilies of St. Gregory of Nazianzus (Schiller 1972, pl. 548). An objection to this explanation is that the figures with the other instruments of the Passion are clearly moustached human tormentors. More probably the figure at the top is an angel, a refugee from the Crucifixion iconography from the other face, this one carrying a cloth to wipe away Christ's sweat, or perhaps a cloth representing the seamless robe, clutched by its two scroll-like edges. This feature is sometimes found in ninth century ivories of the Crucifixion in which angels carrying various objects associated with Christ's death and state hover about his head. See for example an ivory of c.820-30 preserved in an altar book cover in the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Munich (pl. 83). Here three angels hover above the cross, two carrying objects like sceptres, or perhaps the spear and the rod with the sponge or as Ferber (1966, 324) suggested, perhaps the whip and cudgel from a flagellation scene. One of these flies down and grasps in his other hand the upper arm of the cross, rather than Christ's nimbus. This figure, with half-turned body and out-turned head is of a type which could easily have provided a model for the angel on the Crucifixion face at Rothbury. The third angel who flies up almost immediately behind the cross, is depicted almost frontally, and carries before him a large cloth which he holds with hands hidden by the scroll-like edges, and which then falls in elaborate folds. It is possible that the figure at Rothbury is an adaptation of this type of serving angel, a possibility strengthened by the hovering angel with sceptre or instrument of the Passion on the other face.

Before concluding this section it is necessary to look briefly at the appearance of the instruments of the Passion in Christian art, divorced from the narrative content of a Crucifixion scene. These elements, represented separately, made a somewhat tardy appearance, and like changes in Crucifixion iconography have a ninth century context in surviving material.

The identification of the figures in the Rothbury cross head as holding objects which can reasonably be identified with the crown of thorns, the scourge, and the four nails, as well as the angel with the sceptre or lance, and the possible angel with the robe or cloth suggests a more advanced development of images in which the instruments of the Passion were detached from the appropriate narrative scenes than is usually accepted, if a ninth century date is accepted from the Rothbury crosshead (see chap. 2 and 4). It is clear from the evidence of some ninth century ivories, such as that discussed above, that this process had indeed begun in the first half of the ninth century, by combining angels carrying such symbols with a Crucifixion scene.

In combination with the Lamb, however, evidence from surviving ninth century material shows only the chalice (as a reference to the Eucharist) the cross, the lance, and the rod with the sponge. See for example this theme in the Alcuin Bible in Bamberg, c.834-43 (Schiller 1972, pl. 397). The earliest surviving illumination of Christ as Judge accompanied by more than the cross seems to be in the Benedictional of St. Aethelwold made at Winchester c.980 (Schiller 1972, pl. 645). Here angels carry the lance and rod with the sponge as well as the cross.

The impulse to separate such symbolic elements is much earlier, however. Angels carrying the lance and sponge appear as guardians of the throne of the Risen Christ in Ravenna in the sixth century (Schiller 1972, 186). The earliest representation of the instruments as symbols of the Passion, replacing the figure of Christ crucified, is in the Utrecht Psalter, c.830

(Schiller 1972, pl. 643). Here the image consists of the empty cross, lance, crown of thorns, and the rod with the sponge. In close association is the Hand of God stretched out over the cross from the side, and two men tearing the seamless robe.

This image according to some scholars, makes no return until the twelfth century. Such studies seem to me to oversimplify the development of the motif. Clearly already in the ninth century the impulse to represent at least some of the instruments with either the Lamb or without any figure or symbol of Christ at all, was already present. The ninth century, like the twelfth, saw an upsurge of interest in the suffering and death of Christ, and new, more personal, interpretations of the historical narrative (see chaps. 4 and 5). It is surely in this period that the separation and recombination of the instruments of the Passion begins. Further intermediary stages towards the development of the more elaborate later medieval images can be seen in tenth and eleventh century Anglo-Saxon funerary sculpture: fortunately some of these later works have epigraphic and archaeological evidence to support their dating (see chap. 2). In other words, the image seems to have been available from the early ninth century, but not to have achieved its peak of popularity until much later, just as other subsidiary themes in late Carolingian theology and iconography of the Crucifixion also became the mainstream at this later period.

All the elements on the Rothbury head are the subject of commentaries before and during the ninth century, and can also be found emphasised in ninth century depictions of the Crucifixion scene and scenes of the Passion. The crown of thorns had appeared as early as the fourth century, on carved sarcophagi (Schiller 1972, pls. 1 and 9). It also appears twice in the Utrecht Psalter (Schiller 1972, pls. 358 and 643). Scenes of the scourging and mocking of Christ are common in the West from the ninth century (Schiller 1972, pls. 225-8). Such scenes could also have aided the

independent development of the instruments. The nails are emphasised in the Carolingian wall painting at Trier, where large nails are being hammered into Christ's feet (Schiller 1972, pl. 347). The emphasis on nailed and/or bleeding hands and feet in Western representations of the ninth century should also be remembered in this connection.

There seems no good reason to remove the Rothbury cross head too far from other major Anglian pre-Viking sculptures in date, by placing it in the tenth or later centuries. Other connections between the style and patterns at Rothbury have been traced for example with the Bewcastle cross and with fragments at Jarrow (Cramp 1965a¹; Adcock 1974, 165-8, 179-81). Moreover such a move would not be helpful, for there are no exact parallels to the treatment of the instruments of the Passion even at a much later period, while the resemblance between the hovering angels and late Carolingian ivories cannot be ignored. What seems clear is that the second quarter of the ninth century was a time of experiment and inventiveness. The little figures dashing towards the central roundel and clutching the instruments of the Passion, are as far as I can see, unique, though in view of the attested iconography of the angel figures, there may have been a model for these other figures also, now lost. Variations on similar themes can however be found in plenty in a ninth century Carolingian context, and the variations and different combinations of elements seem to me to be the mark of different designers and schools, working to express the same ideas.

Conclusions

The development of the loincloth type in the pre-Viking period seems to

¹And see Corpus of Anglo-Saxon Sculpture, vol. I, forthcoming.

be parallel to Carolingian developments in such details as can be recovered such as the method of depicting the loincloth, the prominence and personification of the sun and moon, and the proliferation of attendant symbolic figures. It is impossible therefore to consider them without close reference to surviving material from the continent and the intellectual background which has been shown to have influenced developments there (chap. 4). It is clear that there is no evidence to show that the revival of the loincloth type was especially early in Anglo-Saxon England, and indeed, of the sculptures considered, only the Ruthwell cross has ever been held to be as early as the early eighth century. There, however, it is possible that the Crucifixion was a later addition to an existing monument. There is no suggestion that the Anglo-Saxon artists were lagging behind their Carolingian counterparts, but rather that, as with the robed iconography discussed in chapter 6, they were influenced by the same developments at much the same date. Anglo-Saxon iconography was developing alongside comparable continental and perhaps even leading in inventiveness as in the designing at Rothbury of a new type of monument with an advanced combination of symbolic figures.

C H A P T E R 10

THE ICONOGRAPHY OF CHRIST IN THE LOINCLOTH IN NORTH EASTERN
ENGLAND NORTH OF THE TEES FROM THE LATE NINTH TO
THE ELEVENTH CENTURIES

i On the shaft of free standing crosses.

The theme has survived on only four monuments of this type, but with a very varied iconography.

At Alnmouth, Northumberland (see cat. and pl. 84) a scene depicting the Crucifixion occupies almost the whole surviving area of one broad face of an incomplete cross-shaft. The other three faces are decorated with panels of interlace and key patterns, plain panels and inscriptions. The Crucifixion panel is incomplete at the bottom. The border at the top survives though the inscription it carries is now illegible. Part of another figure panel survives above this border.

The Crucifixion panel is edged vertically by mutilated roll mouldings. Between them, the panel is dominated by a tall cross on which the figure of Christ is raised high, feet reaching only about half way down the shaft. Possibly the cross is a plain latin cross (type A1) but no upright is visible behind Christ's head, which reaches to the top of the panel. Below the suppédaneum the shaft of the cross is elaborately decorated with a very delicate small scale interlace pattern.

The figure of Christ is much defaced but its general lines are clear. He is shown with straight body and legs (type 1), standing on a suppédaneum. His arms are stretched out to the ends of the cross arms. Some sense of anatomy is shown in the slight natural slope from the shoulder to the upper arm. The hands are held outward, palm open, with the thumbs apart. His feet are straight and follow the curve of the suppédaneum in a way more hand than foot-like. His head is erect, but no details of face or hair survive, and he has a plain nimbus shaped into a peak over his forehead. His body is very damaged but it is clear that he was wearing a short garment,

most probably a loincloth.

On either side of his head are symbols of the sun and moon in relief, also much damaged: they have carved detail enclosed in a circular frame and enough detail survives to suggest that they were personified as faces. It is not possible to say which is the sun and which is the moon. Beneath each arm of the cross are two figures, one above the other. The upper pair have been much damaged by the breaking of the stone, and are consequently somewhat enigmatic. Both have short tunics, which suggest male figures, and the one on Christ's right faces the cross, while the feet of the opposite figure point away. Nineteenth century commentators usually describe these figures as the two thieves (Haigh 1857, 173-4; Stephens 1884b, 156, 256; Bateson 1895, 489-90). This is certainly a possibility, since the break in the stone could have effectively destroyed all traces of their crosses - though one might have expected some trace of their shafts beneath the feet. The repentant thief (Luke XXIII, 39-43) is found on many miniature and ivory representations of the early medieval period, on Christ's right and turned towards the cross, while the unrepentant thief is on the left and turned away. They are so represented in a Sacramentary from Fulda now in Göttingen and in the Egbert Gospels from Reichenau, now in Trier, both of the late tenth century (Schiller 1972, pls. 381, 392). There was certainly such a tradition, but in many representations both thieves are turned towards the cross. There are, however, two other possibilities for these damaged figures. The first is that they are a duplication of the soldier theme below, which however seems unlikely; and secondly that they are a misunderstanding of the symbolic figures Ecclesia and Synagogue. These are usually represented as robed females, but otherwise their chief characteristics (apart from identifying objects which they carry) such as a chalice for Ecclesia, is that Ecclesia stands on Christ's right and faces the cross, while Synagogue stands on the left and turns away. The short dress of both and turned away feet of one preclude any suggestion that these could be

John and Mary, as in a panel with a very similar layout at Romsey, Hampshire (chap. 13 and pl. 140). The various possibilities will be discussed in relation to the date of the cross.

The other pair of figures are placed very low in the scene, below the suppedaneum and by the highly decorated shaft of the cross. The figure on Christ's right is clearly the spearbearer. He wears a short tunic, and stands half-turned to the cross with his bearded head thrown back to gaze at Christ far above. He holds the spear in both hands between himself and the cross: Christ's side is so far above that the spear is almost vertical. The sponge- or cup-Bearer is much more defaced, but assumes the same stance. The sponge^{or cup} is too worn for identification.

The Crucifixion has never been seriously considered as a dating factor since Haigh (1857, 173-4) and Stephens (1884b, 156, 256) considered it supported their view that an inscription on the cross referred to an historical figure who died in 705. Haigh related the scene particularly closely to that on the Ruthwell cross (pl. 77), which he regarded as of the same date. He thought the Alnmouth scene filled out the missing detail on the much more seriously damaged Ruthwell panel, while the position of the Ruthwell scene low on the shaft showed the relationship of the Alnmouth fragment to the cross of which it formed a part. The comparison, however, does not stand up to examination, since the monuments considered are dissimilar in proportions and overall decoration. It cannot even be certain that the Alnmouth panel is at the bottom of its shaft. Moreover the scenes are laid out differently with the figures of Christ at different proportions to the cross and panel. Twentieth century opinion has inclined to a tenth century date based on the evidence of the interlace patterns (Collingwood 1927a, 101; Adcock, 1974, 262-71) and the inscriptions (Okasha 1971, 47-8).

The tall cross in the panel at Alnmouth can be paralleled in pre-Conquest sculptures of the Crucifixion only with the panel at Romsey,

Hampshire with which it has already been compared in layout as having paired figures in two registers beneath the cross (chap. 13 and pl. 140). More than two figures beneath the cross is in itself a rarity in pre-Conquest sculpture; including Romsey there are only five certain examples at Auckland St. Andrew Co. Durham (chap. 6 and pl. 34); Newent, Gloucestershire (chap. 13 and pl. 139); Sandbach, Cheshire (chap. 12 and pl. 121); and Durham II (below and pl. 90). Of these only those from Romsey and Sandbach have any other features comparable to Alnmouth. The layout of figures in two registers is not found in pre-Conquest English manuscripts or ivories.

The tall cross, the personified sun and moon, the paired figures in two registers, and the stance of the spear and sponge-bearers which is dictated by their lowly position, are therefore the outstanding characteristics of this scene; which provide unusually clear evidence of the model on which it is based.

It was suggested more than forty years ago by Reil (1930, fn. p. 113) that the spear- and sponge-bearer figures from Alnmouth are of the type found in Crucifixions of the Metz school, particularly in ivory carvings. When this suggestion is followed up a number of interesting comparisons emerge, for characteristic features of the Metz type of Crucifixion are not confined to the stance of these two figures. A large proportion of works ascribed to this school like the example on pl. 85 have a vertical layout with a tall cross, with paired figures in two registers below the cross-arms. The lower pair are the spear- and sponge-bearers, half-turned to the cross and with thrown back heads and with the spear and cane held up vertically before them. The upper pair are normally Ecclesia and Synagogue. The personified sun and moon are always present in representations of this type. Finally the shaft below the cross is always elaborated, usually with a snake wound about it (? here transformed into interlace) but in several cases is actually supported on a decorated pillar (see for example

Goldschmidt 1914, pl. XXXII, no. 78; see also nos. 83, 85, 86, 88, 89).

These Metz ivories give a much richer impression than the Alnmouth scene, since the central vertical area is commonly crowded about by other scenes relating to Christ's Passion and Resurrection; and with other symbolic figures: nevertheless something of the miniature style of the probably ivory model has been suggested by the scale of the figures and the unusually small scale interlace ornament on the cross. None of the Metz ivories is earlier than the late ninth century and many are tenth century in date, and this would seem to confirm the tenth century dating of the cross arrived at from study of the interlace and inscription.

At Aycliffe, Co. Durham (cat. and pls. 86 and 87) are two Crucifixion scenes on the same cross, one of Christ and one a martyrdom of St. Peter. The latter will be discussed briefly here since such martyrdoms could be influenced by developments of Crucifixion iconography.

The Martyrdom of St. Peter (pl. 86). This scene is represented on one narrow face of the shaft. The shaft is incomplete but the panel was probably originally at about the middle of the decorated area, with a panel of animal ornament below and at least one panel of interlace above. The figure of St. Peter is represented, upside-down, on a broad armed latin cross (A1) which extends the full height and width of the panel: the arms of the cross are consequently extremely short in relation to the length of the shaft. St. Peter is depicted as a rigidly frontal figure with his feet turned out on the base of the panel. His head is unrimbed and his features are lightly incised. Light diagonal incisions above the waist band of his tunic are probably an attempt to convey the rib-cage. The loincloth itself shows a similar attempt at naturalistic carving, in the inverted V at the bottom of the incised parallel vertical lines which indicate folds: the attempt has been rendered meaningless by the rigidly horizontal lower border of the

skirt. The oddest feature of the figure is its short stumpy arms: little more than hands extended rigidly from the shoulders. The sculptor could only have attempted more naturalistic proportions by reducing the size of the figure in relation to the panel, but clearly the figure itself was more important than naturalism as a concept of design. The same approach to the importance of the central figure is also observable in the Christ Crucifixion panel on the same cross.

The iconography of the St. Peter figure is of the simplest type; if one relates it to the iconography of Christ crucified, it is also the commonest type of the early medieval period, without drooping, turning or sagging of any part of the body (type 1). It provides no internal evidence for the dating of the cross. The martyrdom of St. Peter is fairly rare in early medieval art but examples have survived. There is one, for example, in the ninth century Sacramentary of St. Drogo (Boinet 1913, pl. XC B), and one in the Benedictional of St. Aethelwold, fol. 95b. It is quite possible that the sculptor/designer did not have a model of the martyrdom, but simply inverted a model of the Crucifixion of Christ, stripped of additional detail and figures. The St. Peter figure seems more rigidly frontal than the more worn Christ figure on the broad face, however, so that it is possible that more than one model was involved.

The Crucifixion of Christ (pl. 87). This panel is the lowest on one broad face of the shaft with quite a large area of dressed but uncarved stone below it. The position is clearly here a prominent one (see discussion of Ruthwell above) especially for a cross standing on a base, and was popular in pre-Conquest sculpture in the north of England and the east Midlands until the end of the period. Other examples with the scene on the shaft are at Alnmouth, Northumberland (above and pl. 84) and Gosforth I, Cumberland for which dates in the tenth century are the most likely (see chap. 12 and pl. 125). There is little distinctive about the figure of

Christ at Aycliffe in its present worn state. The head is upright and apparently unrimbed. No features are distinguishable. The arms are outstretched straight from the shoulder, the trunk is upright and apparently frontal (type 1). The legs and feet appear to be turned outwards: possibly the knees are meant to be seen as sagging slightly. The dress is short and a slight lumpiness probably indicates a loincloth, but no detail comparable to that of the loincloth worn by St. Peter has survived. The cross on which he is represented is of the plain Latin form (A1), and extends the full height and width of the panel: a common approach to the designing of a Crucifixion panel.

More distinctive are the representations of the sun and moon in the spandrels above the cross. Even in their present condition these were clearly represented by frontal heads, the moon within a crescent on Christ's right, and the sun within a circle on His left. Such personifications have their origin in the iconography of the expanded Crucifixion as it developed in Carolingian art of the ninth century (chap. 9), but they were still not unusual in the eleventh century. The figures beneath the cross are quite clearly the spear-bearer, on Christ's right, and the sponge- (or cup-) bearer on Christ's left. Their bodies are half-turned, with heads turned fully to the cross. Their legs are bent at the knees so that they appear to be half-crouching and they hold the shafts of the spear and can between themselves and the spectator. The curved lines of bent arm, haunch, and belly are emphasised and they are rather grotesque figures.

The iconography shows no certain trace of Irish influence. The sun and moon do not figure certainly in any Irish sculptured Crucifixion scene. Henry (1967, 158) has suggested that two human heads beneath Christ's arms on the Tall Cross at Monasterboice are representations of the sun and moon but they could equally be vestigial remains of any other pair of figures which there was no room to depict fully: John and Mary, who are also lacking in Irish sculptures, are another possible interpretation. Figures beneath

Christ's arm on the cross of Muiredach at Monasterboice were also considered by Henry (1967, 159-61) as possible representations of the sun and moon. The figure on the right in this case is kneeling and faces away from the cross: the personifications Ecclesia and Synagogue are at least as likely interpretations here. The sun and moon were represented in Anglo-Saxon sculptures before the Viking settlements - for example at Ruthwell (pl. 77) (where the carving is too worn to reveal whether they were personified or represented anniconically) or at Bradbourne II, Derbyshire, where both appear as encircled heads, but it is not now clear how one was distinguished from the other, if at all (see chap. 9 and pl. 79). There is no other example in pre-Conquest sculpture in which the moon is personified by a head within a crescent except possibly in Durham III (pl. 91), though crescent moon symbols appear elsewhere on the Durham cross heads (see below) and on the Penrith cross (chap. 12 and pls. 123-4), but by whatever date the Aycliffe cross was carved, the personification of these symbols in some form must have been an established Anglian tradition.

The gross figures of the spear- and sponge-bearers are equally unparalleled in Ireland. There one finds half-crouching figures but usually of a distinctive type: the figures leaning or sitting in the curve of the cross head adapted to the exigencies of the space they were required to fill. None have the obese bodies of the Aycliffe figures, and it is at least possible that these are related to, or at least influenced by, strange distortions which appeared in some continental schools of ivory carving and miniature painting in the tenth and eleventh centuries. Large pot-bellied representations are found on a late eleventh-century ivory in Paris (Goldschmidt 1914, pl. XLVII and 54, no. 100) and on a tenth-century manuscript in the Bodleian Library, Oxford (Reil 1930, pl. I). The latter shows the bent knees, a common feature in tenth and eleventh century figures

expressive of movement; and the arms drawn as boneless curves. Possibly therefore the distorted Aycliffe figures are a reflection of a tenth-eleventh century figural style, and represent some new influence. Certainly the Aycliffe Crucifixion scene is no mere copy of an early sculptured model, such as that at Bradbourne in Derbyshire (pl. 79), even though the same choice of figures and symbolic elements is known from Dumfriesshire and Mercia of the pre-Viking period. It is even less closely related to pre-Viking crucifixions surviving from eastern Northumbria, such as those from Hexham and Auckland St. Andrews (chap. 6 and pls. 32-4). The Alnmouth cross (above, and pl. 84) and a fragment from Bothal (below and pl. 89) both from Northumberland, also suggest new models in eastern Northumbria north of the Tees in the tenth and eleventh centuries. The programme of the Chapter House cross heads (see below) indicates Durham in the eleventh century as one centre at which such new models could be found.

From Bothal, Northumberland (cat. and pls. 88-9) come two fragments of crosses with two distinct types of Crucifixion iconography.

Bothal I (pl. 88) is a very simple type of representation set low on one broad face of a small shaft. The shaft, however, is incomplete at the bottom, where the stone is broken, and as can also be seen from the unfinished pattern on all three other faces.

The Crucifixion face is framed vertically by heavy and crudely carved roll mouldings. The representation itself has only the figure of Christ, cut off at about knee level, and without cross or attendant figures. The carving is both crude and very worn, but clearly the body is depicted frontally, the head, trunk and arms themselves forming the shape of the cross (type 1). Christ is portrayed in a short skirted dress, but it is impossible now to see any evidence, for example of a waist band, which would prove it to be a loincloth. The most distinctive feature is the way the background has been cut away around the figure, especially above, where

the cutting follows the line of the arms and head and by a very simple technique suggests a halo or canopy. It is impossible to say whether the area above was meant to be left blank, however, and the apparent simplicity of this face may be rather misleading.

It is impossible to suggest parallels or models for such a simple type 1 figure, of which no detail of what must originally have been a crude carving has survived. The cut away background without framing lines or mouldings could perhaps be compared with the method employed on a very late cross shaft at Harmston, Lincs. (chap. 12 and pl. 132). The absent cross is also a rare feature, found only on two tenth century representations at Gosforth in Cumberland (chap. 12 and pls. 125-6). The position of the scene in the shaft seems to confirm a conservative taste in North Eastern Northumbria (cf. Alnmouth, Aycliffe, Bothal II) but the lack of the cross suggests influence from the crucifix head where in most cases in England a cross directly behind Christ is omitted as redundant.

All these factors suggest a date in the pre-Conquest period, though the crudity of the carving may also suggest a local mason rather than a carver attached to an important institution maintaining a continuous tradition. Alnmouth, Aycliffe (both above) and the Durham crossheads discussed below all attest to the maintenance of and revival of the Lindisfarne tradition at least in the tenth and eleventh centuries. On Bothal I the meander, step, and irregular interlace patterns on the other three faces; the small proportions of the shaft; and those factors relating to carving of a figure panel of the Crucifixion mentioned above; all suggest a date as late in the pre-Conquest period as the late tenth to the eleventh century - the period of Aycliffe and the Durham cross heads. We seem to have to see both a school or schools of sculptors still attached to a monastery in this period; and local masons working more humbly but still recognisably within a tradition.

Bothal II, Northumberland (cat. and pl. 89). The figural scene on this shaft was not recognised as a Crucifixion when the stone was discovered, perhaps partly because of its crudely incised techniques of carving, but undoubtedly also because the upper part of all three figures depicted is missing. The central figure is depicted frontally, without sagging of body or legs (type 1), with feet turned out; and is dressed in a short skirted garment dipping in at the sides. This dip implies a loincloth of the centre-tied type if this figure is to be interpreted as Christ crucified. There is no cross behind the figure. This could be a parallel for Bothal I (above) and Gosforth I and II (chap. 12): but it is also possible that this scene should be reconstructed as a crucifix cross such as those from Kirkburton, Kirkdale and Dewsbury in Yorkshire (chap. 11) in which the figure of Christ occupies the head and extends into the shaft of a cross of small or slender proportions (pl. 109-15).

On the left of the central figure are the legs and feet of a figure in a short dress. One foot is turned out, the other appears to stand on Christ's right foot. Between him and the centre figure is a vertical object perhaps the end of a spear or staff held upright as at Alnmouth, or possibly it is a conventional representation of the blood from Christ's side. On the right is a figure lacking only its head. This frontal/quarter-turned figure in a short dress holds up before him a spear or shaft at an angle to the body of Christ: it is his stance and this object which identifies him as the spear- or sponge-bearer (though it cannot be certain which) and which provides the firmest evidence for the identification of the whole group.

Two features of this right hand figure suggest that the carver had seen a representation of the Crucifixion, in the more elaborate form in which it could appear in miniatures or ivory carvings especially from Carolingian or Ottonian schools. The first is the conventionalised rocky ground on which

he stands. Early Crucifixion scenes, such as that in the Rabula Gospels (pl. 16) sometimes had a full scenic background which was later very widely adopted in the form of a strip of ground beneath the feet of attendant figures even when these are shown one above the head of another. This appears, for example, in a Metz ivory already referred to in connection with Alnmouth (Goldschmidt 1914, pl. XXXVI, no. 85). The second is his stance. This is based on a type also found as early as the Rabula Gospels, but in Western schools from the ninth century onwards there was a tendency to render the sponge and spear bearers as slightly and sometimes very grotesque figures by exaggerating their pose, which is not in any case a natural one. In some schools this took the form of showing a frontal or half turned figure with its legs and hips swinging in an exaggerated curve towards the cross, while the upper part of the body leans away. This is very obvious in ivories of the Liuthard group (Goldschmidt 1914, pls. XXXVI, no. 85; XXIII, no. 56; LVIII, no. 136). This is the type of figure represented at Bothal (see pl. 89). Northumbria north of the Tees was not cut off from outside influences in the later period as we have already seen at Alnmouth and Aycliffe. The importance of the Shrine of St. Cuthbert as a repository for gifts from wealthy and influential visitors should not be overlooked (chaps. 3, 5 and below).

