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ABSTRACT

This thesis consists of a survey of events and material culture in Cumbria for the period between the withdrawal of Roman troops from Britain circa AD 410, and the Viking settlement in Cumbria in the tenth century.

An attempt has been made to view the archaeological data within the broad framework provided by environmental, historical and onomastic studies. Chapters 1-3 assess the current state of knowledge in these fields in Cumbria, and provide an introduction to the archaeological evidence, presented and discussed in Chapters 4-8, and set out in Appendices 5-10. The archaeological material is constantly related to currents in other disciplines and vice-versa. The concluding chapter concentrates on selected, general themes related to the data considered and its limitations.
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INTRODUCTION

This thesis is an attempt to explore events, material culture and settlement in Cumbria in the centuries between the end of Roman rule and the Viking settlement in the north-west. The period was selected because it is of interest to the writer; the area, because it has been largely neglected by archaeologists in practical terms until recently, and also because it is an area of considerable interest, though not perhaps of political importance, in the post-Roman centuries.

In the event, and in spite of much help from local fieldworkers and museum staff, 'archaeological' evidence in the strict sense proved to be in very short supply. No site of the period has ever been recognised as such and subsequently excavated, and the initial impression of a few settlement sites and cemeteries of doubtful attribution, some stray finds, and 'all those crosses' (Rahtz, 1974a, 130) which the term Early Christian usually conjures up, at least with respect to Britain, was depressingly apt. The only hopeful approach to this kind of situation was to set the material in its broadest possible context, and try and relate the meagre archaeological data to as much evidence as was available in other disciplines - environmental, historical, onomastic, etc.
Certain avenues of approach have, it is true, been neglected. Cumbria is a large area, and although it was possible to check sites in the field where there was any hope of this providing new information, it seemed pointless to even attempt to walk vast stretches of fellside, plain and valley in the faint hope that dateable sites hitherto undetected would leap to the eye. While the value of such work would doubtless prove enormous for the study of all periods in Cumbria, it is a project that should involve many people, and much more time than was available for practical work. For the same reason, it was not possible to delve beneath the pattern of modern and medieval settlement to discover earlier forms at any but the most superficial level; although it is this kind of study which perhaps offers the strongest hope for the future. Work has been started, but it will be a long time before it bears much fruit.

The emphasis of this research has been perforce largely oriented by the nature of the material studied. Because of the general unavailability of any bulk of data on almost every aspect, theories have been considered only in terms of overall probability. Attempts to quantify the evidence numerically or statistically have usually been avoided, for reasons which will become apparent. One may say here that one is almost always dealing with what appears to be a very small and unrepresentative sample. We have no very concrete methods with which to assess what has conditioned its survival, but some general consideration of the issue with respect to Cumbria is appropriate.
Archaeological data is largely recovered by two means: the chance discovery of material as the result of human or natural action, and the deliberate search for new sites or finds by groups or individuals whose interest is usually selective rather than all-embracing in various ways. The former process will frequently attract the attentions of the latter.

Chance discoveries (Appendix 10a) are usually made by people without any particular archaeological interest, and therefore the kind of material recovered by this means tends to be of a fairly obvious nature. This applies to both sites and finds in Cumbria. Objects of precious metal, for instance, or massive walls, sculpture and skeletons, are less likely to be missed than decaying objects of iron or bronze; and features such as postholes will never be spotted. Once the material is recovered from the ground there is still no guarantee that it will 'survive' as evidence. Valuable or interesting objects, such as the Kingmoor ring, or the Kirkoswald mount and hoard, may be brought to the attention of a landowner, but structural features or skeletons will be usually left in situ or destroyed. We will only learn of their existence if some interested person records the information and makes it available. What we learn from this kind of system is frequently at third or fourth hand. Two apparently 'independent' records may well give quite contradictory information, as in the case of the Warcop burial. An object may in turn pass through several hands before it is properly identified and described; at this
stage it may well have lost the record of its original provenance, nothing may be remembered of the circumstances of its finding, and it will be virtually useless for archaeological purposes. Thus we have a sword handle 'from Cumberland' and two extremely interesting but unprovenanced mounts from the Crosthwaite museum at Keswick.

Such chance finds will in any case be observed only within a limited range of human activity - usually destruction or development of some kind. Many chance discoveries are turned up by the plough, and it follows that since large parts of Cumbria are pastoral, or mountainous waste, these are relatively unpromising ground in this respect. Alternatively, the progress of destruction or development may be on too large a scale. Small objects are most unlikely to be observed in the course of modern opencast mining, urban demolition, and quarrying, although earlier methods of quarrying and gravel digging do not appear so destructive, and the quantity of archaeological material which comes to light in the course of these operations is surprising.

Until recently destruction of archaeological material in the ground was seen as an incidental result of widespread development. Nowadays most archaeological resources are geared towards the recovery of information in advance of development; but for large parts of Cumbria, as elsewhere, this has come rather late in the day. The destruction or radical alteration of much of the early rural landscape has already taken place, in medieval and modern times.
Afforestation has rendered large areas of marginal land archaeologically sterile in the recent past, but before the value of landscape studies was appreciated; while the building of reservoirs has been another destructive force which has continued more or less unabated since early modern times. Many archaeologists, but particularly those interested in material from Roman times, see 'destruction' in archaeological terms almost solely in the light of recent massive developments in towns, but in practice the destruction of the medieval landscape and Early Christian rural landscape is on a similar scale, and is in any case a part of the natural order of events. But the recent development of marginal land is serious because areas of prime land have naturally since earliest times been the most intensely settled, and each successive population removes the remains of former ones. Indeed, it is a commonplace for archaeologists to observe that the relatively high incidence of surviving sites in marginal areas must be weighed against the fact that the destruction of sites in more densely settled areas is earlier, and much more intensive. One would naturally expect a relatively high instance of surviving sites and a low instance of stray finds from the former, and a contrary trend in the latter.

Nonetheless, 'distribution' maps continue to be produced which take no account of this principle. In the writer's opinion we must assume that at least from the Roman period onwards, and perhaps from a much earlier date, it is reasonable to assume a variable but significant
density of population in all areas until proved otherwise, unless we are dealing with really inhospitable, barren and unproductive terrain. The surviving distribution of any particular class of settlement will reflect other factors apart from the real or original distribution; and certainly the most significant of these is the fact that physical survival of sites in upland areas or on open commons which have never been ploughed is much more common than physical survival in other areas. If we contrast two maps of different kinds which show evidence for settlement as distinct from evidence for burial or ritual, we will not necessarily get the same results. Let us compare, for instance, the map of Anglo-Saxon settlement names with the map of 'native'sites - Maps VII and VIII respectively. There is no direct correlation between individual sites, for obvious reasons; the former have survived largely because they are successful settlements, and the latter are known to us by definition as the abandoned sites of an earlier time (see below, Ch. 4). But there is also not much general correlation - the great concentration of settlement sites is away from the main areas of settlement in place-name terms - on the upland pastures of the Upper Eden Valley.

Nonetheless, it would seem naive and simplistic to claim that either of these two maps reflect the genuine distribution of settlement of the native or 'Romano-British' population on the one hand, and the Anglo-Saxon on the other. All that is really demonstrated is that the factors
controlling the survival of place-names and settlements are rather different. Modern settlements will conceal those of an earlier period in the same place. For these reasons, place-names are perhaps to be preferred as general indicators of settlement, rather than surviving abandoned and therefore presumably unsuccessful sites. We should be very cautious about using the term 'distribution map' about any archaeological data collected from marginal areas. It is only really legitimate to see our maps of cemeteries, sites and finds as location maps of recovered evidence.

The other means whereby archaeological material is collected - as the result of the interest and bias of groups or individuals in archaeological matters - must also be considered. Again, it has often been observed that many 'distributions' of archaeological finds mirror the distribution of archaeologists rather than the material itself. Cumbria has had a regional archaeological society producing a regular journal for over a hundred years, and it has a small network of local museums and active fieldgroups, but until relatively recently it has always lacked any full-time professional archaeologists permanently committed to working on Cumbrian archaeology. It received the sporadic attentions of various antiquarians such as Canon Greenwell, but has never produced a local antiquary of the stature of Bateman or Mortimer. W. G. Collingwood is, indeed, the only comparable figure. He knew Cumbria extremely well, and his opinions on many matters still stand today. His great interest was in Anglo-Saxon and Viking Age sculpture, but
he was also a conscientious and sceptical recorder, and his
general surveys of the archaeological material of all
periods (1923, 1926) are still the basis of later gazetteers\(^2\)
although they have obviously required considerable augmen-
tation.

Collingwood would hardly have seen himself as a field-
worker however, though he did organize and direct some
seasons of excavation, notably at Ewe Close (Collingwood,
W. G., 1908, 1909). These were perfectly adequate in terms
of the standards of the time, though of rather limited scale.
It is perhaps surprising that he never developed his talents
further in this direction. Indeed, apart from the perennial
perusal of Hadrian's Wall, Cumbria was to lack any large-
scale programme of excavation for several decades. Perhaps
because of the proximity of the Wall, the region has received
most attention from Romanists, and the later periods have
received relatively little attention since Collingwood's
death, until recent years.

In terms of fieldwork and discovery of new sites,
however, there were several developments. The publication
of the work of the Royal Commission on Historical Monuments
in 1936 is a landmark both in terms of actual standards of
recording and also of the comprehensive nature of the
evidence considered. Accurate surveyed plans of almost all
the then known earthwork sites of prehistoric and later date
were made available for a large part of Cumbria. This work
was to a certain extent complimented by the early flying
programmes of N. K. St. Joseph, who discovered several
cropmark sites in the lowland areas. Indeed, almost every new site has been automatically viewed in Roman terms before any other possibility has been considered. The excavations which were done concentrated on the problems of Roman archaeology rather than archaeology as a whole, and were more or less confined to the small-scale examination of the defences of Roman forts, or native sites. Some of this remains unpublished and some of it is of a very poor standard. Even the best work has not resulted in any great clarification of the main problems, and it is clear that much more work on a much larger scale will be necessary, geared to some rational programme of research objectives. Of much more recent years some initiative has come in this direction from the work of T. W. Potter and G. D. B. Jones, but again, their interests have been largely confined to Roman material.

The Viking material from Cumbria has been exhaustively studied by Dr. R. N. Bailey (1974) and it is clear from his work that the problems of settlement study are largely unaffected by any of the recent developments in Cumbrian archaeology. Indeed it is striking that in a study of every aspect of things Viking Dr. Bailey makes virtually no use of the fruits of excavation. The present writer finds herself in a similar position; the quantity of archaeological data collected by what we might term mode two, has at first pitifully little relevance to the period or the problems involved, apart from Collingwood's work. It is, however, possible to reconsider much of the Roman material in the light of recent work elsewhere, and although any conclusions
must be tentative until tested in the ground, she thinks that this is an essential avenue to explore.

Of course, not all the material dealt with here is of an archaeological nature and factors other than those which we have considered must be examined when we are dealing with history in the strict sense, place-names, or folklore. The writer has little claim to expertise in any of these fields, and must rely on the judgement of others. Most sectors of Early Christian society were illiterate, and the available documentation, however representative it may or may not be in terms of original quantity, is in any case likely to be heavily weighed in favour of the literate few. It is true that the laws do cater for all sectors of society, but the earliest surviving legal system of specifically Northumbrian origin does not pre-date the eleventh century, and is in any case mostly concerned with clerics.³ We can, of course, generalise from other areas but this approach rather begs the question, as we cannot be sure of the relevance of the comparison. Place-names are, if anything, rather more problematical. It is clear that many early names have disappeared, and been replaced by later ones, but we cannot draw direct conclusions from this in settlement terms. In some cases this may indicate a genuine break, but it is certain that the process works both ways, and that many later place-names denote settlements which have a much earlier origin (see below, p.108). It is also uncertain that the survival of an early name is a reflection of the settlement's original importance. Increasingly we are
being forced to consider place-names as individual relics, in the same manner as archaeological data. Even if we can date a particular name form, it does not follow that we know anything about the earlier or later history of the settlement which it denotes.

Folklore is often viewed as the lunatic fringe of history, but in reality it is something quite different. Our own mental separation from the attitudes and motivation of earlier pre-industrial societies in Britain is complete, and it is doubtful if we can ever hope to recover this kind of information from the physical or documentary evidence which survives. Much of folklore is local, popular pseudo-history, and while it should never be mistaken for history in the proper sense, it can offer explanations for observed phenomena which would otherwise elude us. Of course, much folklore is of relatively recent origin, and it is by no means easy to separate the legendary past from the legendary present. 'Tradition' is an ever changing perspective. Archaeologists have not always been happy in their use of folklore, and it is difficult, even for experts, to separate the wheat from the chaff. However, it is probably a relatively untapped resource, deserving of more attention. Having said this, however, it must be observed that the standards of folklore study in Cumbria are very poor. The only recent book on the subject (Rowling, 1976) is largely a synthesis of earlier published work, and almost nothing of real value has been done in the field. It is probably too late, now, to recover much more, and the writer's own
attempts at using the recorded material are relatively unsuccessful; there may be some hope for the future, but we would be overoptimistic to expect a substantial contribution.

Many of the avenues explored in this thesis are finite, in the sense that we cannot expect any more primary data, and can only view what survives in the light of present understanding. We cannot really expect more in the way of new documents or more early place-names, although new methodology may make for revision and reassessment. On the other hand, we can expect a great deal more from the ground, and from a proper understanding of the landscape. In the years in which the writer has been working on this project Cumbria has seen a considerable increase in both the number of excavations and in the scale of fieldwork. Every effort has been made to keep in touch with recent fieldwork, but it may seem that the present synthesis is premature. It is hoped, however, that the gaps and faults in the present study will indicate the direction in which future work should proceed. It should be seen as a view today, rather than an attempt at a definitive perspective.