The crudity of the muddled interlace below the Crucifixion scene and on the one other surviving face of this cross, and the lack of a true frame for the panels on the broad face place Bothal II in the same category for dating as Bothal I, near the end of the period and at the end of a tradition; and cut off from the surviving schools of sculpture. Nevertheless it confirms in a most surprising way the considerable variety of models available in Northumbria after what we think of as this area's golden age.

ii The Crucifixion Empanelled on the Crosshead
Durham II and III, Co. Durham (cat. and pls. 90-4)

The Lamb in Durham I and IV, and the ? Daniel scene in Durham IV have

already been discussed (chaps. 3 and 7). Here the Crucifixion scene which appears twice in a circular panel at the centre of cross-heads II and III will be described and discussed, and then placed in relation to the programme which seems to have been worked out for Durham I, II and III, which form a distinct group. The somewhat different interpretation of Durham IV was given at the end of chap. 7.

The Crucifixion on cross-heads II and III (pls. 90, 91)

The Crucifixion appears to substitute for the Lamb symbol in nos. II and III since all three heads have the same central scene on the reverse face. The two Crucifixion scenes are not identical either in iconography or in their surrounding motifs.

The scene on no. III is the most nearly complete (pl. 91). It shows an erect frontal figure (type 1) with horizontally outstretched arms on a cross of type A1 with slightly concave arms and a splayed foot. Christ wears a short dress, probably a loincloth. Above his arms on the left are a head in relief and on the right a simple curve in relief possibly representing a crescent moon. Possibly this also originally contained a head. Below his arm is, on each side, a robed and hooded (or nimbed) half-figure clutching a book or scroll in both hands. Either of these figures could represent St. John the Evangelist, while neither clearly represents Mary. That these figures represent John and Mary is nevertheless a possible interpretation, especially in view of the interest in the writings attributed to St. John which the crosses seem to witness (chap. 3 and below).

No. II even with its partial restoration of the figure of Christ, (see cat.) is less complete and slightly different in iconography (pl. 90). The figure of Christ is equally simple (type 1). Nothing survives of his head or of any detail above the arms of the cross. Four three-quarter length figures, two on either side, are squeezed in below the arms of the cross (the figure on the extreme left is almost completely defaced). These

figures, armless and wrapped in swathing robes, are featureless and virtually unidentifiable, though the possibility that they are witnessing figures is the most likely interpretation.

The motifs which surround these two scenes are wholly different. No. III has the most complex programme, of which, however, only that on one side arm and the lower arm has survived (pl. 91). In the side arm are two beasts crossing each other diagonally with heads and forelegs to the outside of the arm and with ear extensions and hind legs developed into interlace. It is difficult to see the motif as anything other than decorative. The lower arm has a vestigial vine or plant motif with small pointed leaves and berry bunches. A bearded man in a tunic clings with one hand to the stem on which a penguin-like bird is perhaps supposed to be perching. It is not clear what the other arm of the man is doing or whether it holds any weapons. Again the scene is difficult to interpret but may look back to an older Northumbrian iconography in which armed men pursue a beast through a vine, as on the well known example from Jarrow (Cramp 1965a, 10 and pl. 9). It could, on the other hand, represent St. John accompanied by his eagle symbol (but see below, on the eagle accompanying the ? baptism scene).

No. II (pl. 90) has only, in its two surviving lateral arms, the pairs of ecclesiastical figures which occur on the 'baptism' side of nos. I-III (pls. 92-4). Richard Bailey has shown that these figures were laid out by templates, the same ones being used for all these crosses (Bailey 1978, figs. 5-7). The existence of a set of ready-made patterns is interesting in its implication for this group of crosses: both for dating and confirmation that all belong to the same workshop. Here, however, it may be that the repetition of one motif on both sides indicates that the inspiration which led to the rich and varied symbolism of nos. I and III was a short-lived phenomenon.

The ?'Baptism' Scene of I, II and III (pls. 92-4)

This scene appears in the centre of one face of all three heads and though there are small differences of detail and variations in competence of carving they will ^{be} discussed as one.

The central scene itself is most finely carved on No. I (pl. 92), the only scene which shows any detail of drapery or any subtlety in the relative size and relationship of the group of figures. The scene has sometimes been thought to represent the Sacrifice of Isaac, although no identifying detail of ram or burning bush is represented, while on the other hand there is a clear attendant figure who, on No. I stands to one side, with a length of material draped over one arm. It seems much more likely as some earlier writers have suggested (Collingwood 1927a, 80-81) that this scene represents the Baptism of Christ. St. John the Baptist is shown with his crook in many representations of this scene, and in spite of its closed loop this seems a more likely interpretation of the long handled implement carried by the central standing figure, while the loincloth apparently worn by the bending figure also possibly shows traces of the iconography of this scene. Angels or attendant figures with clasped hands, even river Gods, appear in both eastern and western depictions of this scene from a very early date and, in English art, in the Benedictional of St. Aethelwold (Schiller 1971, pl. 354-71, esp. 354-5 and 371). A dove representing the Holy Spirit is also, of course, frequently associated with this scene, but it is usually shown flying down towards the head of Christ: the curved beak of the bird in the upper arm suggests more strongly that it is an eagle.

All three versions of the scene appear accompanied by paired ecclesiastical figures in the lateral arms, one carrying a staff cross and one carrying a book. It is possible that these figures are representations in human form of the four evangelists symbolised elsewhere on the heads (again most clearly on no. I. See chap. 3 and pl. 14), but this cannot be certain: other witnessing ecclesiastical and saintly figures may be intended.

The programme of the lowest arm survives only on no. III (pl. 94). It shows a beast with open jaws facing left. Its front legs are free and end as paws or hoofs, but it has only one hind leg or tail which loops about it and ends in a serpent head which bites its own neck. The motif doubtless owes much to the development of animal ornament in pre-Conquest art, but a source of inspiration could well have been the plagues which will be let loose on mankind as a warning of the end. These plagues are described as horses with the heads of lions, with power in their mouths and in their tails which were like snakes with heads, and with which they deal injuries (Revelations IX, 7-10). It is not possible to say whether this motif was repeated on nos. I and II, even though the evidence of the lateral arms of all three and surviving details of two upper arms suggest for this face at least a consistent programme. Even as it stands, the lower arm of no. III could be seen as once more demonstrating the interest in apocalyptic imagery shown in the Lamb face of cross head I (chap. 3 and pl. 14).

On no. I are, on the upper arm, a perching bird with hooked beak, with the head of the sun on the right and the crescent of the moon on the left (pl. 92). Only the tail of the bird survives in the same position on no. III (pl. 94). The hooked beak identifies the bird as an eagle and not a dove associated with the baptism scene (see above).

Barbara Raw has put forward strong reasons to show that Christ could be symbolised by the eagle, as indeed was said by some early writers (Raw 1967, 391 and fn. 8). She accepted this interpretation for the bird at Durham, considering it identified by the symbols of the sun and moon, as well as for the eagle on the Ruthwell cross and on an ivory reliquary in the Victoria and Albert Museum (possibly of eleventh century date) both of which are, however, associated with an archer. The reliquary is indeed in many ways an interesting parallel. It also has the Lamb with the staff cross surrounded by evangelist symbols in the centre of the opposite face, and it too can be interpreted in terms of the Apocalyptic Vision (Raw 1967,

393). On this interpretation, the eagle becomes a symbol^{of} the Ascension and the Lamb of the second coming of Christ, which as Miss Raw notes, are linked in Acts I, ii (Raw 1967, 392).

On cross-head III, however, the eagle appears opposite not to the Lamb, but to the Crucifixion and in both I and III above a probable Baptism scene. It is possible to interpret no. I at least as based on the theme of the revelation of Christ's Godhead to man. In John I, 29, the Baptist says, at the approach of Christ, 'Behold the Lamb of God, Behold him who taketh away the sins of the world'. This is the only Gospel in which the Baptist identifies Christ in this way. It would seem that there is a reference to the Agnus Dei, explicitly linked with the Apocalyptic Lamb from the vision ascribed to St. John on crosshead I; and with Christ Crucified on II and III. In spite of some breakdown, therefore, in accompanying symbolism between I and III on the one hand, and II, the repetition of the Baptism scene on all three suggests that they should be seen as a unified group, with a markedly Johannine emphasis.

The eagle could still be seen as symbolising Christ in his incarnation and Ascension, and thus carrying on the theme of the revelation of his Godhead. It is possible, however, in this context, that it symbolises St. John. It is impossible to be sure whether his symbol appeared on the lower arm of the Lamb and face of no. I, or not. It could, however, have been isolated or repeated in the Baptism face, as a symbol of witness to the revelation of divinity represented there. Certainly it should not be seen as necessarily repeating the same message as in representations in which eagle, archer and Lamb are associated. On the opposite face, the man symbol of St. Matthew is also shown accompanied by two heads, which are most probably personifications of the sun and moon: there they would seem to be related to the apocalyptic imagery of the whole face. The eagle with sun and moon could equally have been borrowed from the iconography of the
1. 'Ecce Agnus Dei, ecce qui tollit peccatum mundi.'

apocalypse; perhaps deliberately rather than carelessly, since it is also from Revelations that we learn that in the heavenly city, the sun and moon will be needed no more (Revelations XXI, 34-4).

These crossheads, together with Durham IV and other sculptures recovered from the same place (Haverfield and Greenwell 1899, nos. XXIV-XXVI) are important as a fixed point in the dating of related material elsewhere in the north. This results from the known history of the site in which they were found.

The Chapter House was probably begun in the late eleventh century and as has often been suggested it is unlikely that the crosses were reused as building stones very soon after they were carved (Brown^{G.B.} 1937, 216-7). It is equally unlikely that they were carved before 995, the date at which the community of St. Cuthbert settled at Durham. According to Symeon, a Durham monk writing in the twelfth century, the community attempted to return to Chester-le-Street, a site they had occupied for over a hundred years, a few months after they had fled from it out of fear of an invasion attack (Symeon 1882, I, 78-9). Instead, they were led by a vision to choose the more easily fortifiable site of Durham where, we are told, only a small area at the top of the hill was under cultivation. There is no suggestion of any sizeable community living there, and labour supplied by Earl Uhtred was needed to clear the plateau and make it habitable. A chapel of boughs had to be built as the first resting place of the shrine of St. Cuthbert, which clearly implies that there was no church building, or any substantial building of any sort, before the community began its own building operations (Symeon 1882, I, 79). As a result of recent excavation there is now archaeological evidence for pre-Conquest settlement in the neck of the peninsula, but the evidence there, including that from radio-carbon dating, does not push this further back into the tenth century than the arrival of the Community (Carver 1978). It seems likely, therefore, that the four crossheads are among the most securely dated sculptures, on historical and

archaeological grounds, that we have.

Interestingly the iconography of the Lamb seems to support the c.1000 or early eleventh century date for the sculptures (chap. 3). The Crucifixion scene itself is perhaps in its central figure less innovative but the accompanying figures whether they are to be taken as John and Mary or witnesses in a more general sense, also imply new influences and new models. In their position - in the head but empanelled - the scenes are perhaps reverting to a layout found at, for example, Eyam in Derbyshire in the early ninth century (when the Crucifixion was still carved in the shaft at Bakewell and Bradbourne, see chap. 9). However, in Northumbria placing the Crucifixion in this way at the centre of a complex symbolism was itself innovative. One is reminded of gifts such as that by Tostig and his wife of a Crucifixion group in precious metals to St. Cuthbert at Durham in this period (chap. 5; see also chap. 3): the Shrine must have received many such gifts so that new external influences in the late pre-Conquest period are to be expected.

iii Crucifix Heads

After the magnificent beginning to the crucifix head exemplified by Rothbury, Northumberland (chap. 9) there is surprisingly little to follow it within its own area. There are in fact only two crucifix heads, both from Co. Durham.

Billingham, Co. Durham (cat. and pl. 95). This fragment is also difficult to date. It is part of a cross head, apparently the lower arm or the neck of the head. On one broad face are the bare legs and feet, straight and frontal, of a (type 1) figure which must have filled the cross head. It is difficult to suggest any other explanation of the figure, other than it represents Christ crucified. The legs are quite deeply carved. It is not clear whether the field on either side of the legs was meant to be cut away, and is therefore unfinished, or whether some further carving was

represented, now too badly worn for identification.

The fragment is cruder than the Rothbury head (pl. 91) but it is notable that the carver has striven more for naturalism in his figure of Christ than in the little figure on the opposite face, which could be an evangelist portrait (pl. 96). The use of an interlace pattern type and the technique in which it is carved relate this fragment to a sculpture from Monkwearmouth which has been placed in the late ninth century (Adcock 1974, 144, pl. 45B and fig. 36). There is nothing like the deeply modelled style of the crucified figure in late Durham work (see Aycliffe, pl. 86 and Durham, pls. 14-5, 90-4) and the carving in the curve of the arms is also a link with the Rothbury tradition. It seems likely therefore that this piece is not too much later in date, and perhaps was carved in the late ninth century.

Hart II, Co. Durham (cat. and pl. 97). This fragment represents part of the centre and lower arm of the cross head. Only the trunk (type 1) and part of one arm of the figure of Christ has survived. The trunk occupies the lower part of the centre of the head and extends into the narrow part of the lower arm. The body is wedge-shaped but there are no surviving indications of its dress. The waist line is obscured by an applied moulding which from its position is clearly the lower half of a ring defining the centre of the head. A similar roundel on the reverse is filled with interlace. The large central ring is typical of late Durham sculpture (see pls. 14, 90-4) and the interlace filling is found in works of this school at Aycliffe and Woodhorn (Adcock 1974, 352). At Durham the ring encloses figure sculpture (chap. 3 and above). Here it could be merely a standard feature of layout since it is actually superimposed on a figural scene.

The line of the underside of Christ's right arm is just visible, but more has survived on his left. The cross is damaged at this point and in some lights it looks more like a hand reaching out from the side and

clutching some object, than an arm attached to the figure. Clearly this arm and the ring which also bulges on the inside just beneath it were not perfectly finished, and this adds to the difficulty of interpretation.

Below the ring, the double edge mouldings of the arm-pit of the cross-head are visible, and between them and the body are the tips of the implements held by the spear- and sponge-bearers: the spear head on Christ's right and the cup for the vinegar on the left. It is not clear where or whether the two figures were actually represented. If they were present, they must have stood in the shaft of the cross below the figure, or have been very small - which is not the suggestion conveyed by the size of the spear and cup. Lancaster III (chap. 12 and pl. 125) shows one of these two figures squeezed into a small shaft. The Hart Christ, however, was certainly completed within the head, and the angle of the implements perhaps suggests crouching figures as on some Irish cross heads (pls. 53ff.). An alternative could be that the implements symbolised the bearers, again as on an Irish cross from St. Mullins, Co. Carlow (pl. 56).

Clearly there are several points of resemblance with the group of heads showing Irish/Scandinavian influence in chapter 7, especially groups bii and c (pls. 44-52). On the other hand its layout and interlace link it very closely with late Durham sculpture of the late tenth, early eleventh century (Adcock 1974, chap. 9). The superimposed ring too must have enclosed Christ's head which could have a different implication from a circle on the breast or replacing the body. It could suggest it was merely an adaptation of a local cross head type. It is interesting, however, that a late tenth, early eleventh century English ivory crucifix shows Christ superimposed on a large ring which passes behind him at about knee level and behind his hands, but encloses his head. The suggestion is of a mandorla, and perhaps there was a period fashion for mandorlas of this type since the ivory was found in Sussex (Beckwith 1972, pl. 70 and cat. 35).

It is sad however not to have this carving complete enough to determine the presence and position of the spear- and sponge-bearers, which might have provided a point of comparison with the iconography of the Aycliffe cross, also a late Durham work (see above and pl. 86). Hart is clearly not a direct follower of Rothbury in either style or layout, but seems to represent a new treatment of the crucifix head. This could have owed something to Yorkshire developments (chaps. 7 and 11) or the local development of the head type with central ring, but it is interesting that it too could be another trace of a new model or influence in this revival period.

iv Architectural Sculpture

There is no trace of architectural sculptures of the Crucifixion from this area in the late pre-Conquest period. This seems odd in view of the pictures at J a r r o w, and the architectural sculpture of the early period, for example Hexham I (chap. 6). The possible sculpture at Monkwearmouth has had to be rejected on the grounds that (while not enough survives to show what it was) its proportions suggest that a Crucifixion interpretation is unlikely (Appendix A and pl. 166).

Conclusions

The absence of architectural sculptures from this area might indicate that much has not survived from the late period, though the region's disturbed history and the decline in the number of monastic organisations capable of patronising the arts must also account for the marked change in the quality of surviving carvings of this scene between the early period and late. At the start of the early period Northumbria was at the height of its power and until the early ninth century at least must have enjoyed considerable cultural prestige. Even in the ninth century, monuments such as the Rothbury crucifix head attest not only to its cultural contacts but

to its ability to innovate and lead. For much of the latter part of the period there is no evidence of innovation, or development of the forms of monuments which instead look back to the 'Golden Age'. Consequently there is little evidence of innovation in the layout or form of Crucifixion monuments. On the other hand, there is a surprising amount of evidence that new models were brought in from outside from time to time and that these were copied though more crudely than in earlier centuries. At the very end of the period, too, the crossheads at Durham and Hart show an attempt not merely to copy but to treat the Crucifixion in a new way, as a focus for related imagery. This supports the idea of a considerable revival in the fortunes of the Community of St. Cuthbert after its settlement in Durham.

C H A P T E R 11

THE ICONOGRAPHY OF CHRIST IN THE LOINCLOTH IN YORKSHIRE
FROM THE LATE NINTH TO THE EARLY ELEVENTH CENTURIES

No sculpture with the Crucifixion which can be securely dated to the period pre-850 has survived or so far been discovered in Yorkshire. That the development of the theme in this area which was at one time the independent Kingdom of Deira, then the southern half of Northumbria, and later part of a Viking Kingdom, might have been different for that of Bernicia seems indicated by the fact that no fragment of shaft which certainly had the theme of Christ crucified has been identified from among the several hundred fragments of pre-Conquest sculpture which have been recorded from this area. Only an interesting but unusual 'empty cross' theme which seems to indicate a new influence from the late period is known on cross shafts from the whole county (chap. 2).

i Crucifix Heads, Anglian Type

In chapter 7 it was shown that some crucifix heads in Yorkshire had been strongly influenced by Irish models; but the development of the crucifix head in this area seems also to have been formed under earlier Anglian influence even though the earliest evidence from the development of this form is from Rothbury, Northumberland (chap. 9).

At Sherburn, Yorkshire (cat. and pl. 98) is a small fragment which seems to show that such a development had occurred. It consists of part of one arm of a cross head which is more likely to have been the same shape as the Rothbury head (D9) than type B9 or B10 as Collingwood (1927a, fig. 124) reconstructed it. If the curve of the arm is produced into an armpit as Collingwood suggests, the arm would be even shorter and the angle of the armpit tighter than in his drawing. The reverse face has traces of a double roll-moulding, but is otherwise so worn that no trace of the decoration has survived. The end of the arm appears always to have been plain. On the

surviving face is part of the right arm of Christ, in relief but rather more flatly modelled than Collingwood (1927a, 102) suggests. The hand is damaged but the thumb seems to have been held close to the fingers. There is a small rounded nailhead in the palm. Above and below the arm are plant forms: a type of stiff formal acanthus seems to have been intended.

The modelling and the form of the cross arm might indicate a date in the pre-Viking period but there is nothing in the surviving fragment of iconography which can be pinned down very firmly. The stiff acanthus-like decoration looks similar to that bordering many ninth century panels and miniatures, such as the ivory cover of the Book of Pericopes of Henry II (pl. 83). A highly decorated Crucifixion cross is found in the Sacramentary of Gellone of the second half of the eighth century (pl. 71) but plant or scroll ornament covering the surface is a feature of later work, as on the late tenth century crucifix in gold and ivory in the Victoria and Albert Museum (pl. 143). Some scholars have considered this a German work to which an English ivory figure was applied, but others such as Goldschmidt (1914, no. 3) have accepted the whole work as English. Plant ornament decorating the shaft of the Crucifixion cross is also found in the work of the late ninth to tenth century Metz school, again especially in ivory carving (see Schiller 1972, pl. 373) and as we have seen works of this school seem to have been known in northern England (above, chap. 10). The acanthus background therefore suggests that this fragment is likely to be much later than the Rothbury fragment, but it is too incomplete and provides insufficient evidence to place it more exactly in relation to tenth-eleventh century sculptures in Yorkshire. It is possible that this could be a fragment of a staff-crucifix like the group discussed in part iii below (Kirkburton, Dewsbury, Kirkdale). The plant ornament could indeed suggest a metal crucifix as a model. The fragment is too small for reconstruction, however.

At Great Ayton (cat. and pls. 99, 100) part of a cross head survives in two fragments which represent the centres and side arms of a cross. The

head which is of type A9 is outlined by an incised line with the border rather than the field cut back slightly. On one face is the torso (type 1) and arms (one complete) of the crucified Christ. His arms slope down from the shoulder and bend up again at the elbow. The hand is held open. The ends of the fingers of the left hand seem to have been defaced. There is no trace of any dress on the upper part of the body but there is a thickening at the waist which seems to indicate the presence of a loincloth. The figure is in relief, and there has been a considerable attempt at modelling. While the figure is certainly frontal, nothing can be distinguished of the position of the head.

On the opposite face the decoration consists of a 'spine and boss' or 'lorgnette' cross motif and on the ends of the arms are panels with a double stranded 'close circuit' interlace motif. Collingwood (1927a, 98, 100) noted the long life of the 'lorgnette' motif and rightly pointed out that its presence on the Great Ayton cross does not date it. An interlace pattern is a feature of the ends of the arms of the Rothbury head (pl. 101) though there the programme is more complex and includes decoration of the curved faces above and below the side arms, and a marigold pattern as well as interlace. It is interesting, however, that the design on the Great Ayton arm is a version of the same pattern type which appears on the Rothbury head, though it is formed of two closed elements pushed together so that each element provides the diagonal strand for the other - a 'closed circuit' version of simple pattern D¹. 'Closed circuit' patterns are not found on any of the great monuments of the early period such as Bewcastle or Rothbury but Adcock (1974, 190) makes the point that such patterns which give an interlace-like effect seem to have begun as a creative variation at sites such as Norham in Northumberland, though they only became common in

¹Terms used to describe interlace can be found in Adcock (1974, glossary); and in more accessible form in Adcock (1978).

the later period. They are often associated in Yorkshire with late or Viking work (Collingwood 1915, 262-4). At Great Ayton the degree of modelling and indeed the surprising complexity of the variant do not suggest a very late date, but one closer to the inventive period of Anglian art. It is probable therefore that it is as Collingwood placed in near the end of the ninth century. Its double stranded compressed patterns associate it with a fragment from Bedale, which Collingwood (1907, 299 and fig. a) placed in the same period.

It is impossible to say whether the Christ figure here was completely isolated on its face since both upper and lower arms are missing. It does seem clear however that there were no spear- or sponge-bearers, since there is no sign of them or their implements. Unlike Rothbury and possibly Billingham, however, it was clearly not part of a schema which associated both faces of the head. Possibly this indicates a development towards establishing the stone crucifix as a devotional object rather than a didactic one, akin to the development of the architectural rood in the south and the east Midlands (see chap. 13, and also chap. 5). The Great Ayton head might then be seen as a stage in the development of the stone staff-crucifix of the type represented by the fragments at Kirkburton (below).

Kirby Hill (cat. and pls. 102-3) is a crosshead which seems to follow the Great Ayton tradition though it is a far remove from Rothbury. Only the upper arm is missing. The back of the head is too worn to determine how it was decorated, but the dimples and ridges at the ends of the arms suggest that they were decorated with interlace or twist patterns. The head type (A10) has smaller armpits than Great Ayton and the Crucifixion face seems to have been edged by a double roll moulding. It is clumsily carved and represents a considerable deterioration in technique over Great Ayton. The figure of Christ occupies the whole face. His head, like the Rothbury head, is set in the narrow part of the upper arm. It is too worn to determine

any features. The position seems to have been erect and frontal, like that of the (type 1) torso below. The legs are completely eroded. The figure's arms are extended in the same way as those of the Great Ayton figure, but are not so well proportioned, being too short above the elbow and with the bent arms represented more as a curve. The hands, held open palm outwards, are disproportionately large, filling the ends of the arms. There has been some attempt at modelling however, as can be seen along the line of the under arm.

The squat proportions of the head and the poor quality of carving suggest a declining tradition of Anglian sculpture and therefore a later date than Great Ayton, but it is difficult to suggest more than that it was carved perhaps in the early tenth century. Like Great Ayton it seems untouched by Irish/Scandinavian fashions in figural style, cross head type, or accompanying motifs.

ii Crucifix heads which suggest a mixing of traditions

The remainder of crucifix heads complete enough for analysis all suggest some mixing of traditions between an established Anglian type and an incoming Irish/Scandinavian type (see chap. 7).