The term 'Early Christian' is used in a chronological sense, to cover the period under study simply because it was felt necessary to express the latter in some kind of unitary sense. It may be that the period is in fact best divided into two, the sub- or post-Roman and the Anglo-Saxon; but in practical terms, as will be clearly shown, not all the material lends itself to what might at first seem a natural
division. There is also the added problem that there is still some dispute over when the Northumbrian conquest took place, and a line that must be taken as 'anytime in the late sixth to seventh century' is hardly a very precise divide. The terms post or sub-Roman and Anglo-Saxon will be used with frequency, but only when it is quite clear that we are dealing with material which belongs to one side or another of this span, such as the Anglo-Saxon sculpture. The term may not be totally uncontroversial or adequate, but it has the advantage of being at least true, which is more than can be said for some of the alternatives, such as Arthurian, Dark Age and Late Celtic, which are now in current use. It is also without obvious cultural bias; and it is the term generally used by Scottish and Irish historians. 'Cumbria' is simply the modern county of Cumbria - the area which was until recently comprised of the former counties of Cumberland, Westmorland and Lancashire North-of-the-Sands, as well as the parishes of Dent, Garsdale and Sedbergh, formerly in the West Riding of Yorkshire.

In this thesis, all measurements taken at first hand are given in metric values, and where metric measurements are taken from other sources, these alone are given. In instances where the original measurement was Imperial - as in the case of virtually all excavation reports and surveyed plans before the nineteen-sixties, for instance, the measurement is given as in the original, followed (in brackets) by the metric equivalent. This is to avoid the misleading impression of extreme accuracy conveyed when
Imperial measurements - correct only to the nearest inch, foot, or even yard - are directly translated into exact metric terms.
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CHAPTER 1

The Physical and Environmental Background

Although the area considered in this study has been administered as a single unit only in very recent times, natural barriers have given it a certain measure of isolation and separateness. The sea surrounds Cumbria to the north and west; the sands and tricky tides of Morecambe Bay separate it from north Lancashire to the south; while the Pennines form an effective barrier to the east. The only natural gaps are to be found in the north-east and south-west. In the north-east, the river valleys of the Tyne and Irthing form a continuous low-lying stretch, connecting the Carlisle Plain with the east coast. To the south-west, the Eden Valley is accessible from the Stainmore Gap in the Pennines, and is thus connected by the valley of the Greta with North Yorkshire; while the narrow Tebay Gorge links the Eden with the Lune valley and thus Lancashire.

Since the earliest times, these have been the pathways by which people have moved in and out of Cumbria. The Roman army built roads along them; this may have made access simpler, but these roads were built along natural routes, used by prehistoric man before them. The importance of the roads themselves should not be exaggerated.
Some parts of Cumbria are much more isolated than others. Therefore, the low-lying areas around Morecambe Bay – particularly on the north and east, the river valleys of the Winster, Gilpin, Kent and Lune, are fairly easily accessible from the south, and it might be argued that, geographically they are more linked with Heysham and Lancaster than with the rest of Cumbria. The sea can act as a barrier but can also enable passage between areas not connected by land routes. King Ecgfrith’s attack on Ireland in A.D. 684 may have been prompted by raids from the west; while it is evident that the tenth century Norse arrived from the sea.

Geology:

The solid geology of Cumbria has been compared to an onion (Hogg 1972). As a simplification, the comparison is valid enough; the 'centre' of the 'onion' is the Lake District, which consists of a core of ancient volcanic rocks and slates surrounded by rings of the younger rocks which have been eroded from the Cumbrian Dome centre. These are mostly limestones and sandstones. The surface has been profoundly modified by glaciation, however. The mountainous areas were subject to erosion by ice and melt-waters, and the accompanying climatic conditions. Great quantities of material were removed from the mountain tops, valleys were shaped and hollowed, and numerous channels for melt-water formed.

In the lowland areas, some erosion of natural features
took place, but much more significant was the deposition of quantities of glacial detritus. Clays, sands and gravels were deposited in the valley floors, and large areas were covered by great sheets of boulder clay. Drumlins, characteristic of glacial deposition, are now found throughout the Eden Valley and the Carlisle plain (Smailes, 1960, 39). Recent changes in the landscape are, by comparison, very minor. A rise in sea-level has resulted in the inundation of parts of the coastline in the course of the last few millennia, while the build-up of alluvium at estuaries, and in some places the reclamation efforts of man, have resulted in the recovery of other parts. Wind-blow sand has also been deposited along the coastline in recent times.

Although, as we have seen, in some respects Cumbria forms a natural unit, there is also considerable diversity, and the region is easily separated into distinctive parts, with many physical contrasts. Perhaps the most significant region in terms of human settlement has been the Eden Valley. The Eden flows north-west through a wide valley, from Mallerstang Common on the borders of North Yorkshire, to where it enters the sea at the Solway Firth. It is bounded to the east by the limestone escarpment of the Pennines, arising to heights of over 750 m. O.D. in places, and fringed to the west by a broken line of sandstone hills of no great height, sometimes called the Lazonby Fells. The lower slopes of the Pennines provide good sheep grazing
and would presumably have held the same attraction for early settlers. The present limit of farming is, approximately, between 210 m. and 300 m. O.D. (Smailes, 1960, 59) although different climatic conditions, and also interference by man, would affect the level of farmland and therefore the level of settlement. The Bewcastle Fells form a continuation of the Pennine escarpment north of the Tyne Gap, with a light soil cover which provides coarse grassland. Most of the Eden Valley is covered in glacial deposits of clay, sand and gravel, but in places the sandstone on which it lies emerges to provide light shallow soils. The sandstone hills are barren and heath covered, although in parts now afforested.

South and east of the Eden Valley are the limestone uplands, which form a broken though encircling rim around the Cumbrian Dome. Part of the limestone is covered with boulder clay - notably the area around Greystoke - but in other places a thin covering of soil provides excellent sheep-grazing, as the underlying rock is pervious and provides very good drainage. In some areas the bare rock is exposed, the surface showing the characteristic 'Karst' landscape where the pavement has been weathered and grooved, and supports vegetation in the clefts.

The central mountainous zone of the Lake District is the only large area in Britain over 750 m. O.D. Its natural beauty does not conceal the inhospitality of the landscape in terms of human settlement. Nonetheless, man has had a slender foothold in those parts since the first
agriculturalists penetrated the central mountains, to obtain the volcanic rock which they used to make axe-heads. The valleys of the Lake District are covered with glacial drift deposits, similar to those of the Eden Valley.

The Carlisle Plain stretches west and north-east of the lower reaches of the Eden. It is formed of mudstones and sandstones which are covered in deposits of boulder clay up to sixty metres deep. Drumllins are well formed in many areas, especially around Wigton. The lands around the Solway are low-lying and subject to flooding, and in places great mosses or flows, bogs of sphagnum peat, have developed in quite recent times, on top of the boulder clay.

The coastal plain is really an extension southwards of the Carlisle plain. Glacial deposits, including stretches of sands and gravels, cover most of the natural rock; north of St. Bees Head this consists mostly of coal measures and limestones; south of St. Bees, sandstones. It fringes the fells and mountains of the Lake District on the west.

The shores of Morecambe Bay have been greatly affected by recent changes in sea level. The deep river valleys cut by the glaciers, such as that of the Kent, have been flooded by the sea; these in turn have been filled with silt, both river and sea-borne. This flooding is continuous, and as a result, large tracts of coastal land are salt marsh, such as Winder Moor. However, in some places dykes and reclamation have succeeded in converting these into fertile land.
The great contrast in relief in the Cumbrian landscape is responsible for the tremendous regional variation in climate; rainfall increases with altitude. Scafell has an annual rainfall average of over 2540 mm. and snow can stay near its summit until well into spring; the west Cumberland coast has less than 1,000 mm. in an average year, and a small part of it, near Bowness, has less than 750 mm. The Eden Valley is in a rain shadow area, and most of it gets an average of 890 mm. per year. The Pennine Crest receives some of the benefit of this and is not as wet as the Lake District, with an average of just over 1,800 mm. of rain per year. This regional contrast would still have existed, even if climatic conditions now differ somewhat from those which prevailed in Early Christian times.

It is greatly to be regretted that detailed soil maps are not available for Cumbria. Even maps of drift-cover are lacking for some areas. It is to be hoped that this situation will soon be remedied. In the interim, only a very brief outline of regional diversities is all that can be offered. Detailed consideration of the potential which distinctive regions had for settlement is not possible without a reasonably detailed knowledge of the physical environment. Modern land classification maps such as those produced by the Ministry of Agriculture, are too generalised, and in any case are heavily weighted in terms of good arable land today. They can in no sense be equated with an early medieval valuation of farming resources. To both the native British and the intruding English, good
farmland would have been virtually always the most important natural resource; one would expect mineral resources to play a not unimportant but secondary role. It is only in very recent times that the Cumbrian population has tended to cluster around places with industrial development potential. Coal and haematite, found together in West Cumberland north of St. Bees Head, and also in Furness; rock salt on Walney Island; silver in the Tyne valley—all these could—and quite feasibly were—exploited by the Early Christian population, but resources of this kind are unlikely in themselves to have shaped the distribution of settlement.

Vegetation and Vegetational History

Cumbria has, by comparison with some other areas, received a considerable amount of attention from pollen analysts, and over sixty pollen diagrams are available for the area (Pennington, 1970). For the post-Roman and Anglo-Saxon periods however, this advantage is somewhat offset by two main factors: firstly, pollen analysts tend to sample areas of moorland and bog, where pollen samples are easily available, or else the sediments of lakes. This has resulted in a fairly heavy concentration of work in the Lake District, while other areas are neglected. Secondly, and partly as a consequence of this, many pollen diagrams do not show post-Roman activity. Those which do are indicated on Map 1. Sometimes, human or natural interference has removed the upper layers, containing the more
recent deposits. In other cases it is likely that the growth of bog itself and the associated climatic conditions were environmental factors which in themselves affected human settlement. As a result of these two factors the number of pollen diagrams which provide positive evidence of post-Roman activity is comparatively small, and many key areas are still to be investigated.

The importance of relating pollen studies to archaeological evidence must also be stressed. It is very rarely possible to relate levels in a pollen diagram directly to an artifact or a site; but it is essential that pollen diagrams be tied in with some form of dating, ideally a radiocarbon determination. It is disheartening to see how frequently environmentalists are satisfied to fit in their evidence with current (or even out of date) archaeological systems, rather than attempt an independent chronology which would offer some kind of check on what are frequently very uncertain archaeological timescales. When independent dating has been established it has frequently given archaeologists surprises.

Most of the Cumbrian pollen diagrams show considerable local diversity, even between sites that are quite close together, and from this it has been deduced that most of the pollen rain is strictly local in origin (Oldfield, 1963, 23), though pollen samples from lake deposits are less so than those taken from fen or peat bogs (Pennington, 1965a, 310). Nevertheless, certain phases of clearance seem to be common to virtually all areas and a brief resume of these is
necessary here, to set the evidence for the post-Roman and Anglo-Saxon environment in its context.

The first major impact of man on the Cumbrian vegetation detectable, the 'landnam' phase, has been dated by radiocarbon to circa 3000 B.C. (Oldfield, 1963, 30). The main characteristics of this phase are a sharp decline in elm pollen, and the first appearance of plantago lanceolata, usually interpreted as one of the weeds of cultivation, and in any case an indicator of a more open environment. These characteristics are apparent in diagrams from both lakeland and lowland sites. After this phase a recovery of the forest is clearly indicated in the diagrams for the Morecambe Bay area. There is a relative increase in tree pollen and a reduction in weed pollen, and in some places the evidence for human activity disappears completely e.g. at Thrang Moss (Oldfield, 1963, 33). In the Lake District the recovery of the forest is less marked, but it has been suggested that this is a result of soil change rather than continuous human activity. Pennington (Pennington, 1965a, 322) suggests that clearance was irreversible in the uplands, and that the habitat was permanently changed by each successive phase of clearance; while in the valleys, clearance was temporary, and regeneration took place after the 'landnam.' The elm itself fairly rapidly disappears from the uplands.

The next important clearance phase, in which cereal pollen makes its first appearance in the Morecambe Bay area at Thrang Moss and Ellerside Moss, has been dated to Late Bronze Age times. This phase is associated with a climatic
deterioration, which has been dated by radiocarbon to c.800-500 B.C., for North Britain. It has been proposed, as further evidence of Late Bronze Age activity, that the Corduroy road, traces of which were discovered in Hensington and Foulshaw Mosses at the beginning of this century, was built across the moss in response to its increasing wetness. Inland, the evidence for agricultural activity is much less noticeable at this phase (Smith, 1959, 125).

Pollen diagrams from the Lake District show a second strong clearance at all upland sites, after the 'landnam' phase. This has been named 'Brigantian'. This clearance is similar in many ways to that which took place in southern Britain during the Iron Age (Turner, 1970, 105) but does not seem to have begun in the Lake District until late Romano-British times. Radiocarbon dates obtained so far indicate a clearance episode spanning the third or fourth to sixth centuries A.D.: a date of A.D. \(390\pm130\) at Burnmoor Tarn and A.D. \(580\pm190\) at Devoke Water (Pennington, 1970, 72). These dates from these sites have been plotted by the writer using equal area bisymmetrical normal curves (Fig. 1.1). This phase has been detected so far in the diagrams of ten upland tarns in the north and west of the Lake District, and seems to have resulted in the permanent deforestation of those areas, and consequent soil erosion. In this case direct archaeological correlation has been possible: a humus layer at the bottom of a Romano-British field bank has been correlated with this clearance at
Devoke Water. Cereal pollens first appear in the uplands at this stage (Pennington, 1970, 72).

The diagrams for the Morecambe Bay area indicate that after the Late Bronze Age clearance and a relatively long episode of partial regeneration of the forest, there is a corresponding clearance in the lowland. At Helsington Moss a radiocarbon date of \( ^{14}C \) 436±100 has been obtained (Smith, 1959). At Ellerside Moss this episode has been divided into two phases. Initially, values for elm and ash drop, and the values for *Plantago lanceolata* increase. It has been suggested (Oldfield, 1963, 35) that this is indicative of the reduction of forest on better soils, and pasture. Then there is an indication of some forest regeneration, followed by a further increase in the pollen of weeds, and a noticeable reduction in oak pollen, indicative of some cereal cultivation as well as pasture.