York I (cat. and pls. 104-5). This fragment ^{of a} cross head of type A11 from St. Mary's is in some ways as enigmatic as Ellerburn (below) although the detail is somewhat clearer. Only the centre and one arm of the cross survives. The figure of Christ is erect and frontal (type 1). Its head is missing but was clearly placed low in the upper arm, so that the shoulders of the figure are in the centre of the head and his surviving arm, flexed at the elbow, extends naturally into the side arms of the cross. The hands are held open, with the thumb held stiffly apart from the fingers. There is no indication of dress in the upper part of the figure, but some extra bulkiness between waist and knee level suggests a loincloth. The position (and degree of modelling) of the figure recalls Great Ayton, as does the

form of the cross head and the fact that the ends of the arms are decorated by a double stranded ring twist, but the use of decorative elements on the Crucifixion face belongs to a different tradition. Above the arm of the figure are three bosses, apparently space fillers. Below the arm is a motif which suggests a possible link with a cross head at Sinnington (chap. 7 and pl. 39). At York this motif takes the form of a double-stranded ribbon creature with a fish-like tail and with its body tied in two figure-of-eight knots, below Christ's right arm. Below his other arm is the head of another creature with a long neck but of unknown body type, with a round eye and open jaws from which a long tongue protrudes. At Sinnington the two snake-like elements make a single twist, but the similarity between the two motifs is striking. It is difficult, however, to be sure that this means that the motif at Sinnington was seen as a snake, or that either there or at York it was seen as a duplication of the snake representing the Devil (and the Fall redeemed through the cross) which was part of western Crucifixion iconography from the ninth century (see Bitton, chap. 8). A different sort of duplication of the snake motif is found on the Viking Age cross at Gosforth I, Cumberland (chap. 12 and pl. 125) where however, placed below the Crucifixion and the human figures, it is in a much more easily recognisable position. It could be that at both York and Sinnington interlaced or twisted animal ornament was simply seen as an acceptable decorative alternative to the interlace and twist patterns which also appear as decorative space fillers in this position, as on a head more closely related to Sinnington at Kirklevington I (chap. 7 and pl. 35).

Since York has been shown to be an important centre for sculptural styles in the Viking period (Pattison 1973; Lang 1978) it could be that this motif was developed there, though whether initially on sculptures dependant on the Anglian or Irish/Scandinavian tradition there is now insufficient evidence to determine. It is certainly not found on the Irish sculptures

which clearly relate to works found in England (chap. 7 and pls. 53-9).

The double-stranded knots and the simple figure of eight ring twist at the end of the arm (also double-stranded) suggest a deterioration from the more complex design on the Great Ayton head (pl. 100). A date in the tenth century seems appropriate for this cross to allow for some mixing of Anglian and Irish/Scandinavian traditions, or at least to allow for a period in which the two types could develop side by side with a similar expression of a period taste.

On the opposite broad face is a standing figure, with bulky swathes across his body suggesting long drapery and with arms sloping down from the shoulders - one, the right, possibly resting on the hip, the other hand upraised (pl. 105). This looks like an association of the crucified with the Risen Christ which seems to have been quite usual in late pre-Conquest grave sculpture, and which is found for example on Gosforth II, Cumberland (pls. 126-7); on a late shaft from Harmston, Lincs. (pls. 132-4) (both chap. 12); as well as in a more elaborate form on the small grave marker from Newent, Gloucestershire (pl. 139 and chap. 13)¹.

At North Otterington (cat. and pl. 106) is the lower half of an unpierced ring head type A10. This shows the lower half of the figure of Christ, clearly erect and frontal (type 1), with short stubby legs and thick heavy feet which are turned out. The most interesting surviving feature is the very clear loincloth, represented by a band across the waist and a short skirt with a nick, like a curved inverted V, between the legs. This V or U shaped nick is also found at Dewsbury (pl. 111) and is clearly a stylisation of the loincloth folded with a central tie. The iconography is therefore distinctively different from that of the robed figures discussed

¹Lancaster III was suggested as possibly also showing this combination (pls. 50-1). See also the discussion of Brigham, Cumberland, also chap. 7. Penrith, Cumberland may also have had a similar schema (chap. 12).

in chap. 7, some of which were also represented on ring heads. Christ crucified with the loincloth does appear in Irish sculpture, for example at Clonmacnois (Henry 1967, pl. 93) but there it is clearly the result of the influence of later models either direct from Carolingian or later continental sources, or perhaps from Anglo-Saxon England. In Yorkshire it is not necessary to see this type mediated through Ireland where in any case there is no group of parallels related in proportion and layout in the same ways as for the robed figures of chap. 7. It seems more likely that here we have an Anglian iconography on an Irish/Scandinavian form of cross head which therefore represents a convergence of two originally distinct cultural traditions.

Ellerburn (cat. and pl. 107). The surviving face of this crosshead, a ring head possibly of type A10 is very worn. It could have been much as Collingwood (1927a, fig. 130) drew it, except for one detail. Collingwood drew it as though Christ's head completely filled the upper arm, but there seems to be a cruciform halo around the head, which can just be distinguished in the photograph. The haloed head, however, does fill the upper arm of the cross. Christ's body is erect and frontal (type 1), his legs straight with the feet turned out, and his surviving arm extends stiffly into the cross arm, rising stiffly from the shoulder. He seems to be wearing a dress with a full bell-like skirt which apparently had many incised lines indicating elaborate pleat-like folds. The figure is too worn to ascertain whether the upper part of the body was clothed. It is uncertain, therefore, whether we have here a long loincloth as appears at Kirkburton (below) but exaggerated into ample folds, especially around the waist, or a long skirted and waisted robe with an equally exaggerated skirt. The lumpiness around the waist, however, makes the first at least probable.

The iconography cannot be considered comparable to that of the groups of late cross heads discussed in chap. 7 because although Christ's head fills the upper arm this is short enough to permit his arms to extend into

the cross arms from shoulders which are in a natural position for this. Certainly there are no steeply sloping or heavily rounded shoulders, and indeed the upper part of the body is markedly thin. The nimbus is not a feature of Irish Crucifixions in any medium, and this especially with its cruciform detail, suggests a possible earlier Anglian source. Rothbury (pl. 81) has a cruciferous halo though of a different form and a cruciform or cruciferous nimbus is also a feature of tenth-eleventh century English manuscripts and ivories (Beckwith 1972, pls. 38, 47, 70, 72-3; Temple 1976, pls. 45, 171, 246, 289, 311, 392). This could imply some new southern or continental influence, but perhaps a reflection of an earlier Anglian tradition is more likely.

The original iconography of this cross head unfortunately has to remain in doubt, but the position of the figure relative to the cross head, the cruciform nimbus and the possible loincloth suggest Anglian rather than Irish/Scandinavian influence. Given the form of the cross head, Ellerburn seems, like North Otterington, to represent a mixed tradition.

Finghall (cat. and pl. 108) has a free armed cross head of type E10 which has some features in common with those described in chap. 7 but though the technique is poor it is more modelled than any of them (pls. 35-52), and the figure of Christ has also a full, slightly dished, nimbus which suggests a different influence from that which produced the flat topped version found at Kirklevington I and Sinnington (pls. 35 and 39). Christ is also shown wearing a dress with a clear waist band. It is not quite clear, however, whether this represents the waist band of a girdled robe or of a loincloth. Perhaps the latter is more likely since there is no trace of any line around neck, wrist, or shoulder, where if a robe had been intended one might have expected to see this detail at least as deeply incised as at the waist.

Christ's head and trunk are erect and frontal (type 1). His arms are thin and bent sharply up at the elbow. There was decoration now very worn,

perhaps a twist, in the upper arm of the cross above Christ's head. Above his surviving arm (his right) the space is filled by either a triquetra or two linked ovals; and a triquetra fills the end of the arm below his hand. Below his arm, filling the space between the body and the edge moulding, is another feature which looks like an inner moulding. It is just possible that this could be a spear, bent to fit the available space. If it is, it should be compared to Hart II, Co. Durham (pl. 97). It is perhaps more likely however that this is simply a double moulding for which there was no room in the upper and side arms of the head. The decorative motifs above the head and above and below the arms link it with the Irish/Scandinavian group a (chap. 7) but these together with the attempt at the modelling, nimbus and possible loincloth suggest influence from the Anglian tradition which as we saw from York I was still developing in the tenth century.

It is difficult to work out whether the figure at Finghall could have been completed within the head but it is unlikely to have extended so far into the shaft as in the group of staff-crucifixes to be considered next.

iii The Staff Crucifix

We have seen that the crosshead treated like a crucifix was not found at a very early date (see Rothbury, chap. 9). However, the whole cross (or one of its faces) treated entirely as a crucifix seems to have been an even later development. Only three examples certainly survive. Finghall is very doubtful but Bothal II (chap. 10 and pl. 89) may belong to this group and a crudely carved fragment from Lancaster (chap. 12 and pl. 128) almost certainly does. Both are too crude, however, to be absolutely certain that any rules of proportion were kept, and cannot be included in the list of certain examples.

Only one of those discussed below is both reasonably complete and relatively unworn and with this we must start though it may not be the earliest of the group.

Kirkburton (cat. and pls. 109-10). This cross, with a head of type B9

is decorated on one face only. The back and sides are framed by a continuous double roll moulding but are otherwise plain. Attention therefore is concentrated on the face with the Crucifixion. Christ fills the head and extends into the shaft. He stands out against the cross as if applied to it, like a figure on a metal cross. His head and hands both encroach on the edge mouldings.

His head and body are erect and frontal (type 1). His smooth hair frames his face and curls up at the ends beside his neck. His eye-brows are arched but little further detail survives of his face, or the upper part of his body, which is partly defaced.

His shoulders slope down so that his shoulders and arms form one line following the curve of the cross arm. His hands are straight, palm open, and with the thumb held close to the hand. The waist band of the loincloth is clearly visible and the fragment which has the widening at the join between the head and shaft has a carved loop or knot presumably indicating the folds of the loincloth below.

Christ's legs are straight and together, his feet are turned out, forming an angle of 90° within which the interlace which fills the rest of the face terminates. The legs are somewhat defaced but the long loincloth suggested in Collingwood's drawing of the cross is present and can be detected in a line in higher relief above the feet.

The iconography of the figure is not easily datable since it is an erect (type 1) figure. Head and hands crossing mouldings are not unusual in relief work dating from the ninth to the eleventh centuries. See for example, an ivory in the Museo Nazionale, Florence, dated by Goldschmidt (1914, 58 and pl. L, no. 114) to the ninth-tenth centuries. The Reliquary casket of Pippin, II of Aquitaine at Conques has precisely this feature although in

other respects its iconography of Christ is different (Lasko 1972, pl. 12)¹.

This detail is however also a feature of tenth-eleventh century sculptures of the Crucifixion (see chap. 13) which might indicate that at Kirkburton it is a regional expression of a period motif.

The very long loincloth, on the other hand is a very rare feature. The only comparable example I have been able to find is from a miniature in a Psalter from St. Germain des Près which dates from the very end of the eleventh century (Beckwith 1964, pl. 172). It is improbable that the cross is as late as this, and the long loincloth may be an individual quirk on part of the sculptor/designer, though there are signs that a more ample loincloth may have been a late tenth-eleventh century fashion (see Schiller 1972, pls. 381, 384, 386). It is possible that the Ellerburn cross head (pl. 107) is another indication that this was a period fashion.

Collingwood (1927a, 101ff., 177) dated this crucifix to the eleventh century but this seems to have been the result of second thoughts as in an earlier publication (Collingwood 1915, 202-3) he was undecided between his period late A (that is, late Anglian, pre-Viking) and AC by which he meant a revival or continuation of Anglian art in the tenth and eleventh centuries. The dating puzzle results from the fact that though from Yorkshire it shows no trace of Viking influence (or Irish influence) while in its modelled style, its type of edge-mouldings, and its use of interlace patterns it stands clearly in an Anglian tradition. The cross designed like a metalwork cross to be seen from one side only had already been developed in Anglian sculpture of the pre-Viking period, as for example on a cross from Hoddon in Dumfriesshire with the Lamb in the centre of the head (chap. 2 and pl. 10). The cross conceived as a crucifix seems however a ninth century development (Rothbury, chap. 9) and the figure of Christ isolated

¹The Crucifixion on this Reliquary dates from the early eleventh century, although the casket also incorporates fragments of an earlier date (Lasko 1972, 56-7).

in the head to be a development of no earlier than the end of the century (Great Ayton, above). It is possible that the whole cross conceived as a crucifix was an even later development, and this bears out the suggestion conveyed by the iconography of the long loincloth.

The interlace conveys a similar impression. The twisted termination at the top between Christ's feet carries on a tradition which is certainly found in Anglian sculpture of the pre-Viking period, as on a fragment from Bamburgh, Northumberland and on an octagonal shaft from Jarrow, Co. Durham¹ but it is also found in Northumbrian sculpture which is certainly later in date and associated with other Viking age features as on a fragment from Bywell, Northumberland (Featherstonehaugh 1859, fig. facing p. 34). The pattern itself is a median incised version of Pattern A, several forms of which (including one very similar) are found on the Alnmouth cross, one of them on the shaft of the Crucifixion cross (Adcock 1974, pl. 127a; vol. II below, pl. 84)². Alnmouth itself is very likely to be tenth century in date (chap. 10).

In chapter 5 I pointed out that there was evidence from the tenth and eleventh centuries for the practice of placing staff crosses behind altars when they were not in use as processional crosses. Such a practice could well have inspired the evolution of the Kirkburton type of staff crucifix with its tall and slender proportions. Surviving Ottonian altar crucifixes also have tall and slender proportions and often have highly decorated shafts (see Lasko 1972, pls. 93-4, 107, 137; Schiller 1972, pl. 395). The layout at Kirkburton, and details such as the hands standing out in relief over the edge-mouldings, could imply a free-standing metalwork model. Crucifixes were becoming more common as church furnishings in this

¹Both unpublished. I am indebted to Professor R. Cramp for permission to quote them.

²See Adcock (1978) for a summary of her classification of interlace patterns.

period. The undamaged parts of the Kirkburton cross show no sign of weathering, which could indicate that it was made for use inside (see Reculver, chaps. 5 and 9; and Rothbury, chap. 9) as could the traces of point which have survived on it.

Dewsbury (cat. and pls. 111-4) is only a fragment of a cross which must have been smaller than Kirkburton and is also different in being carved on all four faces. The Crucifixion face (pl. 111) is different from the rest in having only one edge moulding, a cable moulding.

Only the legs and lower part of a body (erect and frontal type 1) survive but apart from the size and isolation of the figure the interpretation of it as Christ crucified is supported by the fact that the feet are resting on a suppeditaneum. The figure is dressed in a knee length dress with a narrow U-shaped indentation in the centre of the hem. This is clearly an attempt to represent the folds of a loincloth tied at the centre. The dress is double outlined. The feet are straight and rather large, the toes clearly differentiated, and the carving is not so crude that they were made all the same length. The figure is in relief but not modelled, being dressed flat on the surface. It is difficult to see how the figure of Christ could have been completed if it did not carry on into a crosshead as suggested by Collingwood.

The double stranded regular interlace on one narrow face (pl. 112) is competently carried out although the pattern involved is a very simple one. On the other narrow face (pl. 113) is a stiff but recognisable vine scroll with leaves, buds and berry bunches. The decoration of both these faces suggests we are considering a continuing or reviving Anglian tradition as at Kirkburton. The opposite broad face has a strange carving which Collingwood (1915, 171) suggested represented a manticora or man-eating figure (death) (pl. 114) but it is more probably a Virgin and Child which appears much more finely carved but with the same basic pose on what is

certainly a pre-Viking cross fragment at the same site (Collingwood 1915, fig. d, p. 164). If so it again suggests a continuation of the Anglian tradition of crosses with a programme, though possibly reduced to two or three scenes. The Nativity and Crucifixion as two aspects of God's gift of Himself is a schema almost complete in itself. The cabled borders of the shaft also link this work with earlier pieces from this site, and suggest an ongoing or reviving tradition, though the fully modelled style of the certainly early work from this site has gone. The slender proportions of the Dewsbury crucifix are similar to those of Kirkburton, and it could have been much taller originally. Its ^{wa}weathered condition might suggest an internal use. Since the crucifix is not isolated, however, it seems in some ways closer to the earlier traditions represented by Rothbury, than does Kirkburton. Possibly both staff crucifixes of the Dewsbury type and crucifix heads of the Great Ayton type preceded the development of Kirkburton which also shows much stronger signs of influence from Ottonian centres. Dewsbury certainly seems to belong to an overlap period, still in touch with the iconography and decorative motifs of Anglian art, but sharing in the flat unmodelled styles commoner in the Viking period (see Kirklevington I, pl. 35) and is possibly of the early tenth century rather than later.

Kirkdale (cat. and pl. 45). The Crucifix fills the head and most of the surviving shaft of the cross which has a head of type A10 or C10. One arm of the head is missing. Both head and shaft are outlined by a plain moulding broader on the head than on the shaft. The horizontal border below the crucifix survives. The panel below seems to be uncarved but so worn is the stone that it is not really possible to be certain even of this.

The stone is very badly weathered, which is very disappointing as it appears to have some very interesting features. What can be clearly discerned is the upper part of the figure of Christ, extended on the cross, his head filling the upper arm. He seem to have been nimbed, and the forked

beard is quite clear, but no details of the face now survive. One arm survives complete: it is rather short in relation to the size of the head and length of the trunk, but is as long as the available space on the cross arm. The hand is open, with the thumb extended, and two pellets fill the space formed by the angle between the thumb and the hand. Filling the space below the hand and lower arm is a simple figure of eight knot. The long narrow body (type 1) seems to be naked to the waist, with an incised circle representing the navel. Rather below waist level a broad band extends across the top of the shaft, wider than the body, but not filling the whole width, at least on the left, where three round pellets arranged vertically fill the gap between the band and the shaft border. Above this band, the narrow spaces on either side of the body are not left empty: on the right is what looks like the sponge, a round object reaching up to Christ's armpit on the end of a pole, which however has been made to curve to fit the space. On the left is a detail in relief which though pointed at the top is not so clearly the head of the spear, though this is what it may be.

It is with the broad band at the waist that the real difficulties of this scene begin. It is not at all clear what this represents, and nothing below the hand survives so as to be undisputable. Below the band the figure of Christ extends a little way, but there is no certain trace of his legs and feet. The lines and marks left on the shaft are partly due to weathering but do seem to suggest shapes of some complexity. One suggestion¹ has been that some of these lines reconstruct into a serpent coiled about the foot of the cross. Although this would be interesting if it were so, the case remains unproven (see below).

Other problems include the function of the broad band across the figure. The most likely possibility is that this is a crude representation of the

¹Made by J.T. Lang. A snake was also seen by Frank (1888, 143). Mr. Lang also believes that the figure is robed, but the very broad band at the waist still looks more like a loincloth to me.

bulky fold of the loincloth found in several late Crucifixions (Schiller 1972, pls. 384, 386). A second is that if the spear and sponge are represented above this binding, there are no traces of the bearers below, nor does there seem to be sufficient space for them. In some Irish crosses there are very small figures of the spear and sponge bearer tucked in close beside his body (pls. 53 ff.) but on none of the English examples which seem to show influence from Ireland do these figures appear. It is interesting however that both Kirkburton and Kirkdale have details suggestive of the elaborate waist folds of a loincloth, a detail which helps to confirm a tenth century date. Kirkdale may be something of a 'mixed-type', however. The figure of eight knot filling the space beneath his arms occurs on crosses which show Scandinavian/Irish influence (pl. 35), although at Kirkdale the shape of the cross head is a stubby development of an Anglian form. Such motifs are also found at Finghall and York I where there is otherwise no obvious connection with the Irish iconography of the Crucifixion discussed in chapter 7 (see part ii, above). On the whole, the layout as for Kirkburton and Dewsbury seems to be a late Anglian development of an existing Anglian iconography rather than the result of Irish influence. Hart II Durham (pl. 17) has a spear and sponge and it is difficult to see on that cross where figures representing the spear- and sponge-bearers could have fitted. A symbolic representation as on the cross from St. Mullins, Ireland cannot be ruled out in either case (see pl. 56).

The serpent suggestion is an interesting one. Clearly the space beneath the figure was elaborated in some way and either a serpent or interlace would reinforce the impression that models with an iconography of an ultimately Carolingian, rather than Irish, type, lie behind the development of the staff-crucifix. New models were being brought into Northumbria in, probably, the early tenth century, and these included later Metz school versions of Carolingian iconography with a distinctive long-stemmed cross as part of a scene, as well as symbolism such as the snake

(Alnmouth, chap. 10). The metalwork staff-crucifix or altar crucifix probably also had a late Carolingian or Ottonian origin (chap. 5). It is clear, however, that the development of the staff-crucifix in stone could have been influenced from a number of sources, including the local development of the stone cross with the crucifix head.

iv Fragments of crucifix heads

Stanwick II (cat. and pl. 116)

Unfortunately, since the shaft of this cross is complete and the surviving carving is in good condition, the Crucifixion survives only as a pair of turned-out feet appearing beneath what is plainly a wide pleated skirt. The skirt possibly links it with the worn head at Ellerburn, but there is no other indication which would show whether the Stanwick head followed by an Anglian, Irish/Scandinavian, or mixed tradition.

Kirby Hill II (cat. and pl. 117)

Here again a relatively unworn cross shaft has survived, although only one face is visible. The Crucifixion however is even more of an enigma than in the case of Stanwick II, since only the lower part of a pair of straight legs with turned out feet, resting on a suppedaneum represented as a simple, bar-like ledge, has survived. Since few cross shafts can be certainly associated with any of the crucifix heads, the subject matter of the shaft, as also at Stanwick, is not helpful. However, it may be noted that the Crucifixion appears here in association with Scandinavian mythological scenes (see Gosforth I, chap. 12).

Thornton Steward II (cat. and pl. 118)

Here the lower part of a cross head survives, springing from a fragment of the top of the shaft. The head was clearly a ringhead. As at Lancaster there is a possible Crucifixion or a Crucifixion/Resurrection on both faces, each represented only by the edge of a skirt and pair of legs with turned out feet. Collingwood believed a cross arm from this site represented the

the arm and enlarged hand of this figure Collingwood (1927a, fig. 129); but a search of the church failed to produce any such fragment. Even if this detail is accepted, however, little more can be said about the iconography of this cross head than was said for Stanwick II.

Kirklevington II (cat. and pl. 119)

This crudely incised cross head, a dishead of type B11 is equally unhelpful. All that survives is a pair of legs indicated by three incised lines, and an arm and hand, the lower edge of which is also part of the incised margin of the cross arm. The hand is held palm open with the thumb spread far apart. Possibly this crosshead could have been similar to Stanwick I, but mere crudity does not imply an iconographic parallel.

v York II, a destroyed hogback (cat. and pl. 120)

A carving on one end of a hogback can now be examined only in photographs, since it was destroyed on removal from the wall footings into which it had been built.

It shows an upright (type 1) figure with erect featureless head and bent arms extended from the shoulders. Above the figure's left is what appears to be a twisted loop, which may however repeat the pincer-like (or twisted ribbon-like) motif which appears to grip or enclose the figure's right arm. These 'pincers' are coming up from some broken, incomplete feature below from which also emerges a spear-like object which reaches the figure's right side just below its arm. A similar spear-like element is on the figure's left, but appears to extend from somewhere near the edge of the scene. Possibly this was Christ crucified with the spear- and sponge-bearers and with decorative motifs which seem to recall those cross heads of mixed tradition described in part ii above. The absence of the cross could link it to Gosforth I and II (chap. 12) and Bothal I (chap. 10) as a late feature dependent on the cross head tradition. I do not feel certain, however, that the spear-like features are indeed spears and not a decorative

termination of a strand. The figure might be comparable to the face opposite the Crucifixion at Brigham (Collingwood 1906-7, fig. 25). It would have been interesting to see the opposite end for if this sculpture is parallel to Gosforth II or Brigham it might have had a Crucifixion there opposed by a resurrected figure in the only face we can now examine.

vi Architectural Sculpture

A panel from Westow (pl. 181) seems to show an iconography which had developed in the tenth-eleventh centuries, but was almost certainly carved in the post-Conquest period. It is discussed in detail in Appendix B. No architectural fragment displaying the Crucifixion theme of certainly pre-Conquest date has survived from this area.

Conclusions

The iconography of the Crucifixion in Yorkshire in the latter half of the period shows clearly the mixture of influences under which sculptures worked. This is especially true if the evidence from chapter 7 is taken in conjunction with that put forward in this chapter. There are traces of an Anglian heritage in iconography and monument type in the crucifix head, but this seems to have become confused with a similar monument type with a different (robed) iconography from an Irish/Scandinavian source. On the other hand there is more evidence of innovation and originality than in the area north of the Tees, in the development of the staff crucifix which cannot really be proved for the crude carving of Bothal II (chap. 10 and pl. 89). There is, however, no certain trace of architectural sculpture of the Crucifixion from the pre-Conquest period but undoubtedly a great deal has been lost. The panel at Westow indicates a model of earlier date though it cannot be certain that the model was itself architectural or had arrived in Yorkshire before the end of the pre-Conquest period. (see Appendix B).

Staff-crucifixes such as Kirkburton however indicate new models and new influences which affected prestigious monuments, but which also seem to have influenced (and at quite a fast rate) the flatter, simpler iconography with an Irish background (chap. 7). It is difficult to know whether to speak of a revival or an ongoing Anglian tradition which had been only partly submerged for those works which show a mixed iconography and perhaps also attempt a modelled style, since new continental or southern English models, or any surviving Anglian sculptures with possibly earlier Carolingian links (cf. chap. 9) would have many features in common in both iconography and style.

C H A P T E R 1 2

THE ICONOGRAPHY OF CHRIST IN THE LOINCLOTH IN
A. THE NORTH WEST AND WEST MIDLANDS, AND
B. THE EAST MIDLANDS

A. The North West and West Midlands

i On the shafts of free-standing crosses

At Sandbach, Cheshire (cat. and pl. 121) the Crucifixion scene is high but not at the top of one broad face of the cross shaft. It is not now possible to say whether the scene was divided from the one above by a border, but there was no border between the Crucifixion and the Nativity scene below, which is fitted in beneath the stepped base of the cross. The layout of figural scenes and decorative motifs on this cross is distinctively different from that of any other cross considered so far (see below).

The cross of Christ is of the latin type (A1) with a stepped base and no soppedaneum, and extends the full width and height of the scene. The symbols of the sun and moon are set side by side on the upper arm of the cross. They are damaged, and it is not now possible to see whether they were represented as personifications. Christ, type 1, stands with his nimbed head erect and his arms outstretched rigidly. A slight thickening of the body about the hips suggests a loincloth. In the spaces above and below the cross arms are the symbols of the four evangelists. The figure in the top right is too damaged for identification, but the man symbol in the top left is clear, and the eagle at the bottom right. The lower left figure which has upstanding horns is probably the bull or ox. Except perhaps for the eagle all are half figures, apparently turned or half-turned to the cross. All carry books. The two below the cross are separated by arched dividers from the figures below, who stand one on either side of the stepped base. Both these figures are nimbed. Their feet point towards the cross, but their bodies are frontal and their heads face the spectator. The figure

on Christ's right carries a scroll in its right hand. Both wear robes which do not quite reach to the feet. The haloes suggest that these figures are John and Mary, but insufficient detail has survived to identify them individually. Possibly John rather than Mary stands on Christ's right, if this figure is indeed carrying a scroll.

This scene is clearly divided into three areas: an upper area with Christ on the cross, the Evangelist symbols, and the symbols of the sun and moon; a middle area with probably John and Mary at the foot of the cross; and an area beneath the cross with a Nativity scene closely related by being partly enclosed within the base of the cross. This is very like the layout of many Carolingian and later ivory book covers which are similarly disposed on a rectangular plan. Ferber (1966) discussed a group of ninth century ivories which clearly fell into three areas: an upper area with symbolic elements such as the Manus Dei, sun and moon, angels and evangelist symbols; a middle area with historical characters and sometimes personifications such as Ecclesia and Synagogue; and an area beneath the cross which could contain a variety of scenes, such as the Maries at the tomb, the dead arising from their tombs, and sometimes personifications such as Oceanus and Terra (Ferber 1966, 323). The Nativity is rarer in this position, but it is an obvious theme to link with the Crucifixion in an abbreviated schema. It is found beneath the Crucifixion, for example, on a mid-eleventh century book cover of the Abbess Theophano, now in Essen cathedral (Thoby 1959, pl. XXVI, no. 59). In this example the crib is shown between two kneeling animals as at Sandbach, a formula which goes back to the fourth century at least (Schiller 1971, pl. 143). More interestingly, a ninth century ivory with Crucifixion and Nativity (though not in the same relationship) has a similar iconography to the Sandbach Nativity, with an angel above and behind the manger, and an animal on either side (pl. 122; Goldschmidt 1914, 15 and pl. X, no. 18). The rest of the scene is missing at Sandbach. It is certainly

possible that a cycle of the life of Christ influenced the design of this face of the Sandbach cross. It could be that an ivory book cover with this scene at the foot of the cross was adapted by the Sandbach carver for his rectangular design area.

The figure of Christ has no distinctive feature which could not have been present from the eighth century (chap. 9). The only unusual feature of the cross is its stepped base. This has been adapted by the carver to accommodate the scene below, but it may have been an element in the original model. The cross with the stepped base is found for example in the late ninth century Psalter of Louis the German, f.58 now in Berlin (Boinet 1913, Pl. CLXB).

The sun and moon placed side by side in the upper arm of the cross shaft again may be a space saving adaptation on the part of the carver, but could also be inspired by a similar practice found occasionally in ivories of the Crucifixion of late ninth-early tenth century date, where it was presumably adopted because the upper area of the scene had become crowded with symbolic elements. They are found for example one above the other on two ninth-tenth century ivories in the Victoria and Albert Museum, London (Goldschmidt 1914, 47-9, pls. XXXVI, no. 85 and XXXVII, no. 88); and side by side on an ivory in Paris of the same date, in a scene which also has the four evangelists and their symbols crowded into the space above the cross (Goldschmidt 1914, pl. XXXV, no. 83). In all these ivories the sun and moon are personified, but the Sandbach carving is too worn for such detail to have survived.

The symbols of the evangelists are known to have appeared with a Crucifixion scene only from the ninth century, when they appeared as part of the expanded Carolingian Crucifixion image, though they had appeared in the previous century in combination with the Lamb (chap. 3). At Sandbach in spite of some damage the symbols seem to be in the order:

man (Matthew)

lion (Mark)

ox (Luke)

eagle (John)

and therefore to follow the order of the Gospels and the western tradition established by St. Jerome. They appear as half figures (of a frontal man and side turned beasts) in the arches above human figures of the evangelists in an ivory already noted as sharing with Sandbach a Nativity with angels and beasts (pl. 122). They could appear around the cross in scenes with the Lamb as for example on a tenth century ivory in Munich where they are set at the ends of the cross arms (Goldschmidt 1914, pl. XXIII, no. 56). The symbols placed around a Crucifixion cross, however, seems to have been an English fashion. On one English ivory of the tenth-eleventh centuries, the Evangelist symbols represented as half figures (but not in the same order as at Sandbach) are set in medallions enclosed between the arms of the cross (Beckwith 1972, pl. 68). Another ivory ascribed to the same period shows half figures carrying books and framed by the cross arms in the same way as at Sandbach (Beckwith 1972, pl. 74).

It is unusual but not unknown for John to stand on Christ's right even when there is no attempt to associate the figures of John and Mary with those of Adam and Eve, as in some sculptures discussed in chapter 2. In an ivory already mentioned as having the sun and moon in the upper arm and the evangelists and their symbols, for example, John and Mary are both together on Christ's right (Goldschmidt 1914, pl. XXXV, no. 83). On the other hand, these two figures were quite frequently represented in identical postures, as part of a symmetrical composition, so perhaps confusion could have arisen because of this. In the ninth century ivory with the Nativity, it is only the head dress of Mary which really distinguishes her from John: both raise veiled hands to the cross (pl. 122). Mary and John both holding books became quite a common theme in the eleventh century (see Stejney, chap. 13) but possibly this iconography had developed somewhat earlier. However, the identification of these figures can only be tentative in their present condition.

It seems fairly clear that the layout, combination of elements, and their

iconography, all suggest that the sculptor had as a model an expanded Crucifixion image, perhaps an ivory carving, in a tradition which became established in the ninth century. This provides only a terminus post quem for the cross, however. It is also clear that the closest surviving parallels within this western tradition are ninth-tenth century and even later rather than earlier.

Kendrick (1938, 205-8) saw a wide variety of influences which operated to produce this cross and its companion from the same site (Kendrick 1938, pl. XCIV). He saw a southern influence in the lozenge shaped compartments which he compares with the Wolverhampton pillar, though he noted the strung out arrangement of these elements at Sandbach as a very different treatment. The vine scroll he saw as a continuing Northumbrian-Mercian tradition, and compared Ilkley for the combination of interlace and vine scroll in the same run (Kendrick 1938, pl. 89). The interlace border he also saw as a northern and perhaps Northumbrian detail, comparing with it the cross from Irton in Cumberland and a cross from Thornhill in Dumfriesshire (Kendrick 1938, pls. XCII, 2 and XCIII, 4). In the style of figure carving, which he described as calligraphic and in the crowded scenes, he suggested that perhaps the cross had been influenced by Irish manuscript styles, and perhaps was in a shadowy area between Irish and Hiberno-Saxon.

The last suggestion seems the most fruitful, for a connection with such monuments as the Wolverhampton pillar seem very tenuous even though the cross and its companion have been seen as forms of 'round shaft derivative' by other writers as well as Kendrick (Radford 1957, 5). In some ways the two crosses seem to belong to the same milieu as the Book of Kells which also shows a fondness for compartments of decoration even on quite simple pages such as ff. 31r; 183r; 187v; and 188r. It also has compartmentalised figures and groups of figures within a scene as on ff. 202v and 290v. The rich all over surface decoration of Sandbach with its multiplicity of decorative motifs could imply a manuscript background and works such as Kells which has added

vine scroll to a more Insular repertoire could have provided the inspiration. The panelled decoration of Irish metalwork could lie behind manuscripts such as Kells, however. Whatever the ultimate source of this approach to design, several of Francoise Henry's 'Northern' groups of sandstone crosses of the ninth-tenth centuries are interesting since they too seem to depend on the same manuscript/metalwork tradition (Henry 1967, 136). A cross at Donaghmore (Tyrone) for example, has on its sides a system of decoration laid out in lozenges and circles; and fragments at Armagh and Tynan Abbey preserve traces of the same layout (Henry 1932, pls. 69 and 96, figs. 2, 4 and 6).

It seems probable, therefore, that the Sandbach cross belongs to an 'overlap' period in which sculptors were still receptive to Anglian traditions but in which there was influence from Ireland (and apparently from north-eastern Ireland). It is unlikely that this influence made itself felt before the end of the ninth century or the early tenth, and this period is suggested too by the continental and Southern English parallels for the Crucifixion/Nativity which are dependent neither on Irish models nor on any surviving earlier Anglian iconography (see chap. 9). Later sculpture in this area shows more markedly Scandinavian influence (Bu'lock 1953) so that the late ninth, early tenth century seems the most likely period for the eclecticism shown by the sculptor/designer of this unusual cross.

Penrith, Cumberland (cat. and pls. 123-4)

Bailey (1974, 151-4) makes a strong case for the form of the Penrith cross (The 'Giant's Thumb') as a 'round shaft derivative', that is a cross on which a round shaft system of decoration has been adapted to a cross of rectangular shape. The round shaft form has an Anglian origin (see Reculver chap. 9 and Bailey 1974, 138-44) but most of the 'round shaft derivatives' are of tenth-eleventh century date and derive their ornament from the round shafts of the Viking period rather than the earlier Anglian examples (Bailey 1974, 151). Specifically at Penrith, the 'Giant's Thumb' could be

an adaptation from a local monument such as the western shaft of the 'Giant's Grave' in the same churchyard (Bailey 1974, 153-4). On these grounds and on other aspects of the decoration, a date after the ninth century seems most probable for this monument.

Interestingly the Crucifixion at Penrith is balanced on the opposite face by a figure within an arched, cable-moulded frame. Bailey (1974, 156-7) considers this to be most likely the detached Viking period type of frame found in the north-west at Arlecdon, Burton in Kendal, and Halton as well as on Gosforth I (below and pl. 125). The arched panel, however, can also be seen as a survival of an Anglian tradition as found at Auckland St. Andrew and Bradbourne (pls. 33-4, 78-9). Collingwood (1920, 54-5) considered that the figure within the frame could be a portrait of the deceased, but it could have been a Christ Majesty, also suggested as a possibility by Bailey (1974, 156). These were clearly the only two figural scenes and a reduced schema (and especially this combination of themes) seems to have been popular in late pre-Conquest sculpture: it could be compared with Lancaster II (chap. 7); York I (chap. 11); Harmston, Lincs; and Gosforth II (below); and Newent, Gloucestershire (chap. 13).

The Penrith cross has been said to represent an iconography of the Crucifixion in which Christ appears flanked by the spear- and sponge-bearers. It was drawn by Collingwood (1927, fig. 162) as an unpanelled scene about midway up one broad face of the shaft (pl. 124). A long necked figure of Christ is portrayed extended rigidly (type 1) on a cross which is invisible except beneath Christ's turned out feet. On the right of Christ's head is a disc, the sun, and on his left a crescent moon. The figures on either side below seem to represent the spear- and sponge-bearers, though they are not clearly differentiated. The cross was clearly already in poor condition when Collingwood saw it, as he explains in detail how he reconstructed the interlace from holes and marks in the stone (Collingwood 1920). He nowhere says the Crucifixion scene was difficult to make out but earlier commentators make no mention of a scene which is usually easily identifiable if it is

visible (see bibliography, cat.). The modern observer is dependent on the light being suitable for any trace to become visible, but on several visits I was able to make out only the crescent moon with any degree of certainty. Bailey (1974, 157) who has studied the cross over a much longer period, was however convinced of the presence of the three main figures, though not of any distinguishing features, and that the sun and moon were as Collingwood drew them.

The dress of Christ is uncertain. The robed iconography of the later Irish type was known in the north west, though in none of the examples from this area does it occur with the spear- and sponge-bearers (see Kirkcolm, Brigham, Lancaster II, chap. 7 and pls. 40, 49-52). The sun and moon, though they could appear in the form of disc and crescent with the robed type in examples surviving from the continent (see for example the Rabula Gospels pl. 16) are not known in association with any surviving example of the robed type in Hiberno-Saxon or later Irish art (see chaps. 6 and 7 and pls. 25-59; and the discussion of the sun and moon at Aycliffe and Durham chap. 10). Neither is there any evidence from Collingwood's drawing that the spear- and sponge-bearers adopted the crouching posture common in Irish sculptured depictions (see pl. 124).

The disc sun and crescent moon were however popular in the late pre-Conquest period in the North East of England, where they are found as a head and crescent in association with the Crucifixion on the late Anglian cross heads from the Chapter House, Durham (see pl. 91 and chap. 10) and in association with a related theme on a grave slab from Lindisfarne, Northumberland (chap. 2 and pl. 8). These could then be, at Penrith, a trace of a period fashion, or a conventional simplification of a theme already known in the west on Anglian monuments such as Bradbourne II (pl. 79).

The total iconography of the Penrith scene must remain enigmatic, but on balance it seems probable that it was based on a group with Christ type 1

(and possibly in the loincloth); spear- and sponge-bearers; and sun and moon, already well established in the east and west of northern England by the end of the ninth century (chap. 9). There is no trace of any feature new in the Viking age, or which suggests influence from Irish sculpture of the ninth century or later.

Gosforth I, Cumberland (cat. and pl. 125)

All other scenes on this cross are drawn from pagan Scandinavian mythology. There has been considerable argument as to the significance of some of the scenes, their relationship with each other, and in particular their relationship to the Crucifixion scene. At one extreme, Kendrick (1949, 68-9) thought that the 'copious assembly of ornaments' could only be brought into relation with each other as a sequence of events from the Norse Edda with some considerable exercise of the imagination, and that:

the crucifixion in a panel with Longinus and Stephaton (sic) in the space below it ... has no special prominence as a Christian theme but is simply one of many equally important elements.

However, modern opinion inclines to the view that a coherent programme was intended, and that the problem is one of interpretation for modern observers. Berg (1958) and more recently Bailey (1974, 316-35) have summarised the main interpretations to date, and in their own interpretations both see the Crucifixion as a focal point.

The scene is the lowest on the figure carved portion of the east face. Within the cabled borders of the shaft, an inner rectangular cabled frame encloses a type 1 figure with horizontally outstretched arms, erect head and turned out feet. The hands overlap the border. He wears a loincloth, girdled or folded at the waist, and drooping at each side. The figure is unlimbed and there is no cross. Below the panel, to the left, is a figure with a belted tunic, facing centre. His tunic dips at the back and front. He holds up a spear in front of him which enters the panel behind the frame and reaches at least to the drooping edge of the dress of the crucified figure.

At this point it becomes unclear whether the spear continues to the figure's side, or meets with a stream of blood from the side, as suggested by Bailey (1974, 317). Below the panel on the right is a centre facing figure with a long robe which dips slightly at the front and trails behind. It has long plaited hair falling to below waist level, and holds out some object or vessel towards the spear-bearer and below Christ's feet.

Below these two figures is a thick interlacing strand terminating in two snake heads, one of which is devouring the other.

Not all earlier writers have accepted this as a Crucifixion scene. Calverley (1883a), for example, offered two alternative interpretations, both based on Scandinavian mythology. One was that the crucified figure was Baldr, the figure on the left the blind Hodr who killed him unwittingly, and the figure on the right Baldr's wife, Nanna. The second was that the crucified figure was Odin hanging on the World Tree, and the figure on his right was Odin's wife, Freya. Calverley, however, saw a parallel between the pagan myths and the Christian story, and these interpretations are set within his conviction that the overall meaning of the monument is a Christian one. Bailey (1974, 330) has pointed out with reference to other scenes, the difficulty of equating a Viking age carving in Cumbria with literary accounts surviving from a later period in Iceland. There is however no obvious symbol of Odin, the figure on the left is clearly carrying a spear, and this together with the disposition of attendant figures in relation to a crucified figure, and even the snake, suggests that the Crucifixion interpretation is the right one, and that any reference to the pagan myths must be an irrecoverably allusive one (but see Bailey 1974, 330 and below).

In form the monument is a round shafted cross but it is, as Bailey (1974, 316) says, unique in its size and slender proportions and in the method of marking the junction between the round and square sections. The cross head too is unusual for round shafts in being a ring head and in being ornamented in a highly individualistic way (Bailey 1974, 316 and fig. 33).

Bailey (1974,322) has shown, too, that the Crucifixion scene has no parallels in Ireland though this has been suggested (Wilson and Klindt-Jensen 1966, 106). This factor (and indeed the inventive development of the round shaft form) suggest that it might be better to look at Anglian and continental traditions in the iconography of the Crucifixion, rather than to Ireland. Even the position of the scene, at the foot of the carved face, is as we have seen an established Anglian tradition with a longer history in England than in Ireland (chaps. 6, 9, 10). The absence of the cross has been noted on Bothal I and possibly on Bothal II (chap. 10 and pls. 88-9). A possible explanation of this occasional phenomenon on English sculpture (see also Gosforth II, below) is the influence of the crucifix head (and especially those in which the figure of Christ is not made to fit the cross such as Brompton, pl. 36; or Great Ayton, pl. 99). I have noted that the cross head is 'invisible' as the cross even to some modern observers.

The detached cabled frame we saw was a feature of north-western Viking age sculpture (above, Penrith, and Bailey 1974, 156-7) in which, however, it also looks like a break down or reflection of the panelled Anglian style.

More interesting is the elongated layout of the scene. I have already noted two adaptations by Anglian carvers of models with such a layout, an appropriate choice for the long narrow space afforded by a cross shaft: these are at Alnmouth in Northumberland (chap. 10 and pl. 84) and at Sandbach, Cheshire (above and pl. 121). The layout at Gosforth is very close to the Alnmouth 'Metz' type of layout, with the spear-bearer placed low in relation to the figure of Christ.

The figure on the right below is more enigmatic, in that it is difficult to identify unarguably with any of the historical or symbolic figures who could attend on the cross. This is partly because the iconography of this figure has clearly been adapted from a type of female figure found in

Scandinavian contexts such as some metal work figures from Swedish sites such as Birka (Bailey 1974, 322; Wilson and Klindt Jensen 1966, pl. XXIV). It has been suggested that similar figures on picture stones from Gotland represent women welcoming the souls of men slain in battle to Valhalla; and in a Christian context one of these may have been seen as echoed allusively by an object-carrying female figure from the Christian Crucifixion tradition (Bailey 1974, 321, fn. 5). The figure could be Mary Magdalene, as Bailey suggests, based on his conviction that the object carried by the figure is a bulbous based alabastron. The form of the object seems borne out by early drawings and rubbings (see for example Collingwood and Parker 1917, fig. 5). Bailey (1974, 320-1) has pointed out the attractiveness of the Mary Magdalene interpretation since early medieval commentators such as Bede regarded her as the type of the individual believer, the Church itself, or the converted heathen, the latter significance being especially appropriate to a cross which was clearly concerned both with paganism and Christianity.

Certainly this is more attractive than the suggestion made by Berg (1958, 30-1) that this figure represents Ecclesia with her chalice since she is on the wrong side for catching the blood (which may actually be represented pouring from Christ's side). The selection and positioning of a vessel carrying female figure however, may owe something to the presence of the women at the Tomb in the lowest register of ivory panels depicting the Crucifixion. In some versions of this scene all three women are shown carrying vessels with a bulbous body and a narrow neck, as for example on an ivory of the late ninth century in Munich (Goldschmidt 1914, pl. XXI, no. 44). This and numerous similar scenes provide a ready made source from which the carver could have made his selection, leaving all elements - Christ, spear-bearer, Magdalene and snake, in the same relative positions.

The theme of the women going to attend the dead Christ affords a direct parallel with the Scandinavian female attendant theme, more so than the

story in which Mary of Bethany (traditionally identified as Mary Magdalene) annointed the feet of the living Christ with oil (John XII, 3). Mary Magdalene appears in all four Gospels as one of the women who went to the grave (in some versions carrying oils and spices) and in St. John's Gospel she is the only one who went (Matthew XXVIII, 1; Mark XV, 47; Luke XXIV, 10; John XX, 1).

The snake beneath the cross belongs to the world of the Anglian and Carolingian artist: positioned as it is like the snake that coils around the shaft of the cross. Again, however, it has been translated into the carver's own repertoire of animal ornament.

It is difficult to say whether such a model incorporating a variety of figures and a 'tall cross' layout would have been available to the carver in the form of an ivory book cover or already adapted on a cross of ninth - tenth century date: what does seem clear is that the carver was looking to an Anglian/Carolingian tradition rather than to an Irish/Scandinavian one in his development of this unusual scene, even though his possibly allusive use of a Scandinavian female figure type and the decoration of the rest of the cross shows an intimate knowledge of native Scandinavian traditions.

Bailey (1974, 331-5) has shown that on a variety of grounds a date in the first half of the tenth century is to be preferred for this monument and some others at the same site. Such a date places it in roughly the same period in which the cross shaft at Alnmouth is presumed to have been carved, and not much after the date suggested for Sandbach. It seems therefore in some measure to share in an iconography fashionable in northern England at this period even though in most of its themes and motifs it has broken away completely from the pre-Viking Anglian pattern.

ii On a grave marker

Gosforth II, Cumberland (cat. and pls. 126-7)

This house shaped tomb was shown by Bailey (1974, 347) to share many details of its technique; its zoomorphic and interlace ornament; and its figural style with other sculptures at Gosforth including Gosforth I. It is likely therefore to share with Gosforth I its tenth century date. This dating is consistent with the date of other hogbacks in the north west, with which it also has links though in some respects it is unique (Bailey 1974, I, 343-4, 350).

Both gable ends of this stone have figure carving, but there is some difficulty in interpreting the end drawn by Collingwood (1927a, fig. 212) as a Crucifixion scene (pl. 127). This is the west end of the stone as it now stands in the church. This was drawn by Collingwood as a crucified figure without a cross and with the loincloth oddly drawn as a band around the hips. On his right is a figure facing centre and holding what appears to be a drawn sword. Bailey (1974, 348) accepted the crucified figure but was not convinced by the presence of this second figure. He pointed out the difficulty of interpreting this end of the stone, where in some lights there appear to be figures on both sides of Christ. My own view is that the main figure does not have outstretched arms but appears to have its right arm raised and its left akimbo, in which case it is more likely to be the risen or resurrected Christ as on the face opposite the Crucifixion at Harmston, Lincs. (below) and also as possibly at Penrith (above). (Compare also York I, chap. 11; and Newent, Gloucestershire, chap. 13).

On the east end of the tomb there clearly is a crucified figure (pl. 126), represented beneath a double outlined arch, perhaps a nimbus, but also reminiscent of the cruder ways of suggesting an arched panel, as on Bothal I (chap. 10 and pl. 88). Above this arch the gable is worn, but was probably filled by a triquetra as on the opposite end. Christ is a type 1 figure, with horizontally outstretched arms. His loincloth has not

such a marked dip at the sides as on the main cross, but in general type and in the absence of the cross it is clearly akin. There are no accompanying figures, however, and there is no certain trace of any detail beneath Christ's feet or at his side. A combination of crucified and risen Christ seems suitable for a funerary monument.

iii On a ?Staff Crucifix

Lancaster III, Lancs. (cat. and pl. 128).

This fragment ought perhaps to be regarded as ungroupable. It is an extremely crude carving, and it is difficult to know whether the type 1 Christ figure, which is slightly off centre, was completed within the shaft (cf. St. Peter martyrdom, Aycliffe, pl. 86) or extended into the head of what must in any case have been a small cross. The scene occupies all that is left of one face of the monument within an outer cabled and inner rolled border. It is not clear whether Christ is dressed in an abbreviated loincloth or naked, though that would be extremely unusual (cf. Conisholme, chap. 7 and pl. 37). On the left is a small figure carrying a spear, the head of which can just be seen below the break. Without this figure the scene would have been difficult to identify at all. There is some trace of a very debased Anglian tradition in the mouldings on this cross, but most of the motifs on the other faces can be compared with work on monuments of the Viking period, though they too are very debased. A pair of figures on the opposite face who have sometimes been (wrongly) identified with attendants at the Crucifixion, may in fact have Irish connections (Appendix A). It seems best to put this cross very late, perhaps in the early eleventh century because it seems to represent the breakdown of a tradition, but it is unlikely on any grounds to be earlier than the tenth century.

Conclusions to part A

Few conclusions can be drawn from the few remains in the North West and West Midlands. Irish/Scandinavian influence on the development of the Crucifixion has already been shown in the area (chap. 7) though the evidence is less clear than for Yorkshire. The remains discussed in this chapter have suggested a continuing reliance on an existing Anglian tradition, and perhaps even some awareness of the later models from western Carolingian art which affected the more determinedly Anglian area north of the Tees. As in Yorkshire there was a mixing of traditions, but this can be seen in the adoption of new decorative motifs and in some monument forms such as the hogback and the ring head, more clearly than in the adoption of a new iconography of the Crucifixion. One sign that this picture may be incomplete, however, is the Crucifixion on Gosforth I, even though this monument is in many ways exceptional and in some unique. This scene seems a remarkably concise adaptation of an ultimately Carolingian formula, apparently used to make an intellectual statement about the significance of the event, in a manner which recalls the discussion of monuments such as Ruthwell and Rothbury in the pre-Viking period (chap. 9) and the Durham crossheads of a later date (chap. 10). Different in style and in the nature of its intellectual concern though Gosforth I is from all these it is clearly also like them the work of a conscious artist/designer, and perhaps an indication of a wealthy and discriminating (though possibly not ecclesiastical) patron. It is very important for its demonstration of one level at which a sculptor could work in the tenth century. It should be contrasted with Lancaster III where the presence of the spear-bearer only may indicate that the Gosforth pattern had some influence, but may equally be the result only of a clumsy adaptation of a standardised theme by a craftsman with a poor technique working in a much humbler milieu.