Indications of a drier climate are associated with this episode: a retardation layer, which implies a temporary phase of dryness during an otherwise moist period, has been directly associated with the clearances at Foulshaw, Hensington and Ellerside mosses, and also at Holcroft Moss and Lindow Moss, in Lancashire and Cheshire respectively. A drier climate would have enabled the cultivation of cereals in the Lake District at a higher altitude than before or since, and is a factor which must be considered with regard to the distribution of settlement.

At Ehenside Tarn, on the west Cumbrian coastal strip, a calculated timescale (Walker, 1966) indicates extensive
agricultural activity and forest clearance spanning the fourth to eighth centuries, with a change in farming practice indicated by the appearance of new species, flax and hemp, shortly before A.D. 800 (Pennington, 1970, 72). After this, some forest regeneration, with limited agriculture, is indicated in the diagrams for the Morecambe Bay area. The pollen sequence at Ellerside Moss indicates a minor clearance before the major oakwood clearance, for pasture, which has been attributed to the Norse colonization. In the Lake District, there is a corresponding clearance attributed to Viking times, although it is likely that most of the Lake District uplands were already deforested before the Viking settlement in the valleys (Pennington, 1965a, 323). This clearance phase has not, however, been dated by radiocarbon. At Thirlmere a clearance episode occurs between the Brigantian and the Viking, doubtless corresponding to that detected at Ellerside Moss (Pennington 1965a, 319).

The radiocarbon dates pose considerable problems to the archaeological chronology which has been accepted by pollen-analysts themselves. It seems reasonably clear, both from the dates shown in Fig. 1.1 and the calculated timescale for the west Cumbrian lowland, that the first major forest clearance spans the late Roman and post-Roman centuries, and that consequently - at least with regard to those areas represented by the pollen-diagrams which show this clearance - the break with Roman government at the beginning of the fifth century was not marked by any corresponding disruption of agricultural activity.
This is also indicated by evidence from elsewhere. Recent work in County Durham indicates an important clearance circa A.D. 300-600 (Donaldson and Turner, 1977) and in the pollen diagram for Bloak Moss, Ayrshire, the first extensive clearance has been dated by radiocarbon to circa A.D. 450 (Turner, 1970, 106). The implications of this are far-reaching. If, for instance, the expansion of settlement into the Lake District uplands was brought about by a drier climate which enabled cultivation at a higher altitude (and the cultivation of cereals is clearly indicated in all diagrams) and this climatic improvement occurred, not in pre-Roman but possibly in late Roman or even post-Roman times, the whole question of the distribution and dating of these settlements is profoundly affected. It is most unfortunate that radio-carbon dates are not available for any of the post-Brigantian phases. The chronology suggested by Oldfield, for instance (Oldfield, 1963) attributes the intermediate clearance at Ellerside Moss to the Anglo-Saxon settlers, and he allots this to the sixth to eighth centuries, while he attributes the Viking clearance to the ninth and tenth centuries. Historical evidence, however, now hints that both the Anglo-Saxon and the Viking settlements did not begin until (probably) the middle years of the seventh century and the early tenth century respectively. ² This being the case, one is left at a loss as to whether the dates suggested for the clearance episodes are derived from some kind of relative chronology, and are still valid, or whether Oldfield is simply trying to fit in the clearances.
indicated by the diagrams with what he understands to be the human history of the region. He attributes the recovery of the forest in the lowlands after the first major clearance episode to the fifth and sixth centuries, in spite of the date he has obtained for the retardation layer at Helsington Moss associated with the clearance episode.

The relative importance of arable and pasture in farming practice is another interesting problem. In East Anglia the Anglo-Saxon clearance marks the appearance of species new to the area, hemp and flax (Turner, 1970, 107). An increase in the percentage of land devoted to arable farming is also indicated by the decline in the percentage of pastoral weeds. One wonders whether the appearance of these species in the west Cumbrian lowlands marks the arrival of Northumbrians in a similar manner. However, it has been pointed out (Turner, 1970, 107) that changes such as this are the exception rather than the rule, and Turner concludes that local geography tends to define farming practice.

The lack of pollen diagrams for certain areas in this period, such as the Carlisle Plain, is another kind of misfortune, as they might help to clear up some anomalies. It has been stated, for instance, that the reason why much of the Carlisle Plain remained afforested until the Middle Ages was because it is covered with boulder-clay and other glacial deposits, which were beyond pre-medieval agricultural skills (Hogg, 1972, 14; Higham, 1978, 15). Yet so were other areas, which did not remain afforested - notably the
coastal plain. It might be that the recent vegetational history of the Carlisle Plain, if it were known, would permit a reinterpretation of the settlement of this area.

This account of topography and environmental history is of necessity brief, and has also been greatly hampered by gaps in the available data. Virtually no work has been done, for instance, on the mapping of soils in Cumbria. The absence of complete drift coverage is also a serious loss, although this is less useful (Smailes, 1960, 67).

The pollen data is helpful. It provides indications of changes in climatic conditions which must have been widespread and would have affected settlement. The diagrams provide local sequences of vegetational history, but comparison shows that some clearances were general, and may be due to important developments in human history. Radiocarbon dates associated with these clearances suggests that the archaeological evidence should be reconsidered. As yet, not much contemporary difference has been detected in farming practice, and this may or may not have some bearing on cultural groupings. Unfortunately, no improvement on this very general picture will be possible until more basic information has been gained.
Notes

1. Data on rainfall is based on that given in Millward and Robinson, 1972.

2. See Chapter 3.

3. Drift cover maps on the one inch scale of the Geological Survey are now available for the West Cumbrian coastal strip and the Carlisle plain, but not for most of the Eden Valley or the lands around Morecambe Bay, or for the central Lake District.
CHAPTER 2

The Documentary Evidence

The assessment of the historical evidence for Cumbria is a very difficult task; the sources are very diverse, and usually involve areas that are ill-defined, and even persons and events which seem at first sight to belong more to the realms of legend and fairy-tale than to history. An original study of the sources would require considerable knowledge of both Latin and Welsh philology, and is not a task that an archaeologist should set her/himself with impunity. It is certainly beyond the competence of the present writer. However, we are fortunate in that the sources have been dealt with by learned scholars with knowledge of both; less fortunate in that these brilliant investigations have not resulted in any large measure of agreement among historians as to "what actually happened".

What follows is a compilation of what is established, what is generally agreed, what is controversial, and what is supposition. Some sources are available in highly respectable editions, which are intelligible to all; others are obscure, and interpretation, even by experts, is acknowledged to be uncertain. Comment and discussion is most abundant where the information is scarcest: the more
obscure the meaning or meagre the data, the greater the diversity of opinion and corresponding volume of commentary. It is neither possible nor probably in any case desirable, in the space available, to attempt to restate all the opinions that have ever been held on the various points raised by the source material. Attention has rather been concentrated on the information contained in the documents themselves.

For similar reasons of time and space, no attempt has been made to consider the merits of each document in detail, and comparatively little attention has been paid to later medieval legend, chronicles and hagiography; the Welsh material is dealt with in some depth, principally because it is of special significance for Cumbria, but this is hardly the place for a full scale exposition of the source material available to Bede, for instance. The omission of later material must be justified both on the grounds of the general unreliability of this kind of evidence, unless we have supportive statements from elsewhere, and also because it would appear that, in most cases, the early documents used by later writers are largely those which have survived in any way to the present.

Before returning to investigate the documentary evidence, and the efforts of historians to elucidate it, and make it yield the maximum of information, it is first essential to define the most important term of reference, the word 'Cumbria'. The definition of Cumbria on which this study is based is geographical, as we have seen: Cumbria is
simply the modern county of Cumbria (see above, p. 16); but the word itself, and the history of its use, are of some interest.

"Cumbria" is derived ultimately from the British (Cæmbria) Jackson 1953 663) "combroges", a common noun meaning "fellow-countrymen" (Morris-Jones, 1918, 52). It is the word used by the Brittonic-speaking people of Britain for themselves, as distinct from the English or Gaelic-speaking population. Its earliest known use is in its Welsh form, cymry, in a seventh century poem on Cadwallon (Williams, 1951, 85). In this it refers to the Welsh. It is later used in the Armes Prydein Vawr, a poem of the tenth century, where it again refers to the Welsh: the terms used for the North British is Cludwys (Morris-Jones, 1918, 52). Its first recorded use in specific connection with North Britain is in the Anglo Saxon Chronicle, in the entry for A.D. 945. It seems to have been synonymous here with Strathclyde; the same event is described in the Annales Cambriae, and the latter term is used. Again, in a work of the late tenth century, the Chronicle of Aethelweard, the word is used with reference to the events of A.D. 875, when Halfdane was active in the north (Campbell, 1962, 41): Halfdane and his army camped on the banks of the Tyne, ravaged the surrounding countryside, and made war frequently against the Pictis Cumbrisue. This is a direct translation of the Strathclyed Wealas of the Anglo Saxon Chronicle (Garmonsway, 1953, 72-5). There are really no grounds for supposing that 'Cumbria' and 'Cumbrians' had acquired
a specific location in northern Britain before the tenth century, or that 'Cumbria' in the modern sense corresponds to any immediate post-Roman political unit.

Historians writing about these times have used the term in a variety of ways with varying degrees of precision, and this causes considerable confusion. Jackson, for instance, defines Cumbria as "Northern England west of the Pennines and Western Scotland south of the Clyde" (1963a, 61) but also seems to include the kingdom of Gododdin, centred on Edinburgh, as a kingdom of the Cumbrians (1963a, 67), i.e. he considers the British peoples of the north generally to have been Cumbrians, presumably because they are all held to have spoken the same language. The definition offered by Kirby is similar to that of the modern county; "The mountainous land of Cumberland and Westmorland south of the Solway" (Kirby, 1962, 77), but he seems to attach a separate political significance to this area in the immediate post-Roman centuries. He makes the statement, for instance, that "it may be concluded that Cumbria was annexed to Strathclyde circa 900 A.D." (Kirby, 1962, 86) which surely implies that Cumbria was distinct from Strathclyde before A.D. 900. In this way of thinking he is apparently following Chadwick, who refers to Cumbria as distinct from Strathclyde on several occasions (e.g. Chadwick 1958), though she seems to consider the term Cumbria as synonymous with the kingdom of Rheged (see below, p.47).

Now all are apparently agreed that Strathclyde exerted
considerable influence over at least the northern half of the county in the tenth century. An upsurge or influx of Cumbric-speaking people took place, and the area was ruled by 'Cumbrian' kings, one of whom, Owen, negotiated with Aethelstan in A.D. 926, at Eamont Bridge (A.S.C.). A resurgence of British influence is evident from both documentary sources and place-name study: in his study of British village-names in Cumberland Jackson has shown (1963a, 77-84) that the vast majority of these names are certainly late, i.e. of the tenth or eleventh century and are located north of the Derwent and Stainmore, which he considered to be the southern boundary of this British kingdom of Cumbria (see below, p. 89). The tenth century history of the area is outside the scope of this thesis; but the obvious conclusion to be drawn from all this is, that then, the northern part of the county was incorporated into the kingdom of the Strathclyde Britons, which was also called Cumbria, i.e. modern Cumbria is not co-terminous with tenth century Cumbria, but the northern part of the county formed a part of it. This part retained the name, and when it was annexed by England in the late eleventh century, it became the county of Cumberland.

Kirby's implication, of a separate kingdom of Cumbria comprising "the mountainous land of Cumberland and Westmorland south of the Solway", existing before A.D. 900, has no real substance. The evidence suggests that when Cumbria, which is in any case a late term, is used in a
territorial sense, it refers to the Strathclyde Britons in general, not just the former inhabitants of present Cumbria.

The Sources

The sources considered here are those which have a bearing on northern Britain in general and north-western Britain in particular. Direct references to Cumbrian matters are infrequent, even within this broad spectrum. Some information is contained in well-known sources such as Bede's Historia Ecclesiae, and Life of St. Cuthbert; the Irish Annals, the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, the anonymous Historia de Sancto Cuthberto and Symeon's Historia Regum which provide so much information about the see of Lindisfarne/Durham. The Vitae of some saints traditionally connected with north-western Britain are also considered, as some of the sources used by the authors of these works considerably ante-date them, but have not themselves survived. Probably the most interesting material, but also that which is most difficult to interpret, is that which itself derives from northern Britain, but has survived only in Welsh documents. Because of its ultimate origin, it merits more detailed consideration here.

The Welsh Material

The Welsh material falls naturally into two groups, the literary and the historical, although both classes may reflect a common tradition.
The 'historical' material may be taken as comprising the *Annales Cambriae*, Nennius' *Historia Brittonum*, and the Old Welsh Genealogies. The *Annales Cambriae*, and the *Historia Brittonum*, as well as much of the genealogical material, are found, significantly, together, in a single manuscript, Harleian 3859—although they are of course found, in whole or in part, in other manuscripts (Hughes 1975, 233-34).

The Harleian M.S. was apparently compiled at the beginning of the twelfth century. It is clear, however, that it represents an original compilation of the mid-tenth century (Chadwick, 1958, 77; Hughes, 1975, 234)—for example, the pedigrees begin with the paternal and maternal lines of descent of Hywel Dda (reigned A.D. 950-988), and the last entry in the Annals is for A.D. 954. Chadwick suggests that the documents contained in the M.S. represent 'Owen's family archives' (Chadwick 1958, 74-6). All show a considerable interest in the affairs of northern Britain in the seventh century. In the *Annales*, the references to northern personages and events begin in A.D. 574, and continue until nearly the end of the eighth century.

It has been suggested (Chadwick, 1958, 76) that the genealogies in this M.S., and the important and somewhat larger collection of genealogies in Jesus College Oxford M.S.XX, have a common source: Chadwick postulates this as being a group of genealogies compiled at the court of Rhodri Mawr (ruler of Gwynedd, A.D. 844-77). The pedigrees and other documents in Harleian M.S. 3859 are thought to
show an 'anti-Rhodri' bias and she suggests that they have been tampered with in the interests of ninth century politics, and that Rhodri's interest in his own ancestry is part of a widespread interest in antiquarian speculation in the ninth century, the natural fruits of which were works such as the *Annales Cambriae* and the *Historia Brittonum* in their surviving form. In view of the northern interest in this material, it is an interesting fact that Rhodri's own paternal ancestry is traced back to Coel Hen (Jesus XX17) who was the common ancestor of many northern rulers, while the ancestry of his mother is traced to Vortigern (XX18). The accession of Rhodri's father Merfyn Mawr, in A.D. 816 or A.D. 825, marked also the accession of a new dynasty; the previous rulers of Gwynedd were descendants of Cunedda. Rhodri's main purpose may have been to establish the respectability of his own ancestry by stressing the northern British connection.