B. The East Midlands

i On the shafts of free standing crosses

Nassington, Northants. (cat. and pls. 129-31)

This interesting cross has one figure panelled face, on which parts of two panels survive (pl. 129). The upper panel now has the lower part of a frontal figure in a short full skirted dress. There is insufficient evidence for its identification. Below, the panel is quartered by an angular cross of type B6. There is no moulding on the lower edge, and the panel is clearly incomplete, but it is uncertain how much is missing. The figure of Christ which has been deliberately defaced is of type 1, with an erect and probably frontal head and short bent arms. His dress is short, most probably a loincloth. Above the cross arms the sun and moon are represented as relief carvings enclosed within a slightly dished circle. That on the right may have been only a frontal face, that on the left could have had a veiled arm held to the face or some other feature such as a torch or a scroll which has impinged on the disc. It is uncertain, however, which is the sun and which the moon. Below each arm is a figure described by Taylor, H.M. and Taylor, J. (1965, 455) as too worn for identification. They are however quite clearly, as Allen (1887-8) saw, the spear- and sponge-bearers, here represented as frontal half figures (if the panel is substantially complete) with their heads turned towards the cross. The spear-bearer is on Christ's left and holds his spear in his right hand and over his right shoulder. It is not clear whether the companion figure holds up a sponge or a vessel. These figures have also been partially defaced.

The cross type in this scene is found in several late sculptures of the Crucifixion from this area, most clearly at Marton, but also in a less marked form at Ropsley and Harmston, all Lincolnshire (see below). It is also a feature of some tenth-eleventh century ivories (Beckwith 1972, pls. 70, 73). The sun and moon place it in the Carolingian tradition, especially since they were certainly personified, but this in itself only provides a

terminus post quem in the mid-ninth century. The figure of Christ is undatable except within very broad limits, or by its context. The most unusual feature of this scene is however the iconography of the attendant figures. These were sometimes shown as static frontal figures, as on a ninth-tenth century ivory box in Brunswick (Goldschmidt 1914, pl. XLIV, no. 966) where however their heads turn away towards the attendant mourning figures on either side. Almost as static as on the cross are these two figures as they appear on an ivory panel of c.900 in Cividale (Goldschmidt 1914, pl. LXXVIII, no. 166). The spear- and sponge-bearers shouldering their implements like a pair of guards seem, however, very unusual, though a crude stone carving on the facade of St. Mesme (Chinon), of the tenth century, has a frontal, half-crouching spear-bearer who holds his spear over his shoulder in the same way (Thoby 1959, pl. XL, no. 89). The pose could be an adaptation of the static frontal figure holding the spear or sponge upright between himself and the cross, an iconography familiar in depictions from the ninth century (Goldschmidt 1914, pl. XXXVI, no. 85).

Possibly the static pose at Nassington is a result of the confined space available, which has robbed the figures, at the scale at which they have been drawn, of any possibility of movement.

The other faces of the cross show, on the opposite broad face three complete registers of an interlace pattern formed into a ring-knot incorporating a loose ring in the lowest register (pl. 130). The side to the right of the Crucifixion face has a pattern of elaborate twists, not the simple figure of eight which became the substitute for true interlace in much Midland work of the late pre-Conquest period (pl. 131). The face to the left has a continuous vine scroll with berry bunches and stem bindings. The layout and composition of the shaft are reminiscent of early Anglian work, such as Hexham II, in that it has one figure carved face and the sides are carved with continuous patterns, but suggests a later date in its use of developed forms of interlace pattern. Adcock has shown that the

ring-knot (encircled pattern C) had developed in late ninth century work at Norham, Northumberland, where it appears on two fragments, and on a related cross from Kirk of Morham in a Pictish area much influenced by Northumbrian work (Adcock 1974, 196 and pl. 73). The cross at Nassington could possibly date from the end of the ninth century, but is perhaps of the early tenth century.

Harmston, Lincs. (cat. and pls. 132-4)

The Crucifixion is set on one broad face and near the top of a fragment of shaft which could be incomplete at both top and bottom. Both broad faces are decorated with twist patterns laid out in two vertical rows. The sides are ornamented with simple zig zag (pl. 133). The angles of the shaft have a heavy cable moulding, that on the right of the Crucifixion having been cut away. On the opposite broad face is an oval recess near the top containing a now headless figure swathed in long robes and with one arm raised, the other akimbo (pl. 134 and see Gosforth II, above). The risen Christ or Christ in Glory seems likely, and the oval panel increases the possibility with its suggestion of a mandorla.

The Crucifixion is inserted rather than panelled into the twist pattern which breaks off without terminating the design above and below (pl. 132). The narrower patterns above on either side of the upper arm of the cross suggest that this insertion was part of the original design. The shaping of the field around the cross is reminiscent of the cut back frame around Bothal I (pl. 88). Below the cross arms, however, the Harmston scene is enclosed within a narrow moulding. The cross is possibly meant to be a latin cross (A1) but the arms are very slightly expanded (B6). It stands on a square base decorated with a 'St. Andrew's' cross in relief. The upper arm has a fine double roll moulding. Christ is a type 1 figure, with head erect but possibly turned slightly to the right, and arms straight but rising slightly from the shoulder. His loincloth is indicated by

diagonal incised lines. Above his head is a crude and worn representation of the Manus Dei. Below the cross on Christ's right is a frontal figure in a long robe indicated by incised diagonal lines. It has no trace of any arms. On his left a figure seems to turn towards the cross and has arms reaching towards it, but this figure is more battered and its dress has diagonal folds above and vertical folds below. Possibly some over dress is meant. Neither figure is nimbed, but they are most likely to be John and Mary, with possibly Mary in this case on Christ's left, although they are really too crude for individual identification.

There is little diagnostic about this simple carving but the decoration of the cross with its simple angular twists and zig zag makes a late and possibly even a post conquest date most likely. The hand of God does not limit the iconography to the pre-Conquest period (chap. 13 and see also Westow, II, Appendix B).

ii Architectural sculpture

Ropsley, Lincs. (cat. and pls. 135-6)

This very worn sculpture is carved on a walling stone in situ in the fabric of a late pre-Conquest church (Taylor, H.M. and Taylor, J. 1966, 51). Christ type 1 has horizontally extended arms and an erect upright head. He is shown on a cross with slightly expanded arms as at Harmston (B6). No further details are distinguishable but the dress was short and the legs and turned out feet were clearly separated. The figure is too worn and too simple to show any interesting feature. It could have been carved at almost any date, and can only be dated by its context, which seems to be late pre-Conquest (Taylor, H.M. and Taylor, J. 1965⁷⁸/₂ 522).

Marston, Lincs. (cat. and pl. 137)

This fragment seems to be a panel without a border, and though worn it is apparently complete. Christ is shown on a cross with expanded arms (B6) and a sunken outline which quarters the panel. Christ is of type 2, with

the hips sagging to the right but the legs straight and the feet, with clearly differentiated toes, placed side by side on a suppedaneum, a sloping projection at the foot of the cross. His head is turned to the right, but no hair or features are distinguishable: there does not appear to have been a nimbus. His arms are bent but the hands are straight with the thumb folded into the palm. He is dressed in a loincloth which droops on his left.

The cross was clearly a common Midlands type for the Crucifixion (see Nassington, Harmston and Ropsley, above) though none of the tenth-eleventh century English ivories with this or a similar cross has a provenance which indicates an East Midlands origin. (Beckwith 1972, nos. 32, 35, 36). The pose of Christ (type 2) could be found from the ninth century in the west (chap. 9) but is more likely to be late tenth or early eleventh century to allow for the influences of later Carolingian art and iconography on southern English art of the tenth century (see chap. 13).

Great Glen, Leics. (cat. and pl. 138)

This sculpture is very defaced. It is most probably an unframed panel as at Marton, but it could just possibly be a fragment of a cross shaft. The cross is of the plain latin form (A1) which can be seen most clearly below Christ's arms where its outline is deeply grooved. The figure of Christ appears to be turned slightly to the right, type 2. It is possible that his head was turned to the right. No features of head or dress have survived, but the loincloth is most likely. It is possible but not certain that no other figures or elements were represented.

In spite of the difference in cross type from that at Marton (pl. 137) this fragment could show that the iconography of the type 2 figure was as widespread in the East Midlands as in the south, if it dates to about the same period. There is, however, nothing which precludes a post-Conquest date for this piece, though also nothing which would suggest one.

Conclusions to Part B

In spite of the paucity of material from the East Midlands, the remains (taken together with those discussed in chapter 7) show a wider variety of influences than those from Yorkshire and the North East or the North West in the later period. The fragment from Conisholme and possibly the panel at Barton on Humber; and the cross shaft tradition of Harmston and Nassington show the same mixture as areas such as Yorkshire, with an early Anglian tradition in iconography and monument types perhaps continuing alongside an iconography and monument types introduced as a result of Viking settlement. This would not be surprising in an area which was under Scandinavian control in the late ninth and tenth centuries (Hunter Blair 1977, maps. 5 and 6). On the other hand the greater proportion of architectural sculpture (especially if Walkern is included as on the southern limit of this area, chap. 8) and the evidence for the iconography of the dead Christ (type 2), strongly suggests that this area was also influenced by developments which took place in the ninth to the eleventh centuries in the western church in general. Possibly such new influences were received independently, from continental sources, or they could have come from the south, politically and culturally dominant in the late pre-Conquest period under both English and Scandinavian kings. The iconography of the Crucifixion in southern England is the subject of the next chapter.

CHAPTER 13

THE ICONOGRAPHY OF CHRIST IN THE LOINCLOTH IN
SOUTHERN ENGLAND FROM THE LATE NINTH TO THE ELEVENTH CENTURIES

i. On a grave marker

Newent, Gloucs. (cat. and pl. 139).

The name stone from Newent is the only surviving certainly non-architectural sculpture south of Northamptonshire to exhibit the figure of Christ crucified. This alone makes it unique. Again, unlike the early grave markers from Northumbria also called name or pillow stones, there can be no doubt but that it was intended to be buried in a grave¹. Its small size, its perfect condition, alike attest that it was as its discoverers reported found in situ in a grave (Condor et. al. 1911-2, 323-6). Finally, although it is the smallest carving discussed in this thesis, it has the most elaborate and crowded iconography of the Crucifixion of any pre-Conquest sculptured monument, or indeed in the depiction of this theme in any medium by an Anglo-Saxon artist.

The name EDRED occurs twice on the stone, once on an edge and again on the face opposite the Crucifixion. It seems fairly clear that 'Edred' was the person commemorated and its unique iconography and its association with a burial suggest it was a very personal monument.

The stone must therefore be considered as a unity. On the opposite face (Okasha 1971, pl. 94a) a large figure in priestly garments and with a cross on his breast holds a crozier in his right hand and in his left a staff cross with a ring head. He tramples a human figure beneath his feet. Above on his left another figure veils his face, while below two smaller figures fall head first. On the right below is a figure holding up a large sword and above two figures possibly ascending. Finally, in the top right corner is a figure disposed horizontally. This scene almost certainly represents Christ and the Harrowing of Hell (see Schiller 1971, pl. 156;

¹For a summary of the arguments about the position of the Hartlepool grave markers, see Brown^{G.H.} (1921, 58-101).

ibid. 1972, pl. 379).

The narrow edges have the names of all four evangelists: in this position it would seem that they stand as witnesses to both the Harrowing of Hell and the Crucifixion scene.

The Crucifixion face (pl. 139) is almost quartered by an angular cross of type B6. It is edged by a fine roll moulding. Christ is shown as a huge figure, dwarfing the rest. He is of the erect type 1 with his feet turned out on a projecting suppedaneum. His arms are bent with straight hands, the thumb parallel with the fingers. His head is inclined to his right though probably not turned and is surrounded by a nimbus in the form of a fine roll moulding. He wears a straight narrow loincloth from waist to knee. In the upper arm of the cross are two raised circles, possibly the sun and moon though there are two similar circles in the shaft below. Above these rings are two affronted birds, with between them, descending palm outwards from the upper edge of the cross, a Manus Dei. In the side arms figures are shown flying around Christ's hands: one above and one below each of his arms. The two on the left are certainly winged. The two below the arms both carry some object, on the left a rod with a three pronged end and on the right a circle. It is probable that these figures are attendant angels carrying instruments of the Passion, as on the Rothbury head (chap. 9). The circle would be the crown of thorns. Possibly the three pronged rod represents the rods or whip from the scourging of Christ: the crown of thorns also derives from scourging and mocking scenes (Schiller 1972, pls. 225-8 and 237-40).

In the shaft of the cross there is a raised circle on either side of Christ. It is difficult to see these as any more than space fillers. Below are two small figures who stand in attitudes associated with the sorrowing John and Mary. The figure on the left wears a long dress. That on the right has a shorter garment and holds its head in a gesture of grief

with its right hand. Its left is held over its body, with over it a fold of material. It seems likely therefore that it is Mary on the left (Christ's right) and John on the right.

In the top left spandrel of the cross, in the outer corner, is a fragment of carving, perhaps only a space filler. Below it a winged angel flies towards the head of Christ: its hands appear to be clasped in worship. The corresponding space on the opposite side is crowded and worn: there could possibly have been a Nativity scene here. The top right hand corner, however, has a tiny frontal figure with its hands clasped in front of its body and standing by a plant form. Possibly this figure is to be seen in association with the entombed figure in the bottom left spandrel, as a reference to Adam and the Fall: this was noted in association with scenes with the cross in Yorkshire and Lancashire in the tenth-eleventh centuries (chap. 2).

On either side of the cross shaft is a tall mourning figure. That on the left is depicted frontally with hands clasped in a gesture of grief in front and slightly to the figure's left. Its head is bowed and inclined towards the cross. On the right is a figure with a shorter dress making the same gesture with its right hand as the (presumed) St. John figure within the cross. His left hands holds up a small cross. It is possible that these figures are a duplication of the John and Mary theme, but possibly they are worshipping donor figures such as could appear in the iconography of the Crucifixion in the west from the ninth century (see Lindisfarne, chap. 2; and Schiller 1972, pl. 354; Boinet 1913, pl. CLXB). Donor figures appear in English art in the New Minster Register¹, where Cnut and his queen are shown donating a cross (Temple 1976, pl. 244) and in the eleventh century a figure in a Crucifixion scene in a manuscript made for Judith of Flanders might be a donor or penitent worshipper (Temple 1976, pl. 289)².

¹British Library, Stowe 944, f.6.

²New York, Pierpont Morgan Lib. 709, f.1v.

The only other odd feature of the scene is the birds within the arms of the cross. Birds with the cross or victor's wreath were an early symbol of the souls of the faithful partaking in Christ's victory (Schiller 1972, pl. 1). A bird appears on either side of Christ's head in a strange Crucifixion in the ninth century Salzburg Gospels in Würzburg which also possibly links birds with the souls of the faithful (Chatzidakis and Grabar 1965, pl. 127). Certainly it is difficult to see two birds as a symbol of the Holy Spirit, unlike the one on the Westow slab (II, Appendix B).

With the exception of this possibly unique detail, the iconography of the slab contains nothing that could^{not} have been found in western Carolingian art at least since the mid to late ninth century. On the other hand representations of the living Adam or Eve in association with a Crucifixion (as opposed to the dead) seem to have been a late tenth century feature which also influenced northern art at the same period (see Halton et. al. chap. 2; and Schiller 1972, pls. 381, 387). In chapter 2, an interest in this theme was also noted in late pre-Conquest literature from the south, although the association of this theme with the Crucifixion was also a commonplace of theology long before this date. Again, the influence of Carolingian and later continental schools to which this iconography was indebted is a feature of the revival of art in the south in the tenth century, as a result first of Alfred's reforms and then of the monastic reorganisation (Parsons 1975, passim). All these factors tend to support a late tenth-eleventh century date for this piece as has been suggested on epigraphic grounds (Okasha 1971, 102-3).

ii Architectural sculptures with Christ type 1

Romsey I, Hants. (cat. and pl. 140)

This small panel is unframed. The whole background is cut away, leaving the figures and plant motifs in sharp though shallow relief. Christ is represented high on a tall cross of the latin type with T-like expansions

at the ends of the arms (type A3). The stem has a stepped base which projects at the front as well as the sides. Christ is the erect type 1, with upright head and arms outstretched horizontally. His hands are held open, the thumbs spread apart from the fingers. He is beardless, with short hair. His nimbus is worn but is clearly cruciferous. He wears a skirt-like loincloth. Below his feet, the long shaft of the cross seems to have been decorated, but it is now very worn.

Above the cross on each side is the frontal half figure of an angel, robed, winged, and nimbed, gesturing towards the cross with the inside hand, and holding in the other a staff with a tri-lobed tip. Immediately below the cross stands Mary on Christ's right and John on his left. Mary is nimbed and veiled, and faces the cross. Her right arm is held in front of her body, her left towards Christ. Her arms lift her long robe slightly. John is nimbed, and in a long robe or tunic and cloak, the folds of which are represented by incised parallel grooves. His right hand is not very clear, his left hand is held towards Christ. Unlike Mary, he is only half turned to the cross.

Below these figures and below Christ are the spear-bearer on Christ's right and the sponge-bearer on his left. The spear-bearer wears a tunic and is half turned to the cross. His spear is held up almost vertically between him and the spectator in order to reach Christ's side. The sponge-bearer turns his back on the spectator, and holds up the round sponge on the cane in his right hand, and the vessel with vinegar in his left. Plant forms grow from the stem of the cross, and from the ground beneath the feet of these two figures.

This panel has been described frequently but never analysed in detail. Its iconography has been usually said to be Byzantine in origin, following a suggestion originally made by Kendrick (1949, 48) who also compared its plant ornament and the energetic posture of the accompanying figures to manuscripts and ivories of the Winchester school. Like Talbot Rice

(1952, 108) he compared it explicitly with the central panel of an eleventh century Byzantine ivory triptych in Berlin (Dalton 1911, 229, fig. 40). This has indeed a similar layout with a tall cross, but it also has some notable differences. Christ for example is certainly bearded, while the Romsey figure may be beardless. The latin cross is not elaborated in any way. The half figures of angels above the cross appear to be empty handed. Mary appears in the group of three women at the cross, and has her hands veiled and her head bowed. St. John too appears in a group of three figures. Both spear- and sponge-bearers have their backs to the spectator. There is no plant ornament on the cross or the ground. There are some differences in style also, with the Byzantine work having the more static figures.

This triptych is in fact unusual in Byzantine art in having more than the group with Christ, two angels, Mary and John (see Schiller 1972, pls. 338-43), and in introducing movement in the figures of the spear- and sponge-bearers. It could be that the triptych is showing western influence, rather than that it itself represents an especially influential Byzantine type. It seems to me more likely that both the Byzantine ivory and the Romsey panel are borrowing their iconography from representations of the Metz school with their tall decorated crosses and their two layers of figures beneath the cross, with the spear- and sponge-bearers at the foot: just as did the carver of the Alnmouth cross (chap. 10 and pl. 84). An image of this type actually shows the shaft decorated with plant ornament: on an ivory with the cross as the tree of life with Adam and Eve (Goldschmidt 1914, pl. XXXII, no. 78). The cross with foliage growing from it is also found in the work of other Western schools from as early as the ninth century. The Coronation Sacramentary of Charles the Bald, for example, has acanthus-like foliage growing from the base of the cross and filling the whole background (Schiller 1972, pl. 362). The gestures of Mary and John, with their raised heads and unveiled hands are common to the work

of many western schools, but are certainly found in images of the Metz type.

A ninth century fresco from St. Pierre les Églises (Vienne, France) shows the spear-bearer with bucket and sponge in the same attitude as on the eleventh century Byzantine ivory, another indication that the latter was influenced by Western art (Thoby 1959, no. 88, pl. XXXIX). The ninth century gold altar in St. Ambrogio in Milan, on the other hand, which has been ascribed to the Rheims school, shows the sponge-bearer with bucket and sponge, and with his back turned to the spectator as at Romsey. The spear-bearer too is more closely comparable and the half figures of angels above the cross are carrying wands. The Romsey panel would then seem to belong to the period in the tenth century when southern English art was enjoying a renaissance under the influence of continental centres, rather than to the importation of an unusual Byzantine model.

The hooked ends of the cross arms relate the Romsey panel to other late southern sculptures in which latin crosses (A1) appear with stepped terminations or elaborate mouldings, such as Stepney and Langford I (below); or Langford II (chap. 8) and Weyhill (chap. 2). Two late tenth-eleventh century ivory crucifixes also have this feature (Beckwith 1972, pls. 69, 72). Both have hovering half-figures of angels, though of a different iconographical type from Romsey I. Both have Christ figures of type 1, though one has a head bowed to the right (Beckwith 1972, pl. 72). This also has half-figures of Mary and John represented in a very similar pose to these figures on the Romsey panel. As Kendrick saw, Mary's fluttering drapery and the form of the plant ornament also relate this delicate carving to the florescence of Winchester art in the tenth century.

Romsey II, Hants. (cat. and pl. 141)

This impressive rood is carved on three separate slabs, one for the body and Manus Dei, and one for each arm. Both arms are damaged. The cross is a plain latin cross (A1). Christ stands erect (type 1) on a suppedaneum, here a sloping ledge triangular in section and narrower than the shaft.

The shaft ends above the first visible course of walling stones, but the ledge is supported on a projecting stone which is possibly not part of the original monument. Christ's head is inclined slightly to his right. He is bearded, his eyes are open, and he has long hair which lies along his shoulders. The top of his head is flat and has a hole in one side (see below) but there is no corresponding hole on the opposite side, which is however, slightly damaged. His arms are straight but not rigid. The figure is in deep relief and fully modelled even to the shape of the thighs beneath the loincloth. The pectoral muscles, the muscles of the upper arm and shoulders and even the fleshy parts of the undamaged right hand are rendered naturalistically. The hands are held open with the thumb close to but not folded into the palm. The loincloth is folded over at the waist and tied by a girdle, the ends of which appear beneath the fold which is in the form of an inverted triangle. The feet of the figure are curiously flatter and less modelled than the rest of the body and follow the shape of the ledge beneath.

Above Christ's head, a sleeved Mamus Dei is held down palm outwards, reaching out of clouds composed of stiff formal curls.

This rood has been dated from c.1000 to the late twelfth century. Quirk (1961); Talbot Rice (1952); and Taylor, H.M. and Taylor, J. (1965)⁻⁷⁸ and (1966) all dated it to the period c.1000-1020. Others such as Kendrick (1949); Rivoira (1933); and Stoll (1967) preferred to see it as post-Conquest and indeed quite late in the twelfth century.

The rood is built into a twelfth century wall and this has been seen as an architectural argument in favour of the later date: in this case, however, it has to be seen as having been made for this position.

There is, however, an architectural argument for the earlier date, first stated by Clapham (1930; and ibid 1951) and later expanded by H.M. and J. Taylor on the basis of earlier foundations noted by Peers who showed that a pre-Conquest stone church had been replaced in two stages, c.1090-1100 and 1120-60, in the last stage sweeping away all vestiges of the

pre-Conquest building (Peers 1901; Taylor, H.M. and Taylor, J. 1965⁻⁷⁸/₂, 519-20). It is possible then that a sculpture from the earlier building was preserved and reset in its present position in one, probably the last, stage of this reconstruction. Taylor, H.M. and Taylor, J. (1965⁻⁷⁸/₂, 519) believed that the run of the masonry in the roods present setting suggest that the sculpture had in fact been reset there at some stage after this wall had been built. There is thus no possibility of dating the sculpture by its present setting, though this provides no evidence of when the sculpture was in fact made.

Only one iconographical argument has been used to date the rood to the pre-Conquest period: that is the presence of the Manus Dei above Christ (Casson 1932, 274; Clapham 1951, 192-3; Taylor, H.M. and Taylor, J. 1965⁻⁷⁸/₂, 521-2). This was indeed a common motif in early medieval art up to the eleventh century (see Walkern, chap. 8) and it is found in manuscripts and ivories of the Crucifixion made in the late pre-Conquest period in England as well as in some sculptures (see Temple 1976, pls. 134, 171, 246, 254, 261, 289, 312; Beckwith 1972, pls. 67-74). The motif was drawn from the expanded Crucifixion image developed in the ninth century (chap. 9) but from then it was part of the common European stock of images, and died out only slowly, probably as a result of the development of the Binitarian and Trinitarian images of the throne of grace, which began developing in the pre-Conquest period (chap. 2) but did not reach a final form until the twelfth century. The motif of the Hand of God acknowledging Christ at the Crucifixion is, however, certainly still found in the work of some continental art schools as late as the twelfth century (see, for example, Väterlein, C. ed. 1977, II, pl. 426). One can only say of its appearance at Romsey that this motif is not known to have been popular in English representations which date from the post-Conquest period while it is known to have been popular in pre-Conquest art.

The iconography of the figure itself is of a simple type well-known from the ninth century (see chap. 9). If the hole on the flattened head

indicates a crown or fillet this again suggests an eleventh-twelfth century dating bracket. The motif of the crown was known in pre-Conquest representations as the story from the Peterborough chronicle shows (chap. 5); and it was represented in manuscript paintings of the scene made in the eleventh century such as British Library MS Cotton Tiberius C. VI, ascribed to Winchester (Temple 1976, pl. 311) where it appears as a row of dots distinct from the cruciferous halo; and British Library MS Arundel 60 also ascribed to Winchester (Temple 1976, pl. 312; see also pls. 246, 254).

Kendrick (1949, 49-50) considered that the loincloth clinging to the limbs beneath was an example of the 'dampened' folds found in some twelfth century works. The Romsey loincloth is not so markedly of this type, however, as a twelfth century sculpture of the Crucifixion from Barking in Essex in which garments cling as if indeed wet (pl. 171). The degree of modelling at Romsey is no greater than in ninth-century depictions such as an ivory relief from Narbonne or the Lindau book cover (Schiller 1972, pls. 386, 389)¹. In dress and in its heavy monumentality it is, however, perhaps better compared to large wooden crucifixes of the late tenth, early eleventh century such as the cross of Gero in Cologne; or one from Ringelheim (Wesenberg 1972, pl. 1; Thoby 1959, pl. XXXVII, no. 84). The loincloth and manner of indicating muscles in the latter are particularly to be compared. Possible influence from these German centres of wood carving and stone sculpture has already been suggested for Bitton (chap. 8).

This interest in the depiction of the muscular development of the human body is shown in southern English manuscripts of the late tenth, early eleventh centuries. The muscles of breast, belly and hand are drawn in the Crucifixion miniature of the Sherborne Pontifical, for example, and muscles are indicated in the Hand of God over the cross, as at Romsey

¹cf. Zarnecki 1966, 89 who also saw this as a German inspired work and compared it to Carolingian ivories.

(Temple 1976, pl. 134). In the British Library MS Harley 2904, in which however Christ is shown dead on the cross, there is a naturalistic rendering of all muscles and a loincloth folded over at the waist in the same way as at Romsey, though no girdle is visible (Temple 1976, pl. 142). A more stylised version of muscles and the same loincloth is found in the mid-eleventh century British Library MS Arundel 60. This figure has a cruciferous nimbus of the same type as at Romsey and a sleeved hand of God emerging from wave-like, rather than curling, clouds (Temple 1976, pl. 312). On both stylistic and iconographical grounds there is therefore quite a strong case for preferring a date in the first half of the eleventh century or even the end of the tenth for the carving of this sculpture, and for seeing German work of the same period as a possible source of the fleshy monumental style.

This seems more likely than Talbot Rice's suggestion (1952, 98) that again a Byzantine model might have been used, though some Byzantine ivories of the same tenth-eleventh century period, such as one in the Cabinet des Médailles, Paris, show a development of the figure of Christ in some ways parallel (Thoby 1959, no. 110, pl. XLVIII). The Manus Dei however implies a model in the western tradition, at whatever date the work was carved.

Wormington, Gloucestershire (cat. and pl. 142)

An unframed slab is carved with a cross (type B6) in deep relief. Christ is extended on the cross, his body straight or with only the slightest suggestion of a twist (type 1). His legs are slightly apart and his feet rest on a sloping suppedaneum. The rounded head of a large nail is visible beside the ankle of his left foot. His head with a cruciferous nimbus is inclined to his right and bowed down on his shoulder to his breast. His long hair hangs down behind his head and tapers off along his left shoulder. He has a forked beard. His hands are missing but there is no sign that the sides of the panel have been hacked away. His right arm is slightly flexed,

the left arm is stretched taughtly out, consistent with the extreme sagging of the head, his loincloth is folded over at his waist, and one end of the garment is tucked under the fold and appears again above. Formal stiff folds are indicated by deeply incised lines and stiffly waving edges. The garment is drawn up at the centre.

Above Christ's head the Manus Dei appears out of a sleeve. It is held palm outwards, in a gesture of benediction, with the little finger and the third finger curled up into the palm. In continental art is is more common to see the hand held open palm out and with straight fingers in a gesture implying acceptance of the sacrifice of Christ, or perhaps holding the wreath or crown of victory (Schiller 1972, pls. 354, 365, 379, 380, 395). Much rarer seems to be the pointing hand, back turned to the spectator, which again seems to be a gesture of indication and acceptance, as well as blessing, as on an early eleventh century ivory from Tongres (Schiller 1972, pl. 377). In English art of the late pre-Conquest period, however, the Hand of God appears several times in association with the Crucifixion in the form of the gesture of Benediction: on for example an ivory of the late tenth-eleventh century already mentioned in connection with Romsey I (Beckwith 1972, pl. 72). In this case, it emerges from the side of the cross (though contained within it) so that it is held almost horizontally over Christ's head. The same gesture in a hand emerging downwards from clouds is found in a Crucifixion miniature in a collection of prayers and church offices made at the New Minster, Winchester c.1023-35¹. This miniature is also interesting in showing a Christ with a bearded head resting on his right shoulder, though not quite with the exaggerated gesture of the Wormington slab (Temple 1976, pl. 246, cat. no. 77). The Manus Dei is insufficient evidence of a pre-Conquest date unsupported by any other evidence (see Romsey II, above) but the coincidence of this unusual gesture in this context on the slab and in a Winchester manuscript is a very strong pointer to an early eleventh century date for this unusual and

¹British Library MS Cotton Titus D. XXVII, f,65v.

interesting slab.

The iconography of the figure of Christ has been described as unusual by H.M. Taylor (1965) who believed that it was represented with a Lamb's head and was therefore a combination of a narrative portrayal and a passion symbol of the risen and ascended Christ (see chap. 3). This impression seems to be caused by the beard which is in the wrong position for a head tilted on its side, hanging down instead of sloping to the right. Such a combination would however be unique, and I am convinced that wear, damage, and the fact that the carver has no grasp of perspective are responsible for a wrong initial impression.

An iconography with an upright or very slightly twisted body and with the head bowed in death on the shoulder was developed in the West in the ninth century. The late ninth century miniature in the Prayer Book of Charles the Bald is only slightly less exaggerated than at Wormington (Schiller 1972, pl. 354). The posture, though accompanied by a slight sagging of the body is also found in robed Crucifixions of the tenth century such as the Egbert Gospels and the Gospels of Otto II or III (Schiller 1972, pls. 393-4), where the head is completely horizontal. More important the head bowed in death in this way is characteristic of late pre-Conquest art in southern England. It appears, for example, in a Winchester Psalter of the late tenth century¹ in which Christ also has a forked beard and long hair tapering along his shoulders and has a body with the outthrust hip of type 2. but which could have been interpreted by a less competent sculptor as an upright figure (Temple 1976, pl. 142). The same combination of characteristics appear in a famous ivory carving of the Crucifixion, so like the manuscript in style and iconography that the two have been commonly linked (pl. 143). In the ivory a fold of the loincloth is drawn into a loop above the waist, a detail which links it closely with the Wormington slab. A late tenth century Canterbury manuscript,

¹British Library MS Harley 2904.

the Arenberg Gospels (Temple 1976, pl. 171) has the same head type and a similar loincloth, but on a more exaggeratedly type 2, almost type 3, body¹. Another Canterbury manuscript, however, the Sherborne Pontifical² (Temple 1976, pl. 134) is a more stylised version of the Christ in the Winchester Psalter, and incidentally is closer to the ivory crucifix linked with it in its version of the loincloth with one end drawn into a loop above the waist. Interestingly, an unfinished drawing of the Crucifixion with a similar though not so exaggerated head position and long hair straggling on the shoulders; and a version of the looped and knotted loincloth was possibly made at Winchcombe Abbey in Gloucestershire (Temple 1976, 99 and pl. 255)³.

Talbot Rice (1952, 98-9) suggested an Eastern model for Wormington, and compared it with the smaller Crucifixion at Langford (below). It is true that the posture and head position are found in tenth and eleventh century Byzantine Crucifixion scenes, but this was a widespread^{period} fashion and as I have shown was found in the West as well as the East, and from an earlier date (above, Romsey I and II). The Manus Dei too is a pointer to Carolingian or Ottonian influence, while a few elements such as the blessing gesture of the Manus Dei and the method of knotting the loincloth seem to be a contribution of the schools of art in southern England in the late pre-Conquest period, possibly developed in Winchester itself.

iii Architectural Sculpture with Christ type 2

Breamore, Hampshire (cat. and pls. 144-8)

The group consists of Christ on the cross, with the Manus Dei descending from clouds above, and with the Virgin Mary in attendance on

¹New York, Pierpont Morgan Library, 869, f.9v.

²Paris, Bibl. Nat., MS lat. 943, f.4v.

³Cambridge Corpus Christi College, 41, p.484.

Christ's right, John the Evangelist on his left. The whole group except for the clouds above has been cut back flush with the wall, but the outline of each figure survives, and quite a number of details can be distinguished (pl. 144).

One of the questions which has been raised about the rood is whether it is in situ. Its position over the south doorway is comparable to the position of the figure at Walkern, over what H.M. and J. Taylor believed was an original south doorway (see chap. 8). At Lusby in Lincolnshire over the blocked south doorway is a stone with cruciform decoration (Taylor^{H.M.} and Taylor^{J.} 1965⁻⁷⁸, 403 and see below, Appendix B). The problem at Breamore is that although the nave is Saxon the present south doorway is Norman, and for the Saxon period a west entrance cannot be ruled out. Taylor, H.M. and Taylor, J. (1965, 94-6) believed here was some evidence for a western annexe of the Saxon period, and they also noted that the Saxon arches leading from the nave into the tower space and chancel have been replaced by fifteenth century arches, so that all the walls which could appropriately have carried a rood have been disturbed at some time. The problem of whether this group has been moved is not easy to resolve.

The chief evidence for disturbance is that noted by A.R. and P.M. Green (1951, 37-9), that the arms of Christ appear to have been placed on the wrong sides. This is a feature which has not been widely commented on, though most writers mention the extreme contortion of the figure, and Kendrick (1949, 46) seems to have accepted the figure as it stands, observing the arms stretched upwards and outwards and ^{have} hands that drop at the wrists. He appears to have thought that the lower part of the arms were exaggeratedly long hands, for in fact the hands are clearly visible, crossing the moulding at the ends of the cross arms, and as the rood is constructed at present they rise from the wrist, rather than droop (pl. 145). This alone suggests that A.R. and P.M. Green were correct in their supposition, though their

reconstruction (A.R. and P.M. Green 1951, fig. 9) suggests that the arms of the cross would slope upwards as at Headbourne Worthy (below). In fact the cross seems to be a plain latin cross (A1) and it could perhaps in this case remain so if the position of the arms was reversed. Whether the incorrect position of the arms is evidence for the moving of the rood from an original position is difficult to say: it would depend on whether one could assume that the sculptor supervised its setting up. The ensuing discussion assumes that the arms have been re-placed correctly.

The elements of the group are carved on five separate slabs of stone:

- a) The upright of the cross, from the Manus Dei to the foot (the cut back block at Christ's feet does not seem to be separate);
- b) and c) the side arms of the cross, including the panels with the symbols of the sun and moon;
- d) the slab with the representation of the Virgin;
- e) the slab with the representation of St. John.

Christ is shown depending from the cross, and not stiffly extended as on many Anglo-Saxon sculptured representations (pl. 146). He is nimbed and his head is turned to the right and falls forward. His arms are bent at the elbow, and his hands droop at the wrist. His hands cross a moulding which separates the cross arm proper from the panels containing the sun and moon. At both Bitton and Langford a feature of the rood is that the hands of Christ extend to and cross a raised moulding at the ends of the cross arms, though at neither of these places was the moulding used as a panel divider (pls. 61 and 65). Christ's body droops, his hips swing to his left (type 2) but he does not hang limply, the line of the body and legs suggests a tense curve. It is really impossible to distinguish the type of loincloth. A.R. and P.M. Green (1951, 37-9) suggested one reaching to just above the knees which is a possibility as the body widens from about waist to hip, then gradually narrows again. It is impossible

to say whether the block beneath the feet was a suppedaneum, or carried any form of decoration.

The Manus Dei appears out of clouds represented by wavy lines in relief and reaches to the top of Christ's nimbus (pl. 147). The sun and moon are in a somewhat unusual position, at the ends of the cross arm rather than above them, but although all detail has been hacked away, the two orbs though now by no means perfect circles cannot be interpreted in any other way (pl. 145).

Some features of the representation of John and Mary can be distinguished: for example, both are nimbed (pl. 144), and both belong to a type in which the hands and arms are not out flung, but held close to the body and head. In the case of John (pl. 148) the line of the arm and hand raised to the face can be seen quite clearly, as also his head which is bowed forward. His robe is slightly shorter and less voluminous than Mary's, and he is in the act of taking a small step forward. Beneath his feet is a patch of irregular outline, also hacked away, which seems to represent the ground on which he stands. Both figures face the cross.

The figures of John and Mary belong to types familiar from Carolingian art of the ninth century. In the wall painting at Trier (Schiller 1972, pl. 347) even the rocky ground level is present, a feature which continues into tenth and eleventh century art in for example the Crucifixion miniatures in the Sherborne Pontifical and British Library MS 2904 (Temple 1976, pl. 134, 142), though in these the iconography of the John and Mary is not the same. Figures of John and Mary with hands held close to the face or head have been noted in a tenth-eleventh century English ivory, though with a type 1 figure of Christ (Beckwith 1972, pl. 72). The type of Christ has also been noted as one which first appeared in Carolingian art of the ninth century (chap. 9). The body remains frontal but sags to the left: the distortion would not seem so extreme if the arms were correctly

positioned. This is the type represented in for example the Canterbury manuscript known as the Arenberg Gospels (Temple 1976, pl. 171), which also has figures of John and Mary which could be quite close to Breamore.

In spite of its extreme damage, therefore, it is quite possible to see this sculpture as belonging to the same late tenth, early eleventh century dating bracket as the material with which it most closely compares.

Headbourne Worthy, Hampshire (cat. and pl. 149)

This rood appears to be in situ in a wall of pre-Conquest date (Taylor, H.M. and Taylor, J. 1965⁻⁷⁸, 289-91 and fig. 218). Above the cross, and carved on a separate stone or stones, is a representation of the Manus Dei issuing from clouds indicated by waving lines. The cross arms slope upwards slightly and the shaft on which the body is carved seems to narrow towards the feet. This slab clearly had a square cut moulding, a feature which can be paralleled at Breamore (see pls. 144-8). The cross arms are formed from two separate slabs, not laid horizontally, but sloping upwards towards the ends. The whole composition is cut back to the wall surface and whitewashed. It is impossible to say whether the arms had a border in relief or not.

Christ's head is nimbed, but the head itself is cut back as a deep cavity. His body is not straight but twisted slightly (type 2), but his feet are together, not crossed, and placed on a suppedaneum. It is impossible to say whether his head was turned or bent, and no details of his arms survive. The narrow outline of his body suggests a loincloth rather than a robe.

The accompanying figures are both nimbed, and though both only survive in outline, can be identified as Mary, on Christ's right, and John on his left. Mary seems to be represented with body frontal to the spectator, but with head turned to the cross as on Langford I (below). A single narrow fold of her long dress survives. Her arms must have been clasped close to her, possibly raised to her face, as there is no trace of an arm otherwise, John too is represented with similarly restrained gestures.

He may be standing in the same position as Mary. Several of the long vertical folds of his dress are quite clear. Enough detail survives to show the general conformation of the figures of Mary and John as broader at the shoulder than the hem and with closely packed fluttering draperies. Again the group Christ, Mary and John in the Arenberg Gospels which also has a Manus Dei, seems a close parallel (Temple 1976, pl. 171), though this is a Canterbury rather than a Winchester manuscript. The dress detail alone, however, is enough to suggest a 'Winchester' style though neither Mary or John are making the exaggerated gestures found for example in British Library MS Harley 2904 (Temple 1976, pl. 142). The narrow fluted fold of St. John's cloak in the sculpture is however very like the fold of Mary's veil in this manuscript and the 'hobble' skirt is also paralleled here. The Crucifixion in the Missal of Robert^{of} Jumièges (c. 1008) could also quite possibly have been very close in both iconography and style to the damaged sculpture. It has similar folds falling in a narrow zigzag in the dress of both Mary and John, and especially of the latter (Talbot Rice 1952, pl. 53b). The Headbourne Worthy sculpture, therefore, seems clearly related to manuscript styles of the early eleventh century, a date supported by the probability of its being in situ.

iii Architectural Sculpture with Christ type 3

Stepney (cat. and pl. 150)

The rectangular panel is enclosed by a border 10 cms. in width, decorated by alternate oval shapes in relief and raised circular forms, not closed but with two ends developing into an internal palmette or leaf with five fronds.

Christ is on a latin cross (A1), the ends of the arms of which are stepped in quite an elaborate way, with the inner three steps as roll mouldings and an outer squared moulding. Christ, with a cruciferous nimbus hangs on the cross (type 3), his arms rising from the shoulders, and his

hands straight, with the thumb folded in. The hands touch the inner roll moulding at the end of the arm. His head is turned to his right and bends down towards Mary. His trunk is straight, but while his knees swing to the right, with his legs together, his feet are together in the forward position and turned out, the left slightly in advance of the right. His loincloth is folded over at the waist the fold drooping to a V-shaped point in front, and is moulded closely over the line of his legs. It is knee length, but hangs lower on Christ's left or rather behind him. There is no suppedaneum. Above his arms the sun and moon are represented by flat discs in relief, against which are relieved weeping figures with veiled hands and bowed heads. The figures face the cross and do not seem to be differentiated.

Below Christ on his right stands Mary, her feet turned to the cross but her body half turned. Her right hand is held to her breast, holding a book, her left hand is raised to her face. She is nimbed. John also nimbed, stands on Christ's left, and is half turned, his long outer cloak lifted by his left arm which is held across his chest so that he can support his right elbow in his left hand. His right hand is raised to his face, and his feet are turned out.

The layout of this panel suggests an enlarged version of an ivory relief panel of the Crucifixion, although the flat rendering of the figures and decorations suggest that an illuminated page with an acanthus or palmette border could instead lie behind it. Apart from the form of the cross and figure of the Christ, the iconography could have been influenced by Carolingian or Ottonian art from any time from the ninth to the eleventh centuries. Certainly, the border is not too unlike that of many ninth to tenth century ivories. The border of an ivory in the Victoria and Albert Museum, no. 251, 67, shows on one side a leaf form, with the ends of the central leaf curling round to form a half circle above it (Goldschmidt 1914, pl. XXXVII, no. 88, p. 49). Another also

dated ninth-tenth century by Goldschmidt shows the ends of the central fronded leaf curling around it but not quite meeting in a complete circle (Goldschmidt 1914, pl. XXXVIII, no. 89). Various versions of the semi-enclosed leaf appear in the borders of English illuminated manuscripts of the late tenth and the first half of the eleventh centuries, although none is surrounded by what appears to be a complete enclosing line. It would not be wise to press too closely for parallels, however, since the Stepney carving though very fine is still cruder in its execution than the ^{fine brush}work achieved by manuscript illuminators.

The weeping busts of the sun and moon are drawn from the expanded Crucifixion image of the ninth century. The only surviving English manuscript which has veiled and encircled busts of the sun and moon is the Gospels of Countess Judith of the mid-eleventh century (Temple 1976, pl. 289) though several others have these elements personified. In style, however, the Gospel Book is different from the panel: in particular the figures of John and Mary at Stepney are static and symmetrical, more like those of Westow with which they closely (but not exactly) correspond: both panels draw on ultimately ninth century models (see Appendix B). The only curious feature at Stepney is that Mary is shown holding a book, a feature which can, however, be paralleled in several eleventh century works: for example on the bronze doors at Hildesheim; in the Gospels of Countess Judith (above); and in British Library manuscript Arundel 60 (Thoby 1959, pl. XXXIV; Temple 1976, pls. 289, 312). Both mid eleventh century English manuscripts are, however, very different from the panel in style and in other aspects of their iconography.

A date in the first half of the eleventh century is also suggested by the form of the cross with its moulded and stepped terminations, which compares very closely with the form of the cross given by Cnut and Aelfifu to the New Minster, and illustrated in the New Minster Liber Vitae (Temple 1976, pl. 244). The same type of cross is used in Crucifixion miniatures in the Arenberg Gospels and the Sherborne Pontifical (both Canterbury)

and in a copy of Bede's Ecclesiastical History possibly made at Winchcombe in Gloucestershire (Temple 1976, pls. 171, 134, 261).

The type 3 figure of Christ is found in a second miniature in the British Library MS Arundel 60 (Talbot Rice 1952, pl. 79a) and in the Gospels of the Countess Judith. The first of these may be a late eleventh century insertion (Temple 1976, 120), but the latter was made in the late pre-Conquest period, probably in the second quarter of the eleventh century, and has affinities with Canterbury manuscripts of that date (Temple 1976, 108-9).

Since all details of this panel can be paralleled in English work of the late pre-Conquest period, and especially since the cross form seems to have had a distinct period of popularity in the first half of the eleventh century, it seems most probable that it dates from this period also. The type 3 figure of Christ suggests, however, that the Stepney panel was carved in the mid-eleventh century rather than earlier.

Langford I, Oxfordshire (cat. and pls. 151-2)

This rood as it appears at present shows Christ on the cross, with distorted and downward curving arms and upraised hands, accompanied by Mary turning away from him on his left and John turning away from him on his right. The porch into which it is built is late medieval. All commentators have pointed out that the arms and accompanying figures have been transposed, including Kendrick who accepted the exactly similar position of the arms at Breamore (Kendrick 1949, 47). The transpositions in themselves suggest the group is not in situ but has been moved in some period of reconstruction from its original site, but it implies an ignorance of normal Christian iconography on the part of the stonemasons and workmen who built the porch, and who built their gable ends around these pieces of sculpture, since the recess in which they are set is clearly made to

measure. If the arms and accompanying figures are put in the right positions (pl. 153) it is immediately clear that the group need not originally have been placed in such close proximity as we see it today, but could have been widely spaced, above a chancel arch or doorway as at Breamore or Headbourne Worthy even though it is not on so large a scale. For if the arms are reversed, the slabs with the arms would have to be built on higher than they are now, and the slabs with Mary and John would not fit in so exactly beneath the arms and therefore need not be supposed to have stood in the same relation to the cross in the roods' original state: they could have been placed quite far out to the sides. My description assumes that the transposed slabs have been returned to their original positions.

Christ is portrayed on a latin cross (A1) with stepped terminations. The upper arm is slightly more elaborate than the side arms, having a roll moulding below the step. Christ hangs on the cross, but while he is not at all Christus triumphans, neither is he the grotesquely contorted figure he at present appears. His upper body is quite straight, the lower part of his body and his knees swing, but not with too exaggerated a curve, to his right and his feet are in quite the normal frontal position with ankles together and feet turned out (type 3). They rest on a suppedaneum which corresponds in form to the decorative steps at the ends of the arms. His arms rise from the shoulders, then at a rather sharper angle from the elbows and his hands (held open, with thumb folded into palm and large nail clearly visible) droop from the wrists. His hands extend onto the outward slope of the step, and this is an interesting point of correspondence with those other crucifixes where the hand crosses a moulding at the end of the arm. (See Bitton and Langford II, pls. 61, 65; and Kirkburton, pl. 109). It is to be noted that while Christ is represented as hanging from his nailed hands, there is none of the contortion that comes from an attempt at depicting in a realistic way the strain on arms and body that

would result. Christ wears a loincloth which droops at the back and may have had a central tie, or perhaps just a deep central fold. The stone is worn, but not too worn to show the fineness of the carving of the folds and pleats, ending quite realistically in a jagged outline at the hem. The loincloth is also under-cut, another indication of the quality of the carving. It is interesting to find this detail of under-cut drapery in both crucifixes at this site, different as they are in iconography.

Christ's head droops on his right shoulder, but is not turned. He appears to have been bearded. His nimbus is cruciferous. Mary, on his right is a dignified and undramatic figure (pl. 152). In position she is frontal, her head turned to the cross, and her shoulders just slightly turned. The tilt of her head is slight and is consistent with the suggestion that she was originally placed at some greater distance from the cross. She wears a long gown falling in rather stiff parallel folds at the front and a cloak and head covering gathered up by the raised arms and falling in folds over them. Her right hand is raised to her breast, her left hand raised to, but not reaching, her face. She is nimbed.

John too is a frontal figure, and the tilt of his nimbed head would also appear more natural were he placed further out on Christ's left (pl. 152). He too wears a long cloak of rather severe outline slightly lifted by his hand. A book is held beneath his left arm, and his right arm rests on his breast. He is beardless.

The Langford rood is important to our understanding of the development of the iconography of Christ sagging in death in the art of late Anglo-Saxon England. It most clearly shows the relationship between late Ottonian and Winchester art. The iconography of the figure of Christ can most closely be compared with the crucified Christ on the back of the gold altar cross of Lothar in the Palace Treasury, Aachen, except for the nimbus

behind the head of the Langford figure (pl. 76). Nevertheless the straining arms and heavily drooping head; the body, almost straight and frontal above the waist, with breast and the termination of the rib cage marked; and the heavily sagging lower half of the body and knees, with loincloth drooping behind, are very close. But the Lothar cross is also a type of altar crucifix which must have helped inspire the typical late Winchester cross as at Stepney and the actual altar cross represented in the New Minster Liber Vitae (see Stepney, above). On its other face, it is a jewelled latin cross with moulded and stepped terminals (pl. 154).

Kendrick believed the Langford rood to be twelfth century but there seems no good iconographical reason for placing it so late and much to suggest it as at the least of the early eleventh century and possibly even of the late tenth century. The Lothar cross was made c.980-90.

A frontal type of John and Mary is found in many late pre-Conquest English manuscripts (see for example Temple 1976, pls. 134, 312) but a group which is in some ways remarkably similar is found in the Arenberg Gospels, which also has a cross with stepped terminations and a figure of Christ with cruciform halo, which is type 2 but verging on type 3 (Temple 1976, pl. 171). Here Mary lifts up with one hand one edge of a fluttering overdress, and John holds a book and gestures with his right hand which is held close to his face. This manuscript has a Canterbury provenance, but it and the sculpture belong remarkably together. Again, however, the static and reposeful quality of the slab, without dramatic gesture, is unlike any English miniature. Neither are the parallel folds quite like anything in surviving manuscript paintings. Even the draperies of the Stepney crucifixion flutter more. In spite of this difference in style there seems a considerable body of evidence to suggest that Langford I was made in the late pre-Conquest period.

iv Fragments of probable roods for which the figure of Christ has not survived.