The problems of the sources used in these works, which have been subjected to considerable scrutiny, are by no means settled. To quote Chadwick: "It may be safely said that no problem of the early Middle Ages presents greater difficulties than the origin and textual history of the compilation of the *Historia*." (Chadwick, 1958, 37). It seems generally agreed, however, that the *Annales Cambriae*, and the 'Northern Section' in Nennius, share ultimately at least one source, in the form of annals probably based on Easter tables written down in North Britain, though exactly where is not known. Various places have claims:
Chadwick detects a 'Cumbrian' (i.e. Rheged) bias, and proposes Whithorn (Chadwick, 1958, 63). Jackson (1963, 53) has suggested Glasgow as a possibility. He has also put forward the idea that this 'Northern Chronicle' may have used information contained in 'notes' written down possibly in Carlisle by Rhun, grandson of Urien of Rheged, from the standpoint of a prominent ecclesiastic and member of one of the North British ruling families, circa. A.D. 635, about the relations between his people and the Anglo-Saxons, from the mid-sixth century until his own day (Jackson, 1963, 53). It is suggested that these postulated notes were used in combination with Annals on Easter tables recorded between the latter part of the sixth century and the eighth. This 'Northern Chronicle' was then incorporated almost directly into the *Annales Cambriæ*; it was also used as the basis of a 'Northern History', compiled in North Britain (Strathclyde) in the beginning of the ninth century. The compiler of the Northern History also used Bede, and possibly oral tradition and saga, as well as Anglo-Saxon genealogical material. This Northern History was in turn used by Nennius without substantial alteration for the 'Northern Section' in the *Historia Brittonum*, i.e. chapters 57-64, and the last sentence in chapter 56. Others have contended that a 'Northern History' derived from Northern Annals was written down in the seventh century, and that this underwent various alterations in succeeding versions, that attributed to Nennius (c. 826-7 A.D.) being the ultimate or penultimate edition.
Be that as it may, it seems established that British annals were kept in northern Britain before the ninth century, and that these were later incorporated into the Annales Cambrie, and the 'Northern Section' in Nennius. This is in itself a point of some importance. If a written source of circa A.D. 635 is involved, one might expect it to be reasonably accurate from about the end of the sixth century, bearing in mind that archaic texts would always be subject to misreadings and misinterpretations, as well as scribal errors. The texts themselves contain discrepancies and obscurities.

The relevant literary material is contained in two thirteenth century M.S.s., the Book of Taliesin and the Book of Aneirin. The former contains a collection of Welsh poetry, attributed to the poet Taliesin; the latter contains two texts, which partially overlap, of the long elgiac poem the Godoðdin and its four associated gorchenau. The Godoðdin is attributed to Aneirin. Both of these poets are among those listed by Nennius as famous sixth century bards (Wade-Evans, 1938, 80).

The authenticity of at least some of the poetry in the Book of Taliesin that is specifically attributed to Taliesin is now generally accepted, since it was first established by Morris Jones (1918). He claimed that seven of the poems were genuine compositions of a sixth century bard, written down in the ninth century. Williams (1968) has extended this authenticity to twelve poems. The poetry celebrates one Urien of Rheged, his son Owen, and
other persons and events with which these were involved. Taliesin is thought to have been Urien's court bard.

The more archaic of the two texts of the Gododdin is held to derive from an Old Welsh written form of the ninth or tenth century. The poem is an elegy on those British who fell at the battle of Catraeth. It is not a straight narrative poem, however: each verse usually deals with the deeds of an individual hero, and therefore the events emerge in a somewhat confusing manner, quite apart from the difficulties of the written text itself. Ifor Williams was the first to make a clear case for the poem being a genuine work of circa. A.D. 600. Jackson (1969, 63) maintains its authenticity, with the qualification that the poem was probably handed down orally for at least two centuries, being first written down in the ninth century. He holds that a text from Strathclyde first reached Wales at this time, perhaps due to the interest in the affairs of the north which, as we have seen, was to be found at the court of Rhodri Mawr, in Gwynedd. The poem was probably known orally in Wales before this date, however, as its influence has been detected on other early Welsh poetry. The most important point made by Jackson for the purpose of this study is, that the first texts of the Gododdin were written down in Strathclyde in the ninth century, but probably until that time the tradition was simply oral; and that the surviving texts of the poem are based ultimately on this version, allowing for considerable corruption. This implies a written vernacular as well as
ecclesiastical tradition in North Britain, though of a late date, and so far as is known outside our area. There is no clear evidence that other sources of the period made use of any written documents emanating from Cumbria, although it is certain that Bede at least had information at first hand from the English living in the area. Cumbria's British tradition was preserved ultimately in Wales, either in Welsh vernacular literature, or the Latin tradition of the Welsh church. There may or may not have been an historical record kept in Cumbria from the sixth century; this tradition might, alternatively, belong further north. There was undoubtedly an oral literary heritage, common to all the Britons of the North, which migrated south and west in a similar fashion, and probably at the same time. The English sources are largely silent about the British. Cumbria was for them a part of a much larger whole, the kingdom of Northumbria, and our knowledge of the English in Cumbria as such is very meagre.

Cumbria and the British North

The departure of the Roman army from Britain seems to have opened the way for the emergence of kingdoms with native British rulers in the early fifth century. Chadwick (1958, 35) has demonstrated this with regard to North Britain by an analysis of the Welsh Genealogies of the Men of the North. She has shown that, by normal reckoning, the lines can almost all be traced back to common ancestors of
circa. A.D. 400, e.g. Coel Hen, Dyfnal Hen, etc. Some lines of descent go back beyond these common ancestors, probably to unhistoric personages - in Chadwick's own words:

"The evidence as a whole points to the conclusion that genuine historical tradition and genuine genealogies in Celtic Britain begin to be preserved shortly after the close of the Roman period."

(Chadwick, 1958, 35)

The deeds of these common ancestors are not necessarily historic; for example, she considers the tale of the migration of Cunedda and his eponymous sons from North Britain to North Wales, found in the Historia Brittonum, to be a 'speculative origin story'. The Genealogies do seem to point, however, to the emergence of a native ruling class and native kingdoms in the immediate post-Roman period.

What disruption this may have involved is hard to assess. Continuous occupation at Carlisle, the only Roman walled town in the area, is attested from documentary sources until (at least) the end of the seventh century, and it seems probably that the town would have been occupied until the arrival of Halfdane's army; but the archaeological evidence for continuous occupation is meagre at Carlisle and non-existant elsewhere

Virtually nothing is known, historically, of the fifth century in the north. The names of some of the British kingdoms of the late sixth century have survived, however, and it is likely that these do not differ greatly from those of the fifth century, except in the areas affected by Anglo-
Saxon settlement. Unfortunately the exact whereabouts and limits of the sixth century kingdoms are disputed or uncertain. Archaeological evidence indicates that at least parts of Deira were settled in the fifth century (Myres, 1969, 46, 103); while the Anglo-Saxon kingdom of Bernicia was founded on Bamburgh Rock by Ida in circa A.D. 547 (Bede, H.E., V:24). The names of the two English kingdoms are probably themselves Celtic, and it may be that these were once the names of British kingdoms (Jackson, 1953, 419, 701-5).

Of the kingdoms which remained in Celtic hands in the late sixth century tales, Gododdin was in the north-east, possibly stretching from the Forth to the Tyne. Its capital was 'Din Eidyn' - Edinburgh Castle Rock. The name is derived from that of the Romano-British tribe, the Votadini, located by Ptolemy in this area. Manau was the name of a sub-province or sub-kingdom in the north-west of Gododdin, around Stirling. North of this were the lands of the Northern and Southern Picts. The Clyde basin was the centre of the kingdom of Alclyde, later Strathclyde; St. Patrick's 'letter to Coroticus' is probably addressed to its king - *regem Aloo* - and therefore attests the existence of this kingdom in the fifth century. The capital of Strathclyde was Dumbarton Rock. North of it was the expanding kingdom of the Scots, Dal Riada, founded in the fourth century. The kingdom of Rheged is usually located south of Strathclyde, in the north-west, but its exact whereabouts are ill-defined and controversial, although it was undoubtedly an important
kingdom. As most historians hold that Cumbria was a part of Rheged, or that at least part of Cumbria was in Rheged, it seems advisable to examine the evidence for its whereabouts more closely.

Urien, in whose honour Taliesin's poetry was chiefly composed, as we have noted, is constantly referred to there as 'Urien of Rheged'. He has other titles too: he is called **Udd yr Echwyd** (Morris-Jones, 1918, 68) - "Lord of (the district of) Catraeth" i.e. Catterick in Yorkshire, the scene of the battle that is the subject-matter of the *Gododdin* - and his men are the men of Catraeth. Taliesin calls his land **Llyffenydd** (Morris-Jones, 1918, 181) - Lyvennet. This is thought to be derived from the British **Leimanie**, and this word has been seen as a place-name element in 'Leeming-Lane' - the name of the Roman road south from Catterick; there is also a river in Westmorland called the Lyvennet, however, and place-names from the stem **Leimanie** are said to be "reasonably frequent" (Morris-Jones, 1918, 71). Urien is also called 'Defender in Aeron' (Morris-Jones, 1918, 77), *Aeron* being modern Ayrshire where his fifth century ancestor, Coel Hen, is said to have reigned.

The element **reget** or **rheged** has been seen in four widely separated place-names: Dunrhagit, in the Rhinns of Galloway; Redesdale; Rochdale, Lancashire, the Recedham of Domesday Book; and possibly, though this is doubtful, in a colloquial name in use in the eighteenth century for the Roman road - Watling Street - from near
Hownam to the Tweed; it was called the 'rugged causeway'. (Morris-Jones, 1918, 67) However, alternative derivations are possible for most of these place-names, and even Taliesin's evidence is ambiguous: the fact that Urien of Rheged was "Lord of Catraeth" or "Defender in Aeron" does not necessarily imply that Rheged itself included either or both of these places.

Another clue is provided by later Welsh tradition: Morris-Jones (1918, 67) has proposed that Carlisle was believed to be in Rheged by Hywel Gwyned, a Welsh poet who died in A.D. 1170 (Morris-Jones, 1918, 67). Even this has been disputed: J. McQueen (1961, 56-60) holds that by this time the only tradition surviving in Wales of the whereabouts of Rheged was that it was somewhere in the north.

The territory arrived at when these names are put together (see Map III) is geographically improbable for a single kingdom and at this time. Even disregarding the evidence of place-names, and relying just on Taliesin, Ayrshire and Catterick are still very far apart. Historians have tended to settle for the central part of this vast expanse, and the usual explanations for the whereabouts of Rheged centre on Cumbria: for Jackson, Rheged includes

"the Solway Basin, (and perhaps Galloway) and the Eden Valley, up to the crest of the Pennines, and possibly across them into Swaledale."

(1963, 38)
for Chadwick, it consisted of
"The lands bordering the Solway"  (1958, 63)

for Ifor Williams, Rheged is
"near the Solway Firth"  (1951, 84)

for Kirby,
"It is possible that Urien's kingdom extended from Ayrshire through Galloway and Dumfrieshire and south across the Solway"

(1962, 79)

while for Morris-Jones (1918, 67-8)
"may have extended northwards as far as the southern wall, or even the Cheviot Hills"

but it was also
"probable ... that Rheged extended southwards beyond Catterick, possibly to the northern border of the kingdom of Elmet."

Earlier writers usually equated Rheged with Cumberland. This vague concord has been much disturbed by J. McQueen, however (1961, 62-3), who totally abandons the location in the north-west and places Rheged on the east coast, while agreeing that the north-west was still part of the British North. His arguments rest mainly on the fact that the known activities of Urien took place mostly east of the Pennines.

Rheged and Godeu (i.e. Gododdin) are referred to by Taliesin in a way that suggests that they stood for the British North in the way that Deira and Bernicia stood for the Anglo-Saxon North, i.e. they must have been the most significant political units in the sixth century. Perhaps Rheged was just one of the kingdoms of Urien, or perhaps it was the name of a group of kingdoms under his rule, as
has been recently suggested by Lovecy (1976, 37). At any rate it fades from the scene after his death; no one from Rheged is mentioned in the Gododdin, although a warrior from Aeron features. This could be taken as a hint that Aeron and Rheged were separate lands, although in Urien's day they may have had the same ruler. When the poem was composed, i.e. circa. A.D. 600, Catterick itself was clearly in the hands of the English. If Rheged were in fact a kingdom east of the Pennines which contained Catterick, its disappearance could by then be best explained as due to conquest by the Angles. It must be admitted that although many historians do think that Rheged was in the north-west, on the balance of probabilities, the data, i.e. the poetry of Taliesin and the place-name evidence - leaves one, at best, uncertain.

As regards Cumbria, much discussion has perhaps given the issue a greater significance than it deserves. It is certain that until it was conquered by the Anglo-Saxons, Cumbria was a part of the British North. It may or may not have been a part of Urien's kingdom; if not, it was perhaps ruled by one or more of the unlocated dynasties of the Men of the North found in the Genealogies. There is no reason to think that the names of all the northern kingdoms have survived; the Gododdin itself features many heroes from places otherwise unknown.
Cumbria and the Anglo-Saxons

The impression given in the sources is of continuous strife in the north in the sixth century. Britons fought with each other, but occasionally made concerted efforts to oppose the Anglo-Saxons. The earliest documented conflict is the battle of Arfderydd, fairly certainly identified with Arthuret, north of Carlisle (Armstrong et al, 1952, 111, XVIII). This event is mentioned in the Annales Cambriae for A.D. 573. The combatants, at least in one, late, M.S. of the Annales, and also in later Welsh tradition, were Gwenddoleu ap Ceidio, and the sons of Elifer. These persons are mentioned in the Genealogies - Gwenddoleu was in fact Elifer's nephew - but nothing else is known of them or of what they fought over from contemporary documents, although the battle must have had some significance because of its mention in the Annales Cambriae. Another battle of the late sixth century was the Battle of Gwen Ystat, which is the subject of a poem of Taliesin's (Morris-Jones, 1918, 162). It was fought by Urien with the Men of Catraeth against the Picts.