Bibury, Gloucestershire (cat. and pl. 155)

Above the original Anglo-Saxon chancel arch and cut by the later pointed medieval chancel arch is a square cut string-course which extends the whole width of the nave. Above, to the left and right and about five feet above the string course are two windows, now blocked, which Taylor, H.M. and Taylor, J. (1965^{-78, 65,} fig. 30 and pl. 388) believe to be original, with the perpendicular tracery visible from the nave a later insertion. Immediately above the string course and below the left window are clear traces of a figure, which as nearly as I can judge is a little over six feet in height. H.M. and J. Taylor also record that the central area of the wall immediately over the chancel arch shows signs of roughness, though I did not notice this when I visited the church. Above the string course to the furthest right are two slabs standing out from the wall. H.M. and J. Taylor considered these formed part of the same composition as the defaced figure on the left. However, the only recognisable carving looks from ground level like a fragment of plant ornament, though it requires closer examination. It does not seem to me likely that these slabs were the vehicle of a companion figure to the one which partly survives, which one might have expected immediately below the window and not quite so far to the side. However, plant ornament could be found in association with a Crucifixion scene (see pl. 140).

The outline of the surviving figure retains certain features of the original sculpture which make it at least possible to suggest that it is the Virgin Mary, and a Virgin Mary of a particular iconographical type. It should be said, however, that in any case the probabilities are all in favour of an identification with the Virgin, on the grounds that this figure must have stood to the right of Christ on the cross (the spectator's left), by far the most common position for her. The other two figures who most

commonly appear at this side are the spear-bearer, and Ecclesia; but this figure seems to me to be quite clearly a long robed figure which would not be suitable for Longinus and is also rather too far away from the presumed central position of the cross shaft for either of them.

The figure has a long skirted robe, narrowing sharply to the ankle and showing a slight bending at the knees towards the cross: on the other hand the width across the shoulders suggests both that the arms are clasped close to the body, perhaps with the right hand held close to the face (as is suggested by the projection above the right shoulder) and that the upper part of the body is frontal (or rather three quarter view) rather than half turned like the lower part of the body. This rather curious position which allows the artist to portray a figure turning towards the cross without turning away from the spectator is very common in depictions of both Mary and John and from quite early times as for example on the wall painting at St. Maria Antiqua, Rome (pl. 18).

H.M. and J. Taylor put the Anglo-Saxon church in their period C by which they mean the late Saxon period from about 950 onwards. The surviving sculpture carved on stones built into the original east wall (and possibly destroyed when the chancel arch was heightened, for this must have partially destroyed the central cross) must also be dated within this period. I would suggest that the exaggeratedly narrowed skirt of Mary's robe is also positive evidence of a closer dating: I have already shown that the stance of the figure is common in the iconography of Mary at the cross, but an exaggerated version with the robe clinging closely to the legs and ankles is found in a drawing in a late tenth century English Psalter, British Library MS Harley 2904, 3v. There Mary's shoulders are more hunched and her head is bent more towards the cross, but the outline of the figure is markedly similar (pl. 156; Temple 1976, pl. 142). The outline thus produced is quite different from those of those other shadow-figures at Breamore and Headbourne Worthy, a pointer to a variety

of iconographical type for these great roods.

Bradford on Avon, Wiltshire (cat. and pls. 157-8)

Each of the angels is carved on a single block of stone, shaped to accommodate the composition of the figure, that is by widening towards the head to take the width of shoulders, head, arms, and wings, and again at the upward kicking feet. The angels, however, are not confined to the stones as in a frame, for feet and wings extend beyond it. As the figures are now positioned they fly horizontally towards ^{each other and to} some central feature, possibly a crucifix of which no fragment survives. Clapham (1930, 139) suggested that both here and elsewhere, decoration in relief might have been in stucco such as was found at Glastonbury (Peers and Horne 1930, 24-9).

The angels are iconographically exactly the same as each other though they differ slightly in detail of execution: the angel on the left of the spectator has more delicately carved drapery with more fluttering folds than the other, and the wing on his left is carved so that it appears to bend and fold presenting its inner instead of its outer surface at the tip (pl. 157). The ridge-like feathers on the same wing of the right hand angel sharply follow the shape of the wing (pl. 158). They are, however, both alike in their out-stretched veiled arms, their long robes with a wide band round the waist, their hair tied back by a double filet, and in the position of the wings which are seen as a frame to the head and arms, rather than springing from the back. They are close though not exactly parallel to the flying angels represented on a small ivory plaque from Winchester (Beckwith 1972, pl. 39). Half figures of winged angels flying towards a Crucifixion scene appear in several English ivories of the late pre-Conquest period (Beckwith 1972, pl. 38 (with veiled hands); and pl. 69) but almost full length figures which provide a very close parallel, with filets binding the hair, occur in the Sherborne Pontifical, a Canterbury manuscript (Temple 1976, pl. 134). Almost as close, though

both wings spring from the back, are the nimbed angels of the Arenberg Gospels another Canterbury manuscript (Temple 1976, pl. 171).

It seems undoubted that these angels date from the late pre-Conquest period and indeed possibly from the late tenth century (the period of the related manuscripts) and most probable that they accompanied a Crucifixion scene.

Winterbourne Steepleton, Dorset. (cat. and pl. 159)

Only one slab of what may have been a larger composition has survived. This shows an angel with robe wound around his half turned body and upward kicking legs, in the manner of the Bradford on Avon angels, but somewhat cruder in execution. A fold of this robe appears above the body. His one surviving wing sprouts from behind his nimbed head and flies back, like the upper wing of the Bradford angels. His head, however, is not facing the direction of flight but looks back over his shoulders towards his feet. The beginning of the arm appears below his right shoulder. It is bent up at elbow. His right wing is missing and the slab is clearly damaged and incomplete at this end. A backward looking angel would be unusual in any composition. Out-facing angels, however are found in scenes in which angels support a mandorla with a Christ Majesty, as in King Edgar's Foundation Charter, Winchester (Temple 1976, pl 84) or in Crucifixion scenes such as on a wooden casket possibly from the Lichfield area. There the figures are three quarter figures, cut off before the feet. Each has only one arm holding out a scroll towards Christ. Neither looks at Christ, but out towards the spectator (Talbot Rice 1952, pl. 38b). Angels of a related type could be attendant on a Baptism scene such as that in the Benedictional of St. Aethelwold (Temple 1976, pl. 85). Odd back-turned angels are found supporting a mandorla in a sketch inserted perhaps in the mid-eleventh century in British Library MS Harley 603, a Canterbury manuscript (Temple 1976, pl. 210). It is likely therefore that the sculpture belongs to the late pre-Conquest period, but less

certain in what composition it appeared.

Muchelney, Somerset (cat. and pl. 160)

All that survives of this rood is a pair of feet, in relief but with a somewhat flattened instep, and rather long, finger-like toes. They rest side by side on a suppedaneum, which seems to have formed the splayed and projecting foot of the cross. The ledge on which the feet rests, which slopes quite sharply, is outlined by a single roll moulding. Below the ledge the base is cut back again presumably to something like the level of the missing cross shaft, and terminates in a second projecting ledge, this time with a flat top and rounded corner on the complete right-hand edge. The vertical face of this ledge also has a border, this time composed by an inner incised line though only the top right hand corner of the panel thus formed now survives. The method of carving the feet is reminiscent of Romsey II (pl. 141) and the ledge is found in other pre-Conquest sculptures (cf. Bitton, pl. 64). There is no conclusive evidence, however, that this sculpture dates to the pre-Conquest period: it is only a possibility based on the existence of the two features described above.

Conclusions

Southern England in the latter part of the pre-Conquest period on the evidence of this study alone, clearly held the position occupied by Northumbria (and later Mercia) in the pre-Viking period (chaps. 6 and 9). It is here that we find the most consistently high standards of execution, and the clearest evidence of close links with works in other media and with an intellectual milieu in which artists were able to develop themes such as that of the dead Christ in line with contemporary theological and pietistic thought. The development of the great architectural rood for liturgical purposes is another example of the close links between ecclesiastical or at least knowledgable patrons, and artists, and seems an achievement of Alfredian Wessex. This situation parallels that in the north in

the pre-Viking period where iconography had to be considered first as an Hiberno-Saxon manifestation of early Christian/Byzantine types (chap. 6), and then in relation to Carolingian developments under the impulse of new ideas (chap. 9). The earlier period too produced new monument types and was confined to prestigious works, some possibly with a liturgical as well as a didactic function. The evidence for the later period is solidier because more comparable English work in other media has survived, and possibly more was produced, partly no doubt because of a general growth in popularity of the theme as it became more familiar in liturgical and devotional contexts, but partly also because of the growth of political power, prestige and wealth which became concentrated in the south from the end of the ninth century. The maintenance of cultural, political and economic contacts with continental centres as well as individual attempts by Alfred and various ecclesiastics in the next century, clearly also must have directly or indirectly kept the iconography of the Crucifixion in England moving in line with the mainstream of European art.

Only Newent, of all southern sculptures, can be said to represent a personal, non-public monument with the Crucifixion theme from this area, and only two grave slabs with a related theme (from Winchester) are from this whole area. This may be a reflection of a regional taste, but it is in fact very difficult to explain. It is, of course, difficult to know the precise use for many of the cruder crosses with Christ crucified from the north (chap. 5), or even to be certain of the liturgical or didactic functions of some of the finer monuments such as Kirkburton (chap. 11) or Gosforth I (chap. 12). It is interesting that all monuments with the Crucifixion or a related theme which have survived from the south can be readily classified as public (architectural) or personal (grave markers) on the basis of form as well as circumstances of discovery, and this in itself (and particularly the development of architectural sculptures) must say something about the different social, economic and cultural frameworks in

which patrons and artists operated in southern England and outside.

CHAPTER 14

CONCLUDING SURVEY: THE DISTRIBUTION OF ICONOGRAPHICAL
FEATURES, AND A STUDY OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN
REGIONAL VARIATIONS AND THE ART OF
AREAS OUTSIDE ENGLAND

The discussion in chapters 6-13 was based on the iconography of the figure of Christ. Two main variations in dress: the robe (chaps. 6-8); and the loincloth (chaps. 9-13) were noted (though these were sometimes seen more clearly in the models which provided patterns than in some worn or crude sculptures themselves). The rare appearance of any figure type apart from the upright, frontal type 1 was also pointed out (fig. 7). Other features, such as the choice of subsidiary figures and elements, have so far been mentioned only within the regional descriptions and discussions based on the Christ types although their occasional importance in demonstrating period developments was shown, for example, in the discussion of the significance of the sun and moon in the development of the loincloth types (chap. 9). Before looking at the implications of the regional and chronological developments in the pre-Conquest sculptured Crucifixion in more detail, therefore, it is necessary to consider the selection and grouping of figures and elements in relation to regional preference; monument type (which could in some cases limit group scenes, and which might also express regional preference); and the iconography of the central figure.

1 The Distribution of Groups of Figures and Elements

Individual figures and elements are listed in volume II, section II. Here they are considered in categories based on the number of human figures or their symbols grouped beneath or around the cross. Other non-human figures and symbolic or decorative elements such as the sun and moon, angels, the snake, or the Manus Dei are mentioned as they occur. A subsequent section notes their regional distribution. Many sculptures are, of course, incomplete and this has been taken into account in the analysis.

a) Christ alone

There is no evidence that Christ on the cross unaccompanied by other figures was represented in pre-Conquest sculpture of the early part of the pre-Viking period (before c.800). Hexham I (pls.26-31) is too incomplete to support such a suggestion, and all its closest parallels in Insular art have other subsidiary figures (see (c) below).

Neither is there any convincing evidence that this iconography was popular in the later period on cross shafts or architectural sculptures. It occurs only once on a cross shaft, Bothal I (pl. 88) which though incomplete clearly has no other figures or elements above Christ's arms, and no sign of any below. Leland's description of the Reculver Crucifixion (chap. 9) mentions only the figure of Christ, but cannot be taken as evidence of its isolation. Of architectural ^{sculpture}, only Ropsley (pls. 135-6) seems certainly to have had no other elements in its composition. There is no trace of any other figure or element at Barton-on-Humber (pls. 70a and b) where, however, they could have been removed like the figure of Christ himself. All other architectural examples on which Christ alone has survived are either manifestly incomplete or worn, or could have had other figures set on separate slabs which have disappeared. They are at Bitton, where there was certainly a snake (pl. 67); Bradford-on-Avon, where Christ has disappeared, but where the surviving angels could have formed part of a large group composition (pls. 157-8); Great Glen (pl. 138); Langford II (pl. 61); Marton (pl. 137); Muchelney (pl. 160); Romsey II, which has a Manus Dei (pl. 141); Walkern, also with a Manus Dei (pls. 62-3); Winterbourne Steepleton, which if it was ^{a Crucifixion was} like Bradford-on-Avon also accompanied by (probably) a pair of angels (pl. 159); and Wormington, with a Manus Dei (pl. 142). The missing hands of this last figure could well have been carved on outer slabs carrying subsidiary figures. No conclusions can be drawn on this incomplete evidence. The existence of Ropsley suggests that some architectural crucifixes were carved on building stones for devotional purposes and

perhaps other small examples such as Marton or Great Glen were of this type. However, that these were indeed crucifixes and not fragments of group scenes would be hard to prove for any example not in situ in an undisturbed wall. It is interesting that all these very small panels or slabs are in the East Midlands but such small works could have been destroyed elsewhere. The larger scale works could all have had additional features, now lost.

The bulk of the evidence for the iconography of Christ alone is found on cross heads from the north, north east and west. The earliest from the late pre-Viking period is the cross head at Rothbury which with its cusped form is unlikely to have had any other figures on either side of Christ on the lower arm of the head (pl. 81). The figure is not completely isolated, since there is an angel in the upper arm above Christ's head, linking the carving to an iconography found also in late Carolingian ivories of the ninth century. The Rothbury head is an isolated survival of the pre-Viking period.

The theme was common in the Viking age, however, though Christ is sometimes found accompanied by other elements (some apparently purely decorative) on both cross heads and staff-crucifixes. Those with no other evidence for any other element are at Ellerburn (pl. 107); Great Ayton (pl. 99); Kirby Hill I (pl. 102); Kirkcolm (pl. 40); Kirklevington II (pl. 119); North Otterington (pl. 106); and the staff-crucifix at Dewsbury, where, however, the possibly more elaborate head is missing (pl. 111). Fragments on which no other detail but Christ has survived are at Billingham (pl. 95); Kirby Hill II (pl. 117); Stanwick II (pl. 116); and Thornton Steward II (pl. 118). The last four are perhaps too incomplete for analysis, but it can be noted of the rest that both robe and loincloth types are represented in the figure of Christ, and Anglian, Irish-Scandinavian and mixed sources of iconography (and style) as identified in chaps. 7 and 11. Most are in Yorkshire, one in south west Scotland, and one from County Durham, just north

of the Tees. The cross head or cross conceived entirely as a crucifix is therefore very much a period feature which affected all cultural traditions, but also has a very strong regional base.

The Sherburn fragment (pl. 98) is too incomplete to show whether there were any subsidiary figures above or below Christ, but it is interestingly different from all those listed above not only in its modelled style (which is more confident than at Great Ayton, for example) but also in the plant ornament used as a background which links it to Carolingian/Ottonian crucifixes rather than to earlier purely Anglian sources. The staff-crucifix at Kirkburton (pls. 109-10) is also distinctive in its modelled technique, and in the Anglian interlace which decorates the shaft: it could have been influenced by Ottonian crucifixes but also suggests either a strong continuing Anglian tradition, or a revival of Anglian art like that which took place at Durham in the late pre-Conquest period (see chaps. 3 and 10). Both these crosses are very unlike the Yorkshire crosses listed above and are even more distinct from those discussed below in the types of ornament added to the background of the scene. Both are in the 'loincloth' group (though the evidence from Sherburn is lacking) and indicate a break both from the earlier Anglian and Irish-Scandinavian traditions which were so strong in Yorkshire.

The remaining cross heads in this section have no evidence for figures accompanying Christ but have interlace or twist (or animal) elements above and below Christ's arms or above his head, or a circle or boss superimposed on the figure of Christ. The first group are Brompton (pl. 36); Conisholme (pl. 37); Finghall, where traces below the arms could be double-edge mouldings rather than the spear and sponge (pl. 108); Kirklevington I (pl. 35); Sinnington (pl. 39); Thornton Steward I (pl. 42); Thornton Steward III where the compartment in the upper arm is missing (pl. 38); York I (pl. 103); and the staff-crucifix at Kirkdale (pl. 115). All are in Yorkshire except one, from Lincolnshire. The interlace motif above the head could have

come from the related Irish tradition (see pl. 58) but the remaining motifs could have been adopted in England. They are found on both Irish-Scandinavian linked monuments and on 'mixed' type crosses (see chaps. 7 and 11) but never on crosses which continue in strictly Anglian traditions. The group with boss or circle remains as close knit as in its discussion in chap. 7. They are at Brigham (pl. 52); Lancaster II (pls. 49a and b); Stanwick I (pl. 44); Thornton Watlass I and II (pls. 46-8). All are related to the development of the robed Christ and there is a strong Irish/Scandinavian link here too, even though the Lancaster cross head suggests it has adapted to local, Anglian tastes.

Christ alone is represented twice on hogbacks: at Gosforth II (pls. 126-7) though some observers have seen additional figures; and the destroyed York II where, if it is a Crucifixion, it is related to the Irish-Scandinavian and 'mixed' groups with twists and other decorative elements (pl. 120). Both are from areas where stone crucifixes were known, and could have been influenced by their iconography.

The apparent rarity of the iconography of Christ crucified without other figures, outside areas where the crucifix head was also popular needs further comment. The earliest surviving example of the stone crucifix in England is the Rothbury cross which could well have been the focus for devotional worship (see chap. 9). As I have shown elsewhere it is difficult to show the particular function of many stone crosses (chap. 5) but some at least of the later crosses could still have had a devotional function. Kirkburton is a possible example (chap. 11). Others could well have been funerary monuments, however. Their iconography could still have been influenced by crucifixes in other media such as wood or metal, especially as these became increasingly common from the tenth century. Restriction of space inherent in the form, and in the small size of the cross head (relative to some Irish crosses, for example) could also have influenced the development of a simplified iconography: indeed the use of space-filling decorative devices

on some carvings where Irish counterparts had angels and other figures, and early crosses in the Anglian tradition were also more elaborate, suggests this. A further cause may also have been the popularity of the free-standing cross in northern areas in the late period: its popularity attested not only by numbers but by the varying degrees of competence with which it was carved (see concluding section below). A factor in the process of simplification could easily have been the relatively incompetent craftsman producing works for a wider (and humbler) range of patrons than can be posited for Rothbury or Kirkburton.

That the stone crucifix in the later part of the pre-Conquest period had a limited regional appeal seems shown by the surviving material from Northumbria north of the Tees, the area in which it seems to have developed in Anglian art. No stone crucifix has survived from Northumberland from the late ninth to the eleventh centuries, and only the fragment from Billingham and Hart II (see (c) below) from County Durham. Both Crucifixion scenes from Durham itself are empanelled at the centre of the head, and do not treat the cross head as a crucifix (see (c) and (d) below).

Cross shaft panels and architectural sculptures also have a regional distribution in the surviving material. Wherever they were used they seem to have been seen as suitable vehicles for a more narrative type of iconography. As I pointed out above, the evidence for the iconography of Christ alone in architectural sculpture is largely of the negative kind from works which could be incomplete. It is found, however, in late Anglo-Saxon art in ivory carvings (mostly of uncertain provenance) and manuscripts attributed to southern English monasteries, though it does not seem to have been common (Beckwith 1972, pls. 67, 70, 73 (all with Manus Dei) and 66; Temple 1976, pls. 261 (with Manus Dei), 45, 255). There seems, therefore, a clear relation between regional choice of monument type and the preference for a more or less limited iconography. This relationship, however, does not necessarily reflect differences in Church building (in either design

or technique) or in liturgical developments in different areas, since both crucifixes and group scenes could have been supplied in other media in all areas. They are more likely to reflect social differences between patrons and sculptors from different areas, such as those discussed in part (iii) below.

(b) Christ accompanied by one attendant figure

This assymmetrical arrangement is found only once, on Lancaster III (pl. 128) where the subsidiary figure is clearly the spear-bearer. It is uncertain whether other elements would have been represented above Christ's arms, especially if this were a staff-crucifix. The cross is a crude one, and the iconography could have been limited by the available space. It is interesting that even here the evidence is of the spear- and sponge-bearers as the preferred choice (see (c) below).

(c) Christ accompanied by two figures

Christ and the spear- and sponge- (or vessel-) bearers as the only accompanying figures appears certainly or possibly only nine times, seven of them on cross shafts.

The only architectural sculpture which possibly had this arrangement is Hexham I (pls. 26-31) where, however, they have not survived. Their original presence is suggested because of the common choice of these two figures by Insular painters, sculptors and metalworkers, out of the greater ranges available in the Early Christian and Byzantine depictions with the robed Christ which provided the models (see chap. 6). Byzantine artists who limited themselves to two subsidiary figures more commonly chose John and Mary (see for example Schiller 1972, pl. 331) so the Insular choice seems to have been a deliberate one. Hexham II (pl. 32) has the spear- and sponge-bearers, and has lost the angels found on Hexham I, in the Durham Gospels (pl. 25) and on Irish versions, a new limitation which seems indicative of its provincialisation of the theme.

Scenes in which the spear- and sponge-bearers appear together with the

sun and moon are on Bradbourne II (pl. 79) in the pre-Viking period; Aycliffe (pl. 87); Nassington (pl. 129) and possibly at Penrith (pls. 123-4) at later dates. Scenes incomplete at the top but with spear- and sponge-bearers below are at Bakewell (pl. 80) probably of the early ninth century; and in Bothal II (pl. 89) from the Viking age in Northumbria. In all these scenes, the dress of Christ where visible, is the loincloth.

An incomplete sculpture, Hart II, is the only cross head which certainly had the implements carved by both these figures, though it is not certain whether they themselves were represented (pl. 97). It is not known whether any other element was represented. This carving is unique in the Mandorla-like use of the central ring of the cross head, which must have enclosed the upper half of Christ.

The distribution of the iconography with these two figures is very remarkable with the most southerly outlier at Nassington, and with Yorkshire (at all periods) unrepresented, and the north west (in the Viking Age) with one doubtful example at Penrith. Equally important is its apparent popularity among carvers who preferred the cross shaft as a vehicle. It seems that this choice became popular very early (Hexham I and II) and survived the transition from the robed to the loincloth iconography, and the acquisition of the sun and moon, since Aycliffe, for example, is quite late in the pre-Conquest period (chap.10). This suggests that this iconography became traditional in areas where its placing on the cross shaft also remained popular, and these seem to have been northern areas not as strongly affected as Yorkshire and the North West by Irish patterns for the cross head.

The original choice of these two figures, rather than Mary and John, may link with the interest in Doomsday expressed in Anglian poetry in relation to the Crucifixion (chap. 5) though it could also suggest an early Eucharistic interest in the blood from Christ's side.

This limited iconography has survived on some ivory carvings (but perhaps from other areas) attributed to Anglo-Saxon artists (Beckwith 1972, pls. 18) (?eighth century Northumbrian); 69 and 71) but seems to have occurred only

rarely on southern English manuscripts (Temple 1976, pl. 311).

Three northern monuments have unidentifiable figures beneath the cross. These are Ruthwell, where they were possibly the thieves but which links with the group above in the presence of the sun and moon (see chap. 9 and pl. 77); Bradbourne I, where the sun and moon did not appear (pl. 78); and Durham III, with the sun and moon (pl. 91).

The surviving sculptures with John and Mary only accompanying Christ are completely different in distribution, date range, and in range of monument type. Only one, a very late example, is on a cross shaft: from Harmston in Lincolnshire with the Manus Dei (pl. 132). All other examples are on architectural sculptures: at Bibury, where only Mary has survived and other figures too may be missing (pl. 155); Breamore, where they appear in a group with the sun and moon and Manus Dei (pls. 144-8); Headbourne Worthy, also with Manus Dei (pl. 149); Langford I (pls. 151-2); and Stepney with the sun and moon (pl. 150). Where the figure of Christ has survived in these scenes, he is always shown wearing the loincloth. None of these sculptures pre dates the tenth century; and their appearance in southern English art suggests that they, like the Christ figure types 2 and 3 (fig. 7) and the development of the large architectural sculpture were the results of new or continuing continental influence rather than an internal development from earlier Anglian models of which the only surviving examples are in the north. The iconography with John and Mary was popular among artists working in other media: in ivory (Beckwith 1972, pls. 38, 57-8, 72 and fig. facing p. 7) and manuscripts (Temple 1976, pls. 134, 142, 171, 254, 289, 312) and there is little difficulty in establishing its general popularity in southern England.

In the north the paired figures of John and Mary appeared flanking an empty cross at Halton, Burton-in-Kendal, and Kirby Wharfe (chap. 2 and pls. 3-5). These are all fairly late crosses which in various ways indicate some

mixing of traditions from Scandinavian and Anglian sources. They also indicate that in the tenth century northern artists were receptive to a new iconography in which Mary was represented as the new Eve, though Burton-in-Kendal in particular suggests that humble copiers took up the theme fairly quickly. It is interesting that this theme was taken up for depiction on cross shafts where it did not compete with the crucifix heads and staff-crucifixes in the same areas. The cross head Durham III which also belongs to a phase of renewal and new influence in the eleventh century possibly had these figures, and is certainly a break with local tradition in not having a clear depiction of the spear- and sponge-bearers. Unfortunately, however, as noted above, the figures on the cross are unidentifiable (pl. 91).