In the reign of the Bernician King Theudric a serious attempt was made to oust the Anglo-Saxons from their foot­holds in Bernicia. The 'Northern Section' in Nennius tells us that Urien and his sons opposed the foreigners and that four British kings - Urien, Riderch Hen (i.e. Riderch Hael of Strathclyde), Gullauc and Morcant - banded together and besieged them for three days and three nights on
Lindisfarne. The confederation fell apart, however: Urien's death was brought about 'through envy' (Wade Evans, 1938, 81) by Morcant. This probably happened about A.D. 590, or a little before (Jackson, 1969, 9).

Aethelfrith became king of Bernicia in 593 A.D. His reign saw the first great expansion of the power of Northumbria; Bede tells us (H.E. I: 24) that he "ravaged the Britons more cruelly than all other English leaders". At some time in his reign, and probably before A.D. 603, when he defeated the Scots at Deagsastan, was fought the battle of Catraeth, the subject of Aneirin's great poem, but unknown from other sources.

It appears from the poem that a host of 300 British warriors, from various parts of the north, and from Wales, were assembled by Mynyddog Mynfawr, king of Gododdin, in Edinburgh. He feasted them for a year there, and then sent them south to fight the Anglo-Saxons. The battle took place in English territory on the borders of Deira. All the warriors but one were killed, although the poet himself saw and survived the battle, probably as an onlooker. The enemies of the Britons are called the men of Lloegr, and the men of Dewr and Brynaich; they are heathens, and said to be a hundred thousand strong. Even allowing for poetic licence, the odds seem ludicrously against the Britons, and it seems likely that the figure of 300 represents 300 chiefs or heroes, each of whom would have been accompanied by a personal retinue (Jackson, 1969, 21). In the event, the expedition was clearly an unmitigated disaster for the British kingdoms.
The poem poses many problems, and undoubtedly one of the most puzzling is the distance that Mynyddog's men had to travel before encountering any Anglo-Saxons in a pitched battle - about 250 km. If the army travelled by the route that is normal today, along the east coast, over two-thirds of their journey would have been through territory that was English already. The only feasible explanation seems to be, that the army travelled south-west through Cumbria. In this way, their journey would have been through British land until they were within a couple of day's march of Catterick, by the Roman road from Brough-under-Stainmore.

As we have noted, no warriors from Rheged are mentioned in the poem. If the army actually went through Cumbria, it would be strange if no Cumbrian warriors were actually part of the force. It may be that the proverbial dissention among the British was the cause of this - and it is notable that no warriors from Strathclyde feature either - but if so, a passage through Cumbria might have presented difficulties too, if not perhaps as many as a journey along the eastern route. It is of course possible that warriors from Cumbria took part without mention of their place of origin - and there is perhaps a hint of this: one of the heroes is a "son of Ceidio" - perhaps one of the two brothers of Gwennfdoleu, Nudd and Cof, who feature in the Genealogies (Jackson, 1969, 21).

Catterick seems to have seen the last concerted attempt to drive the Anglo-Saxons out of northern Britain. After this, Aethelfrith's success may have made concerted
action impossible. In A.D. 605 he took the kingdom of Deira and united it with Bernicia. The Scots were defeated by him in 603; and in 616, just before he died, he inflicted a great defeat on the Welsh at Chester.

The battle of Chester, and the motives which might have taken Aethelfrith so far west, have been sometimes linked by historians with the Anglo-Saxon settlement in the north-west, although more recent opinion tends to disconnect them. The older view, put forward notably by Ekwall and Stenton, and adhered to by Kirby, holds that the Anglo-Saxon settlement of Cumbria was more or less complete by Aethelfrith's reign, if not earlier. Jackson, however, has argued that it cannot have been as early as this, and in all probability did not take place until the middle years of the seventh century.

The arguments of Ekwall (1922, 232) rest mainly on the hypothesis that some English place-names found in Cumbria cannot be later than A.D. 600. Stenton (1947, 78) modifies this, noting the paucity of English names of early type, but states that

"There are enough ancient place-names in Cumberland and Lancashire to suggest that Aethelfrith could have ridden from the Solway to the Mersey through territory in the occupation of his own people."

while Kirby holds that

"the kingdom (of Rheged) disintegrated before the onslaught of Aethelfrith."

(Kirby, 1962, 80)

Jackson has more than one argument to set against these views (1953, 215-16). He proposes that until the reign of
Aethelfrith, Bernicia was much too weak to undertake any major settlement of Cumbria via the Tyne Gap and that until at least 617, the kingdom of Elmet barred access via the southern route, across the Pennines from Deira; that the place-name evidence is uncertain, and that conclusions drawn about early forms are based on studies of lowland Britain, and are not necessarily valid for the north; and that there is no archaeological or place-name evidence for pagan practice west of the Pennines. The first point still stands; the interpretation of English place-names, especially those once considered to be the earliest kind, has undergone considerable revision in recent years, and so the second point is, if anything, even more valid now than when he made it. His third point must now be positively challenged, although the evidence for pagan practice in Cumbria does not necessarily invalidate his argument as a whole (see below, Chapter 5).

As an alternative, Jackson proposes that the English settlement of Cumbria took place in the reign of Oswiu (A.D. 642-670) although he allows for 'raids across the Pennines' before this; and other historians lend support to this view: Hunter Blair has interpreted a statement in Eddius' Life of Wilfrid as showing that the settlement of northern Lancashire took place circa. A.D. 650-670 (Hunter Blair, 1948, 123). There is also the interesting fact, recorded in the Historia Brittonum, that Oswiu's first wife was a princess called Riemelth; she was the great-granddaughter of Urien, the granddaughter of Rhun,
and the marriage must have taken place at least before A.D. 642 when Oswiu married his second wife, Eanfled. It has been suggested that this union might have given Oswiu some title to Cumbria, and that Cumbria might thus have passed more or less peacefully into Northumbrian hands (Wade-Evans, 1950, 823). The impression given in the early poetry of the attitudes of the Britons to their neighbours makes this not wholly probable, however, though our interpretation of the general course of events is perforce based on sidelights and innuendoes which can be drawn from the activities of individuals.

Relations between the two peoples were not necessarily consistently warlike: the credit for the baptism of King Edwin, the first Christian king of Northumbria, is given in the 'Northern Section' of the Historia Brittonum to Rhun, son of Urien. This Rhun has already been mentioned as the possible author of some kind of brief history of relations between Britons and Anglo-Saxons in the north in the late sixth and early seventh century. Bede (H.E. II:9) supplies the information that Edwin was baptised by Paulinus at York in A.D.627, but omits all mention of Rhun. Nennius is supported by the Annales Cambriae, however (e.g. A.D. 626; Phillimore, 1885, 157) so Rhun's claim should not be dismissed too lightly; it has been suggested that the ceremony may have involved the two prelates (Jackson, 1963, 33).

History tells little of the manner in which the settlement was accomplished, but it would seem that the
British survived in numbers, even in areas which may have been conquered at an early stage. In the anonymous Historia de Sancto Cuthberto⁹ (Hinde, 1868, 141) a claim is made that the saint received from Ecgfrith (who died in A.D. 685) "The land called Cartmel, and all the Britons (there)". Elsewhere in Britain their status was lower than that of the Anglo-Saxons and from the way in which this statement is couched it would seem that the British were in some way tied to the land, subservient to their Anglo-Saxon overlords.

British personal names are not known from documents as landholders, but this is hardly amazing as so little documentation of this type survives at all. All that can be said is that in the very few instances where landholders names are known, these are English. The See of Lindisfarne seems to have held property in several parts of Cumbria, although the evidence for this is admittedly late. It is claimed that some landholdings date from the time of Cuthbert himself - Cartmel, already mentioned, and Carlisle, where the community claimed an area of fifteen miles around the city (H.S.C; Hinde, 1868, 141). There are also references to landholdings at Holm Cultram (H.R. s.p. A.D. 854; Hinde, 1868, 68) and possibly Yealand Conyers or Yealand Redmayne (Morris, 1977a, 91).

It is usually assumed that Cumbria or at least, most of Cumbria, formed part of the Diocese of Lindisfarne, largely because of St. Cuthbert's connections with Carlisle (e.g. Hunter Blair, 1966, 143, 145) but this is
largely reasonable conjecture; we do not know of any land-
holdings of other sees or monasteries in the region, but
since Lindisfarne is clearly the best documented of all
sees in this respect, this is not conclusive.

In any event, Cumbria had clearly been absorbed into
Northumbria by the late seventh century. Apart from the
passage in the Historia de Sancto Cuthberto, it is clear
that St. Cuthbert at Carlisle had no need to fear a local
alien population. The purpose and outcome of the Battle
of Chester remain obscure; Chadwick (1963, 181) has inter-
preted Aethelfrith's hostile strike as a move to get a
foothold on the Irish sea, and curb the depredations of
the piratical Irish, rather than as an attempt to cut off
the Britons of the north from the Welsh. At any rate it
seems to have been an isolated attack, as all are more or
less agreed that the surrounding territory did not pass to
the Northumbrians at this time. The route that Aethelfrith
took to Chester is impossible to establish; if the north-
west were still in British hands at this time, so was the
kingdom of Elmet. There would have been little to choose
between the two hostile territories. The battle remains
enigmatic but it was probably not the final blow against
the Men of the North.

Christianity and the Church

It is clear from the poetry of Taliesin and Aneirin
that the heroes of the late sixth century, Urien and his
sons, and the Men of the Gododdin, were Christian, and
their Anglo-Saxon enemies pagan. Taliesin prays for Owein:

"The soul of Owein ap Urien,
May the Lord have regard to its need."

(Morris-Jones, 1918, 187-8)

while of Urien he says:

"Happy the bards of Christendom while thy life lasts."

(Morris-Jones, 1918, 172-3)

Aneirin speaks of

"the heathen, the crafty men of Deira."

(Jackson, 1969, 123)

and of the hero Ceredig:

"may he have welcome among the host (of Heaven) in perfect union with the Trinity."

(Jackson, 1969, 129)

Little is known of pre-Anglo-Saxon Christianity in the north, however, and how conversion was brought about, or what type of ecclesiastical structure existed, is largely conjecture. The archaeological evidence for Christian practice will be dealt with in a later chapter; here, attention will be concentrated on the historical framework, in so far as it is known from documents.

There is some evidence for Christian practice in Roman Cumbria - the archaeological and epigraphic data has been assembled by Wall (1965, 1966) and a total of five objects or tombstones with Christian symbols or inscriptions have been found (see Appendix 6). There is also evidence for some form of organized hierarchy; a bishop at the Council of Arles in A.D. 314 appears to have come from York (Toynbee, 1953, 4). It is uncertain to what extent
Christian practice was the norm rather than the exception in the closing years of the Empire in Britain, but if it was general then it seems probable that Carlisle, because of its importance as a regional centre, may well have had its own bishop.\textsuperscript{10} It is equally clear, however, that pagan practice continued in some places (Frend, 1955, 11).

Be that as it may, the extent to which Christianity survived the breakdown of the Roman administration in the north is a matter of considerable debate - all the more so as there is almost no evidence which can be said to bear upon the matter directly. Two saints, St. Ninian and St. Kentigern, are traditionally associated with the evangelization of the north in sub-or post-Roman times. Without entering fully into the numerous controversies about the careers of these two saints, some consideration of the main issues is essential, if only to see whether anything tangible is established.

There is no serious reason to doubt that both were historic figures. The death of St. Kentigern is recorded in the \textit{Annales Cambriae s\textsubscript{A}} A.D. 612, while Bede devotes a passage to St. Ninian in his \textit{Historia Ecclesiae}\textsubscript{Anglica} (III: 4).

Both saints are the subjects of twelfth century hagiographical lives, by Jocelyn of Furness and Ailred of Rievaulx respectively; these works are acknowledged to be based on earlier hagiography.\textsuperscript{11} A poem about St. Ninian, the eighth century \textit{Miracula Ninie Episcopi} (McQueen, W., 1961) has also survived, and a fragment of an anonymous \textit{vita} of Kentigern which is of twelfth century date, but earlier than Jocelyn's work.
Bede's account of Ninian is well known: in brief, he states that Ninian was a Briton and a bishop; he converted the Southern Picts 'long before' Columba converted the Northern Picts; he had been 'regularly instructed' at Rome, and his see was at Candida Casa, i.e. Whithorn, where he built a stone church "in a manner to which the Britons were not accustomed". Both the church and the see were dedicated to St. Martin. The saint's body was at Whithorn in Bede's day.

Bede gives no clear indication of Ninian's date. However, the Miracula Ninie Episcopi connects Ninian with one King Tudwal who is usually identified with a figure in the Genealogies who was the great-grandson of Maxen Gwledig. The dynasty is usually located in the Isle of Man or Galloway (McQueen, J., 1961, 12). By normal reckoning, Tudwal would have reigned circa A.D. 410-440, and Ninian's floruit might therefore be safely considered as the first half of the fifth century.

The 'traditional' picture of Ninian is now seen as largely without historical foundation - for instance, Ailred's testimony, when unsupported by Bede or the Miracula, is now generally found unacceptable. Ailred claims, for example, that Ninian actually visited St. Martin at Tours and that the latter gave him stonemasons to build his church. This statement is now usually taken as a piece of fabrication, a worthy act "borrowed" from much later practice; and his claim that Ninian "ordained presbyters, consecrated bishops, and divided the land
(i.e. southern Pictland) into parishes (Forbes, 1874, 15) is clearly an anachronism. Douglas Simpson (1950, 1959, etc.) has made out an elaborate case for Ninian's missionary activities in northern Scotland and Cumbria, but his evidence consists mostly of medieval or post-medieval dedications, none of which seem to preserve the earlier form of the saint's name; a revival of the cult of Ninian, rather than the saint's own travels, seems the most plausible explanation of these; and Douglas Simpson's views are not widely accepted now. Thomas (1968) has discussed this fully.

Even Bede's statements do not remain unchallenged. It has been variously argued, for instance, that Ninian never converted the Picts (McQueen, J., 1961, 87); that his association with Candida Casa is spurious, and that his relics were translated there towards the end of the seventh century (Chadwick, 1950, 51-53); and that his church cannot have been dedicated to St. Martin (Chadwick, 1950, 48). More serious, however, is the increasing quantity of evidence which indicates that the earliest monasteries in Britain and Ireland were not founded until very late in the fifth century. The evidence is both historical (Morris, J., 1966; Hughes, 1966) and archaeological (Thomas, 1968, 1971).

Bede does not state that Ninian founded a monastery at Candida Casa, but a monastic foundation is implicit in both the Miracula poem and Ailred's vita, and is generally frequently simply assumed by historians.
McQueen has, indeed, shown that the use of the word casa in the name must imply a very early stage in the development of monastic communities (McQueen, J., 1961, 13-16). It is still impossible to refute Thomas' judgement that "there are no indications that any monastery existed at Whithorn until (perhaps) the late sixth century" (1968, 101) although there is certainly evidence of Christian activity on the site before that date. Perhaps the most that can be said at the moment is that if Ninian did found a monastery at Whithorn in the early years of the fifth century, he was well in advance of the mainstream of monastic foundations in Britain and Ireland and can hardly be said to have set a trend.

As an alternative to the traditional view, of a missionary and monastic founder, Thomas has proposed that Ninian was really a Christian Briton, sent as bishop to a pre-existing community of Christians at Whithorn, in the same manner as Palladius, sent to the "Irish believing in Christ". His bishopric was centred on Whithorn, and was probably co-terminous with some form of tribal division. These proposals are impossible to prove or disprove; but the case which Thomas makes for other bishoprics is rather more tenuous (Thomas 1968; Thomas, 1971). His arguments for a sub-Roman bishopric at Carlisle, for instance, are fairly hypothetical. Inter alia, he argues from the presence of a single tombstone that "the Carlisle area shows distinct traces of fourth century Christianity" although of the other Christian objects from Roman Cumbria, none
occurs within a twenty mile radius of Carlisle. He implies that the continuity of settlement at Carlisle must indicate that Christian practice continued; but in fact there is no archaeological or other evidence of Christian practice in sub- or post-Roman Carlisle before the time of Cuthbert; that because Carlisle was a much more important settlement than Whithorn in the fifth century - although in practice we have really no idea of the extent of any fifth century settlement in either place - it cannot have been subject to a bishop of Whithorn, and would therefore probably have had a bishop of its own. He even suggests that the river Nith was the boundary between the two dioceses.

Thomas' other suggestions are even more speculative - he proposes, for instance that Ninian was probably consecrated at Carlisle, and that the late Roman Christianity of Carlisle "offers the best background for Patrick". We have no evidence whatsoever for the former, and as for Patrick, it must be realised that there are several candidates for Banna Venta Berniae, the site of his birthplace. The only reason for locating it in the Carlisle area is the tentative identification of his birthplace with the Banna of the Rudge Cup, one of the forts along the wall. At the time of Thomas' writing this was usually equated with Bewcastle, but in a more recent reshuffling of names and forts, Breeze and Dobson (1976, 274) propose that the correct identification is with Birdoswald. There is some Early Christian evidence from Birdoswald, (see
below, p.234) but before jumping to rash conclusions we must remember that there are several other possibilities for Banna Venta Berniae, and most Patrician scholars tend to leave the whereabouts of St. Patrick's birthplace open to question.

In the writer's opinion, the only strong argument for a bishop at Carlisle in post-Roman times is the existence of a bishop there in the Roman period; but there is no reason why a bishopric should have survived in Carlisle and not, say, York; and it is quite possible that although Christian practice continued the formal organisation was disrupted. We do have some evidence for continuing Christian practice in Cumbria (see below, Chapter 6) but this is not at all the same thing as evidence for a structured and well organized church. Analogies with Whithorn provide, rather, arguments against Carlisle having been the centre of a bishopric. As a single site, Whithorn has produced more material evidence of Christianity than the whole of Cumbria put together; whatever its merits and reliability, Whithorn did at least preserve a tradition of its own origins; the absence of any historical evidence or tradition of an early bishopric at Carlisle is an argument against there ever having been one. If such a tradition were preserved at Whithorn, how much more likely that one would have survived at Carlisle, which was, according to Thomas, so much more important, and where there is positive evidence that the town was occupied in post-Roman times? Likewise, if the reason why Whithorn
and Abercom became Anglian bishoprics was due to their previous importance as early Christian centres, why did Carlisle not merit the same distinction? Carlisle only became a bishopric after the Conquest. The fact that it preserved its Romano-British name implies nothing more than that it was continuously occupied, and is not testimony in any investigation of the religious practices (not to mention bishops) of its inhabitants. It certainly does not imply that the monastery of Ecgfrith's sister-in-law was of British foundation.

Other statements made by Thomas are confusing. For instance, the proposal that "in the Whithorn and Carlisle areas the dug-grave cemetery was the appropriate site" in the Early Christian period is totally unsupported by any example from the Carlisle area, presumably because none are known; the nearest example given is at Camp Hill, Trouhaupton, in Dumfriesshire, which is west of the supposed boundary of the river Nith and therefore, on Professor Thomas' own premise, part of the Whithorn area only. The idea that post-Roman ecclesiastical units were based on tribal territories is perfectly reasonable, but we must first have evidence of their existence; and it is also clear that the boundaries of the tribal kingdoms are themselves very far from certain. The case for Ninian's connection with Cumbria will be examined in detail elsewhere (Chapter 6); but it is important to establish here, that his role as a missionary is open to serious challenge.
The traditions and legends associated with St. Kentigern are even more uncertain than those of St. Ninian. Indeed, Jackson, after an exhaustive study of his *vitae* (1958) concludes that the earliest written traditions are unlikely to predate the tenth century, apart from the entry in the *Annales Cambriae* which simply records his death. Other historians however (Jackson, 1958, appendix) hold that some of the material in the *vitae* may go back to a Strathclyde source of the seventh century, so even this is not established. The *Annales Cambriae* do not call Kentigern a bishop although the same entry refers to the death of Bishop Dubricius; it is nonetheless usually assumed that he was, with a see based at Glasgow. This indeed seems to be the only point on which there is any real concurrence.

The earlier part of Jocelyn's *vita* associates Kentigern with the area around Lothian, and the tutelage of St. Servanus, at Culenross. He then moved west to Strathclyde, where he was opposed by the pagan king Morken, and went to Wales as a result. Morken is thought to be the king called by Nennius Morcant, who brought about the death of Urien of Rheged at the siege of Lindisfarne. It is surprising that he is described as a pagan. In Wales, Kentigern meets St. David, founds the monastery of Nantcharvan (Llancarfan) and has St. Asaph as his pupil. The land for this monastery is given to him by King Cathwallain (Cadwallon). Jocelyn also credits him with the conversion of Carlisle and the Lake District en route,
and notes that a church is being built there in the twelfth century, in his honour, at a place called Crosfeld (Crosthwaite, Keswick), where the saint once erected a cross.

St. Kentigern is also credited with the erection of two other crosses, one at Glasgow, of stone, and one of sand (? sandstone) at a place called Lochwerwerd, identified by Forbes (1874, 368) with Borthwick, Midlothian. The erection of a stone cross must be an anachronism, in the seventh century, but these monuments must have been standing in these places in Jocelyn's day, because he says so.

Jocelyn also claims that St. Kentigern's first see was at Hoddom; it later moved to Glasgow. Critical study of Jocelyn's writing has made it likely that he is simply crediting the saint with having founded a famous site; and it is probable that the visit to Wales is, similarly, a fictitious use of famous names, invented quite possibly by Jocelyn himself. Jackson dismisses the visit to Carlisle and Cumbria in a similar manner, as well as missions to Pictland, Orkney and Ireland.

Several churches in Cumbria are dedicated to St. Kentigern, but none of these possess any symptoms of being pre-Anglo-Saxon foundations, as will be shown (see below, Chapter 6).

One interesting point does emerge from a study of these two saints. It may be that Ninian and later Kentigern, were involved in reforming the British church. Of Ninian,
Ailred states that when he was in Rome he learnt that "many things contrary to sound doctrine had been inculcated on him and his fellow countrymen by unskilled teachers" (Forbes, 1874, 9) and that when he returned, he proceeded to:

"root up what had been ill-planted, to scatter what had been ill gathered, to cast down what had been ill built."

(Forbes, 1874, 11)

Whilst of St. Kentigern it is said that he was consecrated by one bishop, from Ireland, "after the manner of the Britons and Scots of that period" (Forbes, 1874, 54) - but that later he took pains to correct his manner of consecration. The point should not be refined on; the rooting out of heresy or malpractice is just the sort of thing that both Ailred and Jocelyn would credit their respective saints with, as a worthy practice; but it is just possible that such was in fact their task. One might conjecture that this would indicate a measure of isolation or disorganization in the British church in the north, which would be more than likely in this period; but it is not advisable to venture too far into the realms of speculation. St. Kentigern is indeed depicted as the bishop of a territorial see, co-terminous with the kingdom of Strathclyde; but the indications are that he was its first bishop rather than one of a long line stretching back to Roman times. It is not impossible that he founded monasteries; but if he did it is surprising that their names are not contained in the sources. In any
event, like St. Ninian, he has no proven connection with Cumbria.

Some consideration must also be given to another Cumbrian saint, of even more doubtful character than Ninian and Kentigern - St. Bega. A seventh century saint of this name certainly did exist: one Bega receives a passing mention in Bede, as a nun of Hackness who was the friend and associate of Hild. This nun has no apparent connection with the north-west, however, and evidence for a Cumbrian Bega does not appear until much later. We first hear of her in the foundation charter of the priory, circa. A.D. 1125 (Wilson, J., 1915, 27) when William Meschlin founds a Benedictine priory dedicated to St. Mary and St. Bega, endowing it with lands in Cherchebi. Charters of slightly later date indicate that this Cherchebi was also known as Kirkebybecoc (Wilson, J., 1915, IV-V) and the usual implication drawn from this is that a parish church dedicated to Bega was already in existence at the time of the priory foundation. The saint is also the subject of a hagiographical vita, probably of twelfth century date, and of further recorded local tradition. The church of Bassenthwaite is dedicated to her as well, but this is probably a local borrowing from the priory name; it is not known before the late thirteenth century (Graham and Collingwood, 1925, 17). Her name is also known on a bell at Ennerdale, but this is probably from St. Bees itself.
It is clear, both from earlier charters and deeds, and from the *vita*, that a relic of the saint, a holy bracelet, was kept at the priory in the early middle ages, and that it was used for the purpose of oath-taking. It disappears from the documents long before the reformation, however, and it may have been lost or stolen *circa* A.D. 1300-1315 (Butler, 1966, 104). We have no real idea what this bracelet looked like; our only source of information is the *vita*, which states that St. Bega received the bracelet as a gift in a dream, before her arrival in Cumbria, and that it had the sign of the cross clearly marked on the top of it (Wilson, J., 1915, 500). Butler (1966) has discussed the possible forms which such a bracelet could take in considerable detail, and has made the very attractive suggestion that the most likely kind of bracelet is of Viking type - the flat armlets of beaten silver which are relatively well known from Irish hoards of Viking date, but also occur in Britain. These commonly have a St. Andrew's cross in the centre, at the widest part.

The life itself is relatively uninformative about the saint's career. It has been dismissed out of hand by Collingwood as "a collection of hagiographical commonplaces" (Graham and Collingwood, 1925, 15) although some later writers (i.e. Last, 1953, Butler, 1966) take it rather more seriously. The bulk of the text is just an account of recent miracles, brought about through the intervention of the miraculous bracelet. The earlier part does give some information about the saint's activities, but it
appears that the writer was determined that Begu of Hackness be identified as Bega of St. Bees, and his account is full of inconsistencies. Briefly, he claims that Bega, who was an Irish princess, wished to escape her unwilling betrothal to a Norseman, presumably rather prematurely arrived in Ireland in the seventh century. She fled to Cumbria where she did various good deeds of a generally unspecified nature, and lived a hermit's life, before moving on to Hackness.

The anonymous author bemoans the poverty of his information in the usual manner, but it is rather sinister that he cites no authority other than Bede as a source; and Collingwood (passim) was of the opinion that the whole life was a confection, built up around the historical Begu of Hackness, in order to explain the existence of the Bracelet at St. Bees. He also suggested that the name might be derived from the Old English beag or Old Norse baugr, meaning a ring. The saint of St. Bees was therefore a purely mythical creation, and the custom of swearing oaths on the bracelet was itself derived from Norse practice, 'swearing on the ring' of which Collingwood cites several examples (Graham and Collingwood, 1925, 16).

Later tradition expands on the main points of the saint's career; in Leland, for instance, it is claimed that Bega founded a monastery at St. Bees (Collectanea, 1715, 39). This should be simply regarded as speculation or local tradition. Not all are prepared to be quite as sceptical as Collingwood, however, and Last at least
maintains that there is nothing improbable in the real existence of St. Bega, as long as her date is brought forward to the latter part of the ninth century rather than the seventh century and the connection with Begu of Hackness is agreed to be a conflation.

There is certain evidence for the existence of a church at St. Bees from at least the tenth century, and possibly for one of some importance and influence if the quantity of sculpture is any guide. The main difficulty which the present writer sees in the story is the Irish connection, and although this is not insuperable, it constitutes an integral part of the twelfth century vita and cannot be dismissed simply because it is inconvenient. Firstly, St. Bega is not known from any Irish source, nor can her father be identified - although as the vita conveniently has no record of his name the latter may be a criticism of doubtful value. Arguments ex silentio admittedly lack a certain force in this period, but we must remember that Ireland is considerably better off for documentation than Britain and that monastic annalists and hagiographers were relatively adept at keeping track of wandering saints. Secondly, and more significantly, the ninth century is an improbable time to find an Irish saint moving into Britain and setting up church, whatever the motive; and it is more than likely that St. Bega's reasons were supplied by her hagiographer. The main movements of Irish saints to Britain and the continent were a couple of centuries earlier - indeed, a date in
the seventh century would be considerably more in keeping with the main pattern.