Only one other sculpture has two figures beneath the cross. This is Gosforth I, with its unique asymmetrical arrangement, and which is also unique in its Scandinavian iconography of a female figure which, following Bailey (1974) I have suggested could be identified with Mary Magdalene (chap. 12 and pl. 125). The retention of the spear-bearer from that pair of figures can perhaps be compared with the cruder sculpture Lancaster III (see (b) above) but the choice and arrangements of figures and elements (which includes a double-headed snake) possibly as an adaptation from a more complex group scene in the Carolingian tradition (chap. 12) seems to be entirely the work of a highly individual sculptor/designer.

(d) Christ accompanied by four figures

Christ is accompanied by four figures on only four sculptures (and by more than four on only two more, see (e) below). These are widespread in date and geographical location, and all are different in iconography and style.

The accompanying figures are ambiguous on the eleventh century cross head, ... Durham II (pl. 90) though like Durham III there is again a break with local tradition since the spear- and sponge-bearers are certainly not

present. At Auckland St. Andrew (pl. 34) the group comprises figures identifiable as John and Mary and the spear-bearer, while the area which could have contained the sponge-bearer is missing. The layout, with two figures behind the cross, is unique in English pre-Conquest sculpture. This is also the only robed Crucifixion scene in England or Ireland to include John and Mary, and is interesting evidence that in other examples the choice of the spear- and sponge-bearers was deliberate.

The third example is also from Northumbria north of the Tees but is probably tenth century in date. This is the cross at Alnmouth (pl. 84). Two of the four figures below the cross are damaged but could be either Ecclesia and Synagogue or the two thieves. The fact that one is turned away from the cross precludes identification with John and Mary. The remainder of the group, the spear- and sponge-bearers and sun and moon links this scene with a common choice of figures and elements in this area, although there are features which suggest that a newly introduced model was used. The architectural sculpture, Romsey I (pl. 140) implies a very similar model expressed in a southern English style, and with the popular choice in that area of the figures of Mary and John as well as the more unusual spear- and sponge-bearers. Angels also appear in preference to the sun and moon, although both these elements appeared in southern art. Plant ornament, more likely to be directly linked with a continental model is also used in contrast to Alnmouth where the iconography is adapted to a regional preference for interlace ornament. The expanded group image may have been less rare in the south, since some of the damaged and displaced roods may have had more figures originally.

(e) Groups with six or more figures

Only two scenes have more complex groups with six or more figures. One is at Sandbach which is unusual for its use of John and Mary (see (c) above) and where as well as the sun and moon the symbols of the four evangelists are also grouped about the cross. This is the only occasion when evangelist

symbols appear with a Crucifixion in English pre-Conquest sculpture, although the theme occasionally appeared in English ivory carvings (Beckwith 1972, pls. 47, 68, 74). Their rarity in connection with the Crucifixion should be compared to the frequency with which they appeared with the Lamb: on Hart I, Wirksworth, perhaps Ramsbury; and Durham I (pls. 11-14). Sandbach is also unusual in English sculpture in having a Nativity scene brought into close relationship with the Crucifixion.

The Newent slab is a special case since though it is accompanied by only four figures beneath the cross, two of these are Donors (or the commemorated) a theme rare in England outside a few southern manuscripts; while around this central group are an extraordinary variety of additional figures and elements in an unusually crowded scene (pl. 139). These include circles, possibly representing the sun and moon; angels and figures carrying the symbols of the Passion (paralleled in English sculpture only on the reverse of the Rothbury cross head; pl. 82); and scenes which refer to the Fall and Redemption. The carver of this miniature slab clearly had the kind of scene found usually in delicate miniature ivory carvings in mind: and did not take only the central part of such a scene as did the carvers of Alnmouth, Sandbach, Romsey I and Gosforth I.

The relative position of paired figures - whether they are on the right or left of Christ, for example - has sometimes been considered a distinguishing feature, either of a region or of the source of an iconography. Many English sculptures are too worn to distinguish figures or elements individually however, even though they may be recognisable as a pair. What evidence there is has been summarised in an appendix to this chapter.

ii The Regional Distribution of Minor Elements

The lists in volume II, section II, are the basis of the following analysis, as they were of the section on the grouping of figures (see i above). Some minor elements have been adequately covered by the preceding section. Such are the decorative motifs associated only with cross heads (see i(a)

above). It is worth noting, however, that the sun and moon appear on cross shaft scenes in the areas which in the pre-Viking period were the kingdoms of Northumbria and Mercia, and on the cross head from Durham, in the same area and otherwise in sculptures in the south of England. They are linked with the development of the loincloth iconography and have a strong Carolingian connection wherever they appear in English art. Angels have a similar distribution although they occur with the early robed type at Hexham I, as well as with the loincloth, Carolingian type at Rothbury. Apart from these and their possible appearance in the ?Daniel scene on Durham IV (pl. 60) they appear only in southern English examples. It is curious, however, that angels do not seem to have survived the reintroduction of the robed type into Yorkshire and the north west, associated with Scandinavian settlers although they are found in association with this type in Ireland (see chap. 7). The Manus Dei is also a southern feature, found further north only on the very late cross shaft from Harmston, and on the curious carving with the empty cross from Lindisfarne (pl. 8).

iii The Relationship between Regional Variations and the Art of Other Areas

In Chapter 1, the only two previous studies to consider the pre-Conquest sculptured Crucifixion either on a national basis, or on the basis of a region confined by pre-Conquest rather than modern boundaries, were mentioned and briefly discussed. Collingwood (1927a, 99-105) presented his discussion as an analysis of the evolution of a monument type, the crucifix head, rather than of the sources and development of an iconography. He also presented it as a regional study, however, and the limited geographical distribution of the stone crucifix has been supported by the present study, although the various sources of influence have also been explored. Collingwood made no attempt, however, to compare the developments he noted in Northumbria with any in other areas of England. The earlier

study by Allen (1887, 158) which attempted to distinguish a 'Saxon' type of Crucifixion iconography has stood up less well, although of course, as was noted in chapter 1, it predated the discovery or adequate publication of many of the sculptures discussed in the present thesis. The robe, for example, which Allen saw as an 'Irish' characteristic, has been shown to have been adopted in the 'Hiberno-Saxon' phase of Northumbrian art, and to have been reintroduced into southern English art in the south in the late pre-Conquest period, as well as to have had a period of popularity in Yorkshire and the North West in areas of Scandinavian settlement (where however it did have an Irish connection). His other main criteria: the sun and moon, and the preference for John and Mary, have been shown to have both a period and a regional significance, but do not distinguish a 'Saxon' type, since in fact they occur (or have survived) on only a minority of the sculptures. Clearly there was no iconography of the Crucifixion which was characteristic of the whole pre-Conquest period, or of the whole of England at any one time within that period. There are, therefore, no general conclusions to be drawn from the mass of the material. On the other hand, there are some very interesting points to be made by looking more closely at the sculpture in a way that has been implicit throughout the previous chapters: that is by considering the development of the iconography of the Crucifixion in Christian art, and especially Western Christian art, and then noting where pre-Conquest carvers followed parallel lines of development and where they diverged. If the sculpture as a whole is looked at in this way, then it divides up rather interestingly into three major groups, one of which crosses both regional and period lines.

(a) Areas in which Iconography Developed in Parallel with Continental (Western Christian) Art

It is interesting to note that if sculptures from Northumbria and Mercia of the pre-Viking period; and from southern England in the tenth and eleventh centuries only are considered, the iconographic developments observable in them can be closely paralleled in the work of contemporary

continental schools.

The first phase was not strictly confined to the area of the Western Church, since the earliest iconography found in England was developed in Early Christian and Early Byzantine art, and reached Ireland as well as Northumbria. This is the early robed group in Northumbria, represented by Hexham I and II and Auckland St. Andrew (pls. 26-34). This iconography was accepted by Insular artists generally, and was adapted to local figural styles in both Ireland and Northumbria, though Irish as well as Northumbrian artists showed a preference for the figures of the spear- and sponge-bearers (see chap. 6 and section 1 above). It reached Northumbria at a time when this area was thriving politically and culturally, when Bede was among the foremost of European scholars (and showed an interest in representations of the Crucifixion) and ecclesiastics were active in promoting contacts with Gaul and Rome, and who are recorded as bringing back pictures for the decoration of their churches, as well as books and other objects, from their continental journeys (see chaps. 4-6). That the robed iconography was known and used in a monastic context at this period (late seventh to early eighth century) is attested by the miniature in the Durham Gospels (Durham MS A.II.17; see pl. 25) which shares several important features with Hexham I and II (chap. 6). Hexham I is an architectural sculpture from Wilfrid's and Acca's great church at Hexham; Hexham II and Auckland St. Andrew are both on large and prestigious monuments. All are in different styles of carving with Hexham I apparently as the least 'provincialised'. These all show connections with other works at major monastic centres (chap. 6). The implication would seem to be that the church was the patron, and that it was a church very closely in touch with contemporary iconography: all elements on these crosses, including the plant ornament on Hexham II and Auckland St. Andrew are owed to Mediterranean influences brought to England as a result of the conversion, and particularly to the acceptance of continental and Roman influence through the triumph

of Roman Christianity at the Synod of Whitby in 663-4.

The second phase began at a date more difficult to determine, when Northumbrian sculptors apparently abandoned the robed Christ (and in so doing diverged from the practice of their contemporaries in Ireland) and accepted a development which also took place in Carolingian art, perhaps as early as the eighth century but certainly by the ninth (chap. 9). This new iconography included the depiction of Christ in the loincloth and in ninth century Carolingian art the sagging figure of Christ suffering and dead on the cross also occasionally began to appear. The expanded Carolingian image included other figures, mostly unknown in English carving at least of this early date, and especially was distinguished by prominent depictions of the sun and moon, frequently personified. These classical symbols were accompanied by a 'classicising' style, more modelled and naturalistic than in most earlier Merovingian work. In English work in Northumbria and Mercia up to perhaps the mid-ninth century, the same tendencies can be seen, even though the most expanded image shows only two figures (commonly the spear- and sponge-bearers) beneath the cross; and the sun and moon above. The Rothbury cross with its angel and the figures carrying Passion symbols on its opposite face (pls. 81-2) shows the most striking links with Carolingian ivories (chap. 9) but is also the work of an Anglian artist fully at home with the locally favoured medium of the free-standing cross; not only in his use of animal and interlace patterns as well as plant motifs and figural scenes on the shaft (Collingwood 1927a, fig. 95) but in his adaptation of the cross as a crucifix. Ruthwell also shows signs of having adopted the type 2 figure rather than the stiffly upright figure found on earlier and contemporary works. All examples surviving from this phase are, however, as in the first phase, on large and prestigious monuments: at Ruthwell, Bradbourne, Bakewell and Rothbury (pls. 77-82).

Lamb depictions from this period are also on grand monuments: Hoddon,

Hart and Wirksworth (pls. 10-12). Only Wirksworth is clearly a grave marker (it is a tomb cover) but it like the rest is clearly meant to be a splendid public and didactic monument with its close packed narrative and devotional scenes.

The implication here is that the church in the pre-Viking period was, if not necessarily the only patron, strongly organised with its own art schools, in which new ideas could be received, and from which they could be disseminated. Even the panelled layout of crosses suggests an ecclesiastical source, in the series and cycles of pictures we know were brought back to adorn churches. The standard of workmanship in all these monuments is, at the least, highly competent, which in itself suggests trained sculptors rather than local masons supplying a local market.

Only the small slab from Whithorn (which may be earlier than the Anglian settlement of Galloway, see chap. 2) is the work of a craftsman of modest competence, and even this was produced in an ecclesiastical milieu and one which had links with Merovingian Gaul.

It is impossible to know the development or even the appearance of Crucifixion iconography outside these two kingdoms in the period up to c.850, since no depiction in any medium which has been attributed to an Anglo-Saxon artist has survived. Nevertheless it is in Southern England - Wessex - in the tenth and eleventh centuries - that one next finds developments which parallel continental developments. These are in some ways different from the early northern sculptures, however. In particular, John and Mary are preferred to the spear- and sponge-bearers; and other elements found in the expanded Carolingian image were also adopted, such as the Manus Dei and the snake beneath the cross (see lists, volume II, section II; and part 1 above). Christ figures types 2 and 3, which also originated in ninth century Carolingian art, are also found in this area: at Breamore (pl. 146); Headbourne Worthy (pl. 149); Langford I (pl. 151); and Stepney (pl. 150). The latest (and only) treatment of Christ in the north tending

in this way is on the Ruthwell cross (pl. 77). One example of this iconography is found in later sculpture in the East Midlands (see below).

Many of these southern sculptures are on a grand scale, and although in various styles, none is negligible in technical competence. All but Newent are architectural, a major difference from the northern scene in the late period. The style of some such as Romsey II (pl. 141) as well as the details of the iconography, the scale, and the development of the architectural rood, suggests new contacts with major continental centres such as would arise from the monastic revival ^{which} began under Alfred and continued in the next century. The scale of the works suggests wealthy patrons and the up-to-date developments in the iconography also suggests the influence of well-informed ecclesiastical centres, such as are known from the many manuscripts also surviving from southern England in this period. The grandeur of the monuments (in comparison with the later northern scene, below) may however reflect the comparative difficulty in some southern areas of obtaining good workable stone, thus confining its use to the rich.

Sculpture was certainly produced for lay patrons in the south in these later centuries although there is little evidence for it in the surviving Crucifixion sculpture. Newent was clearly made for private rather than public use, since it was buried in a grave rather than displayed but the patron or the sculptor seems to have had direct access to a miniature ivory carving, perhaps a book cover, as a model. The only other grave markers with related themes are on Winchester I (pl. 9) and Weyhill (pl. 7), and even these are related to contemporary developments found in the monastic art of manuscripts, and in ivory carvings which also have been considered to emanate from Winchester (chap. 2).

The robed rood at Bitton (pls. 64-6) points to Ottonian influence, as does the Manus Dei at Walkern (pls. 62-3) although this and Langford II (pl. 61) suggest a wider range of contacts both with Italy and, possibly, the conservative art of Ireland (chap. 8). All are on a grand scale,

however, which distinguishes them from late works in Yorkshire which were certainly dependent on Irish models (below).

To my mind there is little evidence of the late Byzantine influence on Crucifixion iconography in the south seen for example by Casson and Talbot Rice (see chap. 13): development in both iconography and style seems best explained as a result of continuing interaction with Carolingian and Ottonian art, which would have been maintained through trading and political contacts and through the international organisation of the church.

(b) Areas in which Iconography in the Western Tradition Failed to Develop from the Ninth Century

In Northumbria, north of the Tees, Crucifixion iconography seems to have 'frozen' at the point it had reached by the first half of the ninth century. The theme continued to be carved on cross shafts (pls. 84-9) and, though apparently more rarely, on cross heads in the Rothbury tradition (see Billingham pls. 95-6 and Hart II, pl. 77). The iconography continued to be modelled on the Carolingian type found in the pre-Viking period at, for example, Bradbourne and did not revert to the earlier type of Hexham I and II and the Durham Gospels. New models seem to have arrived in the area in the late ninth and the tenth centuries: evidence was found for this at Alnmouth, Bothal II, and Aycliffe. The elements chosen from these, however, and the stance attributed to Christ, remained the same as in the pre-Viking period. The type 2 figure of Christ at Ruthwell does not seem to have been followed up at all. There are traces of influence from the more Scandinavian areas to the south and west in the simplicity of Bothal I (and in other decoration on this stone). At Durham, after 995, there is evidence of new iconographical influence in the Lamb scenes (pls. 14-15) and the Crucifixion scenes (pls. 90 and 92) and these are possibly traces of external, perhaps southern English, influence in a more settled period: even here, however, the new scenes are placed in a context (of traditional forms of layout and with interlace patterns) which still suggests a harking back to pre-Viking Anglian art. The picture presented by these

sculptures suggests conservatism in an Anglian tradition, and a church which was not acting as a clearing house for new ideas except perhaps at the very end of the period. The Alnmouth and Aycliffe crosses, and the Durham cross heads are, though crude in their figure carving, all competent works of sculpture on a fairly large scale, though they cannot be reconstructed at the scale of Ruthwell or Rothbury. The monumental Alnmouth was however clearly a memorial to an individual and for none of these crosses can a public, didactic function be as certainly claimed as for the crosses of the earlier period in the same area. The small, crude crosses at Bothal (pls. 88-9) suggest the emergence of several grades of sculptor, some working at a village or local level, and this possibly implies a change in the system of the patronage.

The shrinkage and political decline of Northumbria, accelerated by Viking attacks in the eighth century and by the Scandinavian invasion and settlement of areas to the west in the ninth century, while territory in Scotland was also lost, could account for the cutting off of fruitful contacts with continental art apparent in the conservatism of Crucifixion iconography. Northern Northumbria remained semi-independent in the Viking age (Symeon 1882a, 114) while at the same time its old monastic and ecclesiastical organisation was virtually destroyed (see Symeon 1882, 109). The lack of evidence for monasteries in the north in the late period apart from the struggling Lindisfarne community (see Cramp 1976) lends credence to the view that the church was no longer in a position to receive and disseminate new ideas or to patronise works on a grand scale. The lack of architectural sculpture (with any form of figural sculpture) is further evidence of its state. What artistic influence there was seems to have been directed at preserving and reviving the heritage of its hey-day, even at the end of the period.

Some sculptures in Yorkshire such as Great Ayton (pls. 98-9) show a similar conservatism but the picture in Yorkshire and the North West is very different in some respects, and also more varied.

(c) Areas in which Iconography Showed Strong Irish-Scandinavian Influence

Sculptures in Yorkshire and the North West which showed an Irish link have consistently stood out as closely related to each other in iconography as well as in chronological and geographical range. It was also clear, however, that the purely 'Irish' phase was relatively short-lived, and that the patterns adopted from Ireland were quickly influenced by Anglian traditions which did not die out (see especially chaps. 7 and 11). Clearly the Scandinavian settlements of these areas was the decisive factor in introducing sculptors who knew Irish models, or in turning Anglian sculptors to Irish models. In chapter 7 I suggested that the influence was indeed one way, from Ireland, because of the ninth century date attributed to the Irish material; because the English work represents a simplification (and frequently a debasement) of the best Irish work; because of the apparent falling together of Irish and Anglian types in England; and because the 'Irish' patterns in England are so closely confined within areas of strong Scandinavian influence and settlement, traceable in monument forms as well as in iconography. The last two points, in particular, suggest that the short-lived kingdom of York (919-54) with its strong Irish link, was the vehicle by which the Irish robed cross head iconography was conveyed. J.T. Lang has pointed out that one of the Castledermot crosses (from which the Crucifixions are represented in pls. 53-4) has on one side a ring twist motif in a flat band style not common in Ireland, but usual in Viking age sculpture in England¹. This too supports the Scandinavian kingdom in York as the link between the work of Irish carvers and Scandinavian or Anglian carvers working in northern England.

The number of monuments in Yorkshire and the North-West; the great variations in technical competence; and the almost total victory of the cross head over all other monument types for this theme, suggest an even greater variety of

¹In a private communication.

patrons and sculptors, of varying degrees of wealth and education, than was suggested even for Northumbria, north of the Tees in the same period.

There were sculptors of great competence working in several different styles who showed great interest in iconography, like the carver of Thornton Steward I (pl. 42) and Gosforth I (pl. 125). The latter possibly had as a model a carving in the Carolingian tradition which he adapted in his own style and to his own purposes (chap. 12A). The carver of Kirkburton, too (pls. 109-10) could have been conscious of works in other media, such as large metalwork crucifixes, and perhaps these were imported in the tenth century. The sculptors of the 'empty cross' scenes at Halton, Kirby Wharfe and Burton in Kendal (pls. 3-5) may have been conscious of an iconography paralleling Mary/Eve which is also found in continental art in the tenth and eleventh centuries (chap. 2). Certainly York cannot have been cut off from continental art traditions even if for a time its political interests also centred on Ireland. Sculpture discovered there and at Nunburnholme attests to scenes not found in work of the pre-Viking period depicted in regional styles (Pattison 1973; Lang 1976).

Much of the surviving material with the Crucifixion however shows neither a high standard of technical skill, nor any great interest in iconography or its development. Most carvers were clearly copying standard designs found on much grander monuments, like the carver of Great Ayton (pl. 99) in the Anglian tradition; or Kirklevington I (pl. 35) in the Irish. These two are both reasonably competent and reasonably close to the originals. Other carvers copied less competently and perhaps based their work on monuments which were already slightly debased copies. Kirby Hill I (pl. 102) and Stanwick I (pl. 44) are examples of such humble copying in the Anglian and Irish traditions respectively. The mixing of the two types in such a situation would have been inevitable, and the doubt about the dress of Christ on many cross heads was possibly present originally and indicative of a lack of iconographic knowledge on the part of sculptors. These heads

in themselves constitute evidence that by the tenth and eleventh centuries village or local sculptors had become established serving local needs.

The situation contrasts sharply both with the apparently monastery centred art of Northumbria in the period up to the mid ninth century, and with the situation in southern England where monastic art centres were also strong.

The East Midlands has not been mentioned in this summary since it offers a more confused picture while at the same time the monuments spread throughout the area are too few to allow any general conclusions. Scandinavian influence is found at Conisholme (pl. 37) as one would expect in the Danelaw, but there is also a cross shaft in the conservative Anglian tradition at Nassington (pls. 129-31); and a type 2 figure of Christ as in the south at Great Glen (pl. 138). Possibly however this area between the Kingdom of York and the south would have been open to influence from all sides. The distribution of sculpture in this area seems to reinforce the point that the centre for architectural sculptures in the Carolingian/Ottonian tradition was the south of England, and that the centre for Irish influence was Yorkshire.

The iconography of the Crucifixion in pre-Conquest England clearly shared in developments which also took place in western Christian art in areas where, and at times when, the ecclesiastical and monastic organisation was firmly established: that is, in Northumbria and Mercia in the pre-Viking age, and in Southern England in the late ninth to the eleventh centuries. Undoubtedly this was not only because a strong well-organised church was a great patron in itself, but also because it acted as a clearing house for new ideas. Outside the south in the late period, England was changed politically as a result of the Viking settlements though these did not affect all areas in the same way or to the same degree. Northumbria north of the Tees was not affected so directly as Yorkshire, but the process of shrinkage within smaller borders (which had begun before the Viking age) was accelerated, and its pattern of ecclesiastical and monastic

organisation was considerably modified, though not entirely destroyed. The conservatism of its Crucifixion iconography could well reflect the inability of the church to do more than mark time until its apparently sole surviving monastic community was established with official protection, at Durham. The Scandinavian Kingdom of York and other movements of Scandinavian settlers were clearly equally important further west and south, and indeed decisive in introducing Irish forms of conservatism in Crucifixion iconography into England. In these areas, however, it is even more apparent that patronage had become local rather than church-dominated and this possibly suggests both a social and an ecclesiastical reorganisation which did not affect the south of England with its more intact institutions.

Appendix. The 'right side' tradition in pre-Conquest sculpture

The symbolic meaning attributed to Christ's right side has frequently been noted, especially with reference to the relative positions of the spear-bearer and the sponge-bearer. The writings which influenced this attribution have been summarised by Gurewich (1957), *who* summed up by reference to St. Augustine for whom the right side symbolised vita aeterna and the wound was the place from which flowed the Sacrament and the Church was born:

For the Church, the Lord's bride, was created
from His side, as Eve was created from the side
of Adam.

Gurewich 1957, 359!

Barb (1971) further pointed out the use of a special Easter anthem which referred to water flowing from the right side of the Temple, in support of the suggestion that this idea would have been a familiar one in the early medieval period. Both supported the view that exceptions in which the spear-bearer was placed on Christ's left were based on earlier models such as the fifth century ivory box in the British Museum and the

1. See Augustine on Psalm CXXVII in C. C. S. L. XL, esp. pp. 1875-6.

Perm Silver bowl (Schiller 1972, pls. 322-3), with the 'right side tradition' established for the first time in the sixth century Rabula Gospels (pl. 16). It should be noted of course that there are very few surviving Crucifixions of any type from before this date (see chaps. 4, 6 and 9). Morey (1953, 136) held that the left side position as on the British Museum box was an early western tradition which was adopted at an early stage by Irish carvers who made it a rule. This seems very doubtful, however, since the early type represented by the British Museum ivory with its narrow loincloth (see chap. 9) does not seem to have been the iconography which influenced the earliest Insular works (chap. 6). Henry (1967, 160-1) has indeed questioned this assumption, pointing out the spear-bearer does appear on the right in many Irish monuments, in accord with the commentary on the Mass in the Stowe Missal, c.800, which demonstrates that the 'right side' tradition was generally familiar at this date (see Henry 1967, 161, fn. 1).

Of the English pre-Conquest sculptures, the figures of the spear-bearer and sponge-bearer are in several cases now indistinguishable, but in only one instance the spear-bearer is identifiably on Christ's left. This is on the cross shaft at Nassington, Northamptonshire, where the large scale, ^{and} heavy frontality of the two half figures seems to owe nothing to an Irish model, ^{while} the sun and moon clearly point to traditions established in ninth century Carolingian art. It may be that this is not in fact the sole exception, though this cannot be determined from the worn and damaged state of many sculptures. Nothing can be argued from the reversal at Nassington which could have been due to the ignorance of an individual.

Mary also appears most commonly on Christ's right, in a tradition also probably dating from the sixth century. Again a few pre-Conquest sculptures are too worn or too crude for these figures to be distinguished, but exceptions to the right side position when apparent seem more easily interpretable than in the case of Nassington. At Auckland St. Andrew,

for example, (pls. 33-4) the position of Mary may have been dictated by her position in the Annunciation scene above. Other possible exceptions in the Empty Cross scenes at Halton, Burton in Kendal, and Kirby Wharfe (pls. 3-5) could have been caused by a need to parallel Mary with Eve, who was usually shown on Christ's left, with the 'good' side reserved for Adam (see chap. 2).