The connection between St. Bees and Begu of Hackness is almost certainly spurious, and there is nothing else in the *vita* which suggests that Bega lived at this time. If the later date is to be preferred, then the importance of her role is considerably reduced since we know that there was a church site at St. Bees in Viking times anyway. The details of her life as supplied by the *vita* are probably fictitious, and can hardly be considered valuable additional information. St. Bees may have been an important secular centre for the area from a much earlier date, however (Winchester, 1978, 78-9), and there is some slight archaeological evidence which hints at the possible presence of an earlier church on the site (see below, 311-12). The documentary material contributes little; even if it does contain a kernel of truth, this is largely superfluous information.

We know a little about some of the Anglian monasteries of Cumbria. Bede refers directly to two - Dacre (*H.E.*, IV, 32) and Carlisle (*V.S.C.*, XXVIII) and mentions in passing the building of another, which was consecrated by St. Cuthbert, and must have been near Carlisle. The monastery at Carlisle was under the supervision of the sister of Ecgfrith's queen, and the latter stayed there when she was awaiting the outcome of Nechtansmere, where Ecgfrith was killed by the Picts. Dacre is mentioned in connection
with a miracle performed there by some relics of St. Cuthbert; Bede had met the very person for whom the miracle happened, and states that the monastery was in the course of construction, and that the event took place three years before; presumably in the late 720s. He gives the names of two abbots - Suidbert and Thridred.

Later evidence tells us of another monastery, at Heversham; in the anonymous Historia de Sancto Cuthberto (Hinde, 1868, 147) mention is made of one Tilred, abbot of Hefresham, who in the reign of Edward the Elder brought the vill of south Eden (Castle Eden, Co. Durham).

"Half of this he gave to the see of Lindisfarne, so that he might be a monk there; the other half he gave to Norham, so that he might be abbot there."

It is thus evident that the see of Lindisfarne carried great prestige in Cumbria. As this took place in the early years of the tenth century, it seems safe to assume that the foundation of Heversham pre-dates this. It has been suggested that there was also an Anglian monastery at Workington (Bailey, 1974, 1, 24). This supposition rests on the fact that 'Derwentmouthe' was the place from which the followers of St. Cuthbert planned to sail with the saint's body, en route for Ireland (Hinde, 1868, 146).

It has long been recognised that insular monasteries of the period are of two types: large establishments which fulfilled many functions, administrative and educational, and much smaller, eremetic monasteries, usually in secluded or inaccessible places, although monasteries of this type sometimes evolved into larger
establishments, as at Glendalough. The classic example of the second type which is only rarely mentioned in the sources, is of course Skellig Michael, but examples are known from the Scottish Isles, and St. Cuthbert had a hermitage on Farne, so it is likely that they formed a component of the church in Northumbria, as well as in the west. No archaeological examples of this type are known in Cumbria; however Bede notes that St. Cuthbert had a long established friendship with an English hermit of Cumbria called Herebert (Bede, V.S.C., XXVIII) who lived on an island in Derwentwater. His retreat cannot have been too secluded as he knew when Cuthbert came to Carlisle, and visited him there. A pilgrimage to St. Herebert's Island was instituted in the late middle ages but there are no visible monastic remains there now. It is possible that Herebert lived alone in a hermitage similar to St. Cuthbert's on Farne; but also conceivable that his island retreat was shared by a few others with a similar vocation.

All the evidence (although there is not much), points to these monasteries being Anglo-Saxon foundations with close links across the Pennines. If the Anglo-Saxons founded an established church organization in Cumbria, no mention is made of it in the documentary sources.

Cumbria disappears from history after Bede, until the arrival of the Norse settlers, with which this study ends. This is also the time when information on Northumbria as
a whole is scarcest. It may have been the arrival of the Norse which prompted Tilred's move; but the progress of this settlement is practically undocumented, nor are historians very sure when it actually began. We may view Halfdane's arrival in the north as the first long term disruption. He certainly visited Cumbria: the Abbot of a monastery at Carlisle was told in a vision to rebuke him, by St. Cuthbert. Recent tendencies are to place the main period of Norse settlement at the beginning of the tenth century, rather than in the last quarter of the ninth (Angus, 1965). It is usually thought that the Norse settlers came from Dublin, though recent work indicates that the Isle of Man may have provided many of the settlers (Bailey, 1974, 1). This seems reasonable as in any case Norse or other Viking settlements in Ireland do not seem to have had much importance until the tenth century.

As we can see, we have very little precise information about Cumbria in this period. We know the names of some who might have been its kings or leaders; a certain amount about the political set up in northern Britain; the fact that in spite of considerable resistance, the north-west was conquered by the English before the end of the seventh century; the names of a few Anglo-Saxon monasteries and some of their inmates; the fact that the countryside was laid waste in A.D. 875 and that much of the county was subsequently settled by the Norse. Much
has been conjectured about other matters but nothing is really certain apart from the fact that at least certain sections of the population, the aristocratic warrior class, regarded itself as Christian in the sixth century.

By inference it is possible to extend this picture. Almost infinite expansions on the Celtic theme are possible. It has been conjectured, for instance, that the system of estates and tenure to be observed in medieval documentation derives from British estate organisation. Multiple estates have been identified all over Britain now and while this is hardly the proper place to consider them in great detail, the general debate has raised many important points which merit some consideration. Briefly, a multiple estate (or federal manor) may be seen as an estate, subdivided into smaller units which seem to correspond with townships or at any rate township-sized units, which possess characteristic features. These include the presence of wholly bond settlements, the existence of a central place or caput which acts as administrative centre for the whole area, with a concentration of demesne land adjacent to it; and the utilisation of both upland and lowland environments, in a mixed economy. These estates frequently make use of distinctive tenures and dues. These may be contrasted with the much smaller and more unitary structure of the lowland manor.

The Welsh documentation for this type of estate is the richest (Jones, G.R.J., 1961; Jones Pierce, 1961) but it is clear that analagous systems are found elsewhere.
(Jones, G.R.J., 1976; Jolliffe, 1926) and it has been forcibly argued that this type of estate is of pre-Anglo-Saxon origin, and represents a basically British institution. Professor Glanville Jones has claimed, indeed, that the origins of estate patterns even in eastern and south-eastern England, are pre-English. Be that as it may, it is quite clear that multiple estates are to be found in Cumbria (Barrow, 1975; Jolliffe, 1926) and have recently been well studied in one area (Winchester 1978). Barrow has suggested that the pattern of post-Conquest rural deaneries may correspond to earlier estate divisions (1975). He observes the very high proportion of compact estates at the Conquest, and parallels this with the structure of Welsh Lordship. Winchester accepts the basic premise of the pre-Conquest origin of the multiple estate, but suggests that the real unit was rather smaller than the medieval rural deanery; he identifies three distinctive multiple estates within the deanery of Copeland, centred on Millom, Egremont and Cockermouth. Doubtless further detailed study of landholding in other parts of Cumbria will reveal more of these estates. Indeed, at least one other possibility springs to mind immediately; the place-name Birdoswald seems to incorporate the British word *bordd*. This term, in medieval Wales, was usually applied to the Lord's mensal or table-land, usually adjacent to the *caput*. It is not totally unreasonable to postulate the estate of an Anglo-Saxon
Oswald, with a centre perhaps adjacent to the old Roman fort at Birdoswald.

The multiple estate appears to be such a widespread phenomenon that one is tempted to suggest that it may simply represent an efficient and unilateral system of maximising the resources of upland and lowland environments, without necessarily ethnic affiliations. Nonetheless, the greatest contribution of the work of Glanville Jones and Jolliffe has been to demonstrate that the concept of territoriality was well developed before — perhaps much long before — the Anglo-Saxon settlement. We can no longer postulate a succession of invasions in a vacuum, where each new wave of settlement involves a new landtake in a virgin environment. The landscape has a much more complex evolution.

We could postulate, at least for post-Roman Cumbria, a society like that of Wales and Ireland; a hierarchical society, perhaps similar to that described in the early Irish and Welsh Laws. A single legal phrase in Cumbria — Galnes — has survived (Jackson, 1963, 66) and a similar term meaning 'blood-fire' is found in the Welsh Laws of Hywel Dda. The two areas shared the same language until the fifth century, and a common legal tradition is clearly indicated. It is unwise, however, to place much reliance on the elaborations of the more literary sources; a tradition which may well pre-date the Iron-Age is not necessarily the safest guide to what was usual practice in the sixth century A.D. The Tain, the great Irish epic of a comparable date to the poetry of Aneirin and Taliesin
in written form, embodies very early traditions, and it is clear that several of the customs and practices described were no longer current when the poem was written down. The northern bards would have been schooled in a long bardic tradition and may well have used anachronistic phrases: the fact that the heroes of the Gododdin are described as wearing gold torques, for instance, hardly means that this was the usual battle-dress of a sixth century warrior.

We do have some indications of what life might have been like in Early Christian Cumbria from the documents but it can hardly be claimed that we are bound within a rigid historical framework, which will close our minds to all other possible models. Each avenue of approach may have its own methodology, but this is not a true restriction. Problems should properly be studied from many angles, before conclusions are reached. In the following chapters we shall consider other possible approaches.
Wilson (P.A., 1966, 69) seems to hold that the entry in the Chronicle of Aethelweard is the earlier, but this is not strictly so; the latter was not written until the late tenth century (Campbell, 1962, XII-XV) and the use of Pictis Cumbrisque dates from then, not from any contemporary entry. The 'contemporary entry' - i.e. the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle - uses Strathcled Wealas, as we have noted; and Aethelweard's sole source of information for this period would appear to have been a text similar to the A text of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle (Campbell, 1962, XVII, et seq). We cannot be precisely sure what word Aethelweard was directly translating, although it is conceivable that his manuscript may have used some term other than Strathcled Wealas at this point.

See Garmondsway, 1954, 107 for text

For discussion, see Jackson, 1963

See Jackson, 1939, Jackson, 1969, Gresham, 1942

Miller (1975) has recently reconsidered this battle and its significance. She stresses the reputation for ferocity which it held in later Welsh writings, and attempts to parcel out north-west Britain into kingdoms, ruled by the leaders who are connected with the battle in the twelfth century Welsh Triads. Her analysis relies heavily on legendary material and connections of the most tenuous nature. She unconvincingly attempts to identify historical or quasi-historical figures in surviving place-names. For instance, because the name Donat survives in a well-name in Morland parish (see below, p.266) Miller claims that this is verification of her contention that the Dunaut Rex of the Annales Cambriae ruled a kingdom in West Cumbria in the late sixth century. She also proposes that thirteenth and fourteenth century church dedications to Wilfrid are evidence that he was granted land in the area in the seventh century. Miller acknowledges that this evidence is fragile. In the writer's opinion it is completely irrelevant to the point at issue, and her conclusions should be seen as purely speculative.

Or Hussa. See Lovecy (1976, 36-7) for a discussion on the rival merits of these two kings. He favours Hussa.
Lovecy (1976) has recently reconsidered this battle. In addition to the material consulted by the present writer he uses some of the traditions contained in later Welsh poetry and legend. Little new emerges from his study, apart from a positive restatement of the view that internal warring and conflict, rather than concerted action against the English, was the norm among the British at this time.

In its present form, this is a work of the twelfth century, but probably based on an original work of the tenth century. How reliable it is for the reign of Ecgfrith is a moot point.

I am grateful to Dr. J. Mann for discussion on this point.

See Jackson (1958), for discussion re sources for St. Kentigern; J. McQueen (1961) for consideration of Ninianic sources.

The most accessible published text of this is in Wilson, J., 1915, 497-520.
CHAPTER 3

The Place-name Evidence

The purpose of this chapter is to assess what can be gleaned from place names about the Early Christian settlement of Cumbria. The basis of any study of place-names is of course the volumes of the English Place-Name Society. Comprehensive compilations are available for the former counties of Cumberland (Armstrong et al., 1950, 1952) and Westmorland (Smith, 1967, i, ii), but for Lancashire North-of-the-Sands, the collection is much less comprehensive and the data correspondingly less complete. Another great handicap to the study of early place names is the absence of early records; Cumbria is poorly provided with early medieval documentation of names. This means that the meaning of names is often uncertain: experts frequently find it impossible to state, one way or the other whether a certain element is or is not present, and the lack of Domesday Book is a serious loss. Over and above this there are general drawbacks to the use of place-names as evidence for settlement which must not be forgotten. Particularly in a county like Cumbria, where many languages have predominated in rapid
succession, the survival of any one name or the non-
survival of another, especially early names, must have
been controlled by many arbitrary factors; and the
recorded 'distribution' is only a fragment. The earlier
the type of name, the more misleading and random its
distribution will be. Where interpretation of names is
very uncertain, the disadvantages increase in proportion:
the main handicap in trying to use only 'good evidence'
is that there is not a great deal of it and what there is
may not be representative. As noted in the introduction
(above, p. 7) some place-names are perhaps rather less
vulnerable to non-recovery than archaeological data, and
this caveat is not, perhaps, of great significance when
we are dealing with large numbers of names; but where
our sample is small, little emphasis should be placed on
the observed distribution. The great disadvantage of
place-names is that we must rely on records of relatively
recent origin. If a name is lost before it is recorded,
it is lost irretrievably.

As can be gathered from Chapter 2, the linguistic
history of the north-west is fairly complex: at the close
of the Roman period it is safe to assume that British and
Latin were the spoken languages. Latin would not have
been spoken outside the areas of Roman influence, i.e. it
was undoubtedly restricted, more or less, to the forts
and vici. British would have been spoken by the population
in general, into post-Roman times; not a great deal is
known about the variety of British spoken (styled Cumbric
by Jackson) but it is usually considered to have been very like Welsh. At some stage in the seventh century, the incorporation of Cumbria into the kingdom of Northumbria brought with it English speakers and English place-names; some of the latter are characteristically Northumbrian. Later on, in the tenth century, the northern part of the county formed part of the British kingdom of Strathclyde/Cumbria, and this seems to have resulted in a movement of British speakers back into the area. Probably more or less contemporary with this was the immigration of what must have been a sizeable Scandinavian population into Cumbria and South-West Scotland. This latter settlement is, as we have seen, virtually undocumented, and the presence of abundant Old Norse place-names in these areas is key evidence for it. In the eleventh century most of Cumbria belonged to the Kingdom of Scotland; and finally, late in the eleventh century, it passed again back to England.

Proceeding by a process of elimination, it is clear that Scandinavian and Gaelic names fall outside the chronological limits of this study, although they cannot be totally disregarded as in some instances they may throw light on earlier periods. It can be safely said that Latin made no impact on Cumbrian place-names; we know the names of most of the Roman forts, but these did not survive in use. There remains for consideration the British and English names.

It seems probable that new British place-names would not have been formed between the seventh and the tenth
centuries, simply because during this time it is unlikely that the British population was in a position to expand and form new settlements. The same kind of thing cannot really be said for English names, however; while these will not predate the seventh century, it is conceivable that English speakers continued to form new settlements or re-named existing ones in the tenth and eleventh centuries, not to mention thereafter. The problem remains, therefore, of deciding which names in these two categories are, respectively, pre-seventh century, and pre-tenth century.

Before looking at settlement names it is best briefly to consider Cumbrian river names. On Jackson's well-known map of British river names (Jackson, 1953, 220) Cumbria is clearly in his area 3 i.e. it is in that part of the country where Celtic or pre-Celtic river-names have a maximum chance of survival. Most of the major river names are Celtic i.e. Calder, Derwent, ?Duddon, Eden, Ellen, the two Esks, Irt, Irthing, Kent, Keer, Leven, Lune, Lyne, Lyvennet, Mint, Mite, Nent, Tees, and Tyne. Many of the minor streams have Celtic names too, especially in the northern part of the county, although the Celtic part is usually followed by the common Norse word for a stream, bekkr, e.g. Carn Beck, Cam Beck, Cammock Beck, Knorrren Beck.

Some fairly important rivers have English names, however, e.g. Eamont, Waver, Liddel Water; and the Winster may be a Scandinavian name (Ekwall, 1922, 190).
Occasionally place-names preserve old British river or stream names, no longer in use, e.g. Tory Bridge (the Kirk Burn, Stapleton) and Hellpool Bridge (Kirkinton Pool). This transferrence could happen at an early stage: as Bede tells us, a certain Anglo-Saxon monastery was near the river Dacore, from which it took its name (Bede, H.E., IV; 32). The Scandinavian impact on the Lake District can clearly be seen in the way that most of the lakes, major and minor, have Scandinavian names. Jackson considers (Jackson, 1963) that the survival of so many British river names indicates the survival of the British population; this point will be returned to (see below, pp. 111-13).

The evidence to be gleaned from British place-names proper is meagre enough. Map IV shows those names which must have been attached to British settlements, either by Britons themselves, or by others. Some of them are not perhaps, in a strict sense, habitational, but do indicate nearby settlement or human activity.

The most important element is obviously caer, which occurs eleven times in all - twice as a parish name (Carlisle, Castle Carrock), five times attached to minor settlements (Cardew, Cardumock, Carhullan, Carmalt, and Carwinley), one example is lost (Caraverick) and in three cases, caer does not refer to a modern settlement. Cardurneth Pike is a peak on Cumrew Fell, Caermote (Blennerhasset) is a Roman fort (although this is not recorded before 1777 (Armstrong et al., 1950, 326) and could perhaps have been given in modern times as an
antiquarian name) and Caerthannoc, (Matterdale) is a hill-fort, also called Maiden Castle. Caer or car generally means a fort - not necessarily an important fortification; in Scotland, at any rate, it may indicate nothing more formidable than a protected farmstead (Nicolaisen, 1972, 2). Elsewhere in Britain it is used for Roman cities (Jackson, 1953, 239) and in Cumbria it would appear to be used at least once in this sense, i.e. Carlisle. With the exception of Castle Carrock, all the examples are in the usual form i.e. caer + element. Inversion compounds like this are not considered to predate the fifth century (Jackson, 1963a, 81) and certainly continued in use until the tenth century or later.

Tref occurs twice, in Triermain (a farm name) and, probably, in the lost Trerankelborhan (Mansergh). Tref is common as a first element like this in Wales and Cornwall. The usual meaning is simply a 'farmstead'. If tref does occur in Trerankelborhan, then it almost certainly continued in use until the tenth century in the north-west, as this name is a compound which appears to contain the Old Norse personal name Hrafnkell. Another late habitation compound is the township name Blennerhasset, which is apparently the equivalent of the Welsh blaen-dre - a hill-farm - and Old Norse heysaetr - 'hag shieling', while Burtholme has buarth, a word corresponding to the Welsh for a farmyard, and ON holmr, L(l)an and cil are not certainly habitation in their Cumbrian occurrences, all in parish names. The first element of Lamplugh is from
British Landa, an enclosure. The meaning of church (Welsh llan, Cornish lan) arose later from this but it is doubtful if any early ecclesiastical significance should be attached to Lamplugh. The second element is unidentifiable. Cil was considered reasonably abundant by W. G. Collingwood (Collingwood, 1899), but virtually all of his suggested examples have been convincingly explained by Ekwall as containing Scandinavian gil (a ravine). The only two names likely to contain cil are Culgaith and Gilcrux - and the first element is now considered to be British cil, a retreat, a corner (Armstrong et al, 1950, 184-5, 287) and not Irish cill, a church. The second elements of Culgaith and Gilcrux are, respectively, coed, a wood, and cruc, a hill. Again, although it is tempting to suggest an early ecclesiastical significance for these names, this is perhaps unjustifiable, on the evidence available.

Place-names do provide us with other evidence for an early church however. It has recently been suggested (Cameron, 1975, 6) that Eaglesfield has as its first element eccles, the latin name for church. Eccles names have been fully discussed by Cameron (1968, 1975) who developed the notion first proposed by Ekwall (1922) that these names indicate the sites of late Roman churches. The re-interpretation of the name was made possible by the discovery of further early spellings by Mr. P. A. Wilson (1978) who has also made a connection between the place-name and the burial site at Tendley Hill, which will be further discussed later. (see below, pp.228-30).
The other names on Map VI are old English or Old Norse place-names which probably indicate British settlements, although not all of these are, again, strictly speaking, habitational names. Cummerdale, near Carlisle, is Old English Cumbras dael - dale of the Britons - for instance; Briscoe, in South-West Cumbria, is Old Norse Bretas skogr - 'wood of the Britons'; and the lost Britscoghenges (Cliburn) is Old Norse 'meadow by the wood of the Britons'. There are two possible examples of Walton (i.e. Old English Wala-tūn, tūn of the Britons) - Walton Hall in Cartmel and the lost Waltoncote in Dalton - and three Birkbys (Old Norse by of the Britons). One of these is a joint township of Cross Canmonby, one a tiny hamlet in Cartmel, and one a mountain name - Birkby Fell, Muncaster. Also worthy of note is Brethstrette, a name recorded several times in the thirteenth century for High Street, the Roman road from Ambleside to Brough.

This is more or less the total of evidence provided by place-names for actual British settlements. As has been generally indicated, none of these names, apart from Carlisle, an adaptation of the earlier, Romano-British Luguvallium, are necessarily early, and some are definitely late. Jackson considers, as we have seen, that many of the caer names cannot be pre-English or pre-Norse. He points out, for instance, that Carhullan is the caer of an Englishman, Holand; and that the form of Cardew indicates that it was not taken into English until the tenth century or later (Jackson, 1963, 82-3); and Ekwall
has proposed that Carwinley contains the Scandinavian 
haugr as a final element (Ekwall, 1918, 107-8). Actual 
British place-names are virtually confined to the northern 
part of the county: only two examples, Lamplugh and 
Carhullan, (and the lost, uncertain Trerankelborhan) are 
south of the Derwent-Stainmore line suggested by Jackson 
as the southern boundary of the Kingdom of Strathclyde/
Cumbria in the tenth century (Jackson, 1963, 74-5). On 
the other hand, names such as Birkby and Briscoe do indi­
cate the survival of some Britons, south of this, into 
Viking times.

The 'Birkby' of Birkby Fell does not refer to any 
surviving settlement, but on this mountain are the native 
settlements of Barnscar. There is as yet no indication 
that these were themselves occupied until the Scandinavian 
settlement, in fact the known evidence rather suggests a 
prehistoric occupation (see below, p. 141), but it is clear 
that if the place-name does in fact refer to these abandoned 
sites, then the Norse must have been sufficiently familiar 
with the type of settlement occupied by Britons to 
recognise that those on Barnscar were to be classed with 
them. One way or another, the place-name may suggest 
surviving Britons in the area until at least the tenth 
century; the same may hold for the other Birkby, in Cartmel.

The great majority of surviving British names are non-
habitational, and their distribution should not therefore 
be used as an indication of settlement distribution. That 
is not to say that many of them are not settlement names;
on the contrary, most of them do refer to modern farms, hamlets, villages, towns, townships, or parishes. But the fact that these names could have been transferred to settlements from natural features at any stage, long after the language in which they were formed had ceased to be spoken, or the names themselves intelligible, renders them useless for the purpose of dating the settlements to which they were attached.

Nevertheless, the imbalance in the distribution of British non-habitational place-names is so pronounced as to deserve some comment. If these names are seen, not as indicators of settlement, but simply as place-names, it seems reasonable to offer some interpretation of their distribution.

This distribution overwhelmingly re-inforces the impression given by the habitational names, that on the whole, British names in Cumbria are late, i.e. to be associated with the re-occupation of the country by British speakers in the tenth century, rather than with the pre-English inhabitants. Virtually all of them are north of, or close to, the Derwent-Stainmore boundary, and most of those immediately south of it refer to natural features such as mountains, which would have been plainly visible from further north. Within the northern area, there are pronounced groupings; there is an obvious cluster of names just north of Ullswater, and west of Penrith, and a reasonably well defined group north and east of, though not particularly close to, Carlisle, mainly in the Irthing valley. Most of the remaining names are generally
scattered along the river valleys of the Wampool, Waver, Ellen and Derwent, although they tend to avoid those parts of river valleys where there are tün names, which may have some significance (see Map VII). Their distribution on the eastern side of the Eden valley is not quite as confined as that of the tün names, but they are still scarce there. The reasons for these pronounced groupings are a little mysterious, but as the names are not being taken as indications of settlements, comment is to little purpose here: it can be generally suggested that these groups represent enclaves of British survival. It is very evident, however, that British names did not generally survive outside the northern part of Cumbria; and the most obvious explanation of this is that those which have are chiefly the product of the migration into northern Cumbria of British speakers which is known from historical sources to have taken place in the tenth century.

Another general indication of their lateness is the fact that many of them are compounded with Old English or Old Norse elements in a way which suggests that the British element is the latest of all. There is the well known example of Cumwhitton, for instance, which is an inversion compound in which cum, a valley, has been prefixed to the (presumably) pre-existing English habitational name Whitington. Cumwhinton may have as a second element the Norman or Anglo-Norman personal name Quintin, in which case it can barely be earlier than the twelfth century; Maughanby is probably the Cumbric personal name Merchieun
compounded with Old Norse \textit{by}. Many other examples could be cited.

In spite of all this, however, it must be borne in mind that within both categories there are names which are genuinely pre-English. Carlisle is perhaps the most readily recognisable example, but it is not necessarily the only one, although it is difficult to establish which other names are as old. Names which are found south of the tenth century boundary are probable candidates. Lamplugh is a case in point, it is several miles south of the Derwent. Even if the non-habitative names do not indicate settlements, there must have been some Britons around to pass on the place-names; and the fact that a couple of these are compounded with English and Norse names indicate that the British population survived to do so into Scandinavian times. It is not really very probable that these names also are attributable to occasional tenth century immigration south of the political boundary of the British kingdom. There is probably a core of primary British survivals in the place-names, but not a large one.

It is at least likely that a similar percentage of the names in the northern part of the county are also early. Apart from those English names which incorporate British river names, there are a few examples which have British elements which may be earlier: Holm Cultram and Coulderton both have as their first element (apart from the Holm of Holm Cultram) the British word which corresponds to Welsh \textit{culdir}, 'a narrow strip of land', and Holm Cultram,
especially, is an early name. Lanerton has as its first element the British 1(l)anerch, a clearing. In the case of names in which all elements are British it is unfortunately not possible to differentiate, chronologically.

It must be concluded, however, that the survival of pre-English place-names in Cumbria has been fairly minimal; particularly in the case of habitative elements, in spite of the fact that Cumbria remained in British hands until the seventh century. Comparisons with other Celtic areas are appropriate here. This situation, i.e. a shortage of surviving early place names, is comparable with that of Devon. A brief look at the British place-names there is illuminating; Devon was conquered by the Anglo-Saxons at about the same time, or slightly later, than Cumbria, i.e. late in the seventh century; but there is no indication there of any later reflux of a British speaking population, so all the surviving British place-names may reasonably be taken as pre-English names. Of the thirteen certain examples of names in which all elements are British listed in the Devon survey, (Gover, Mawer, and Stenton, 1931, 1932), there are three instances of tref, and one possible example of Lia or les, the Cornish word for a palace, so the 'percentage' of habitative elements surviving is quite high; there are no wäl-tuns, although wäl is compounded on five occasions with non habitative English elements. There are a fairly large number (twenty-two possible instances) of hybrid compounds, with a British first element and an English second element, of the Coulterton, Cultram variety.
The English *burh* is occasionally the second element and in these cases it usually refers to a hillfort - doubtless with the meaning 'native stronghold'. Most of the surviving names are inversion compounds, and therefore post-Roman.

This shortage of early place-names is in marked contrast to areas like Cornwall and Wales, where Celtic languages continued to be spoken into modern times, and this factor must be recognised as of prime importance in determining the survival of early British place-names.

Detailed consideration of English place-names is here confined to those with habitational elements, as these are sufficiently abundant, and because of the problems of using non-habitational names discussed above (pp. 90-91). The exact sequence of development of early English names is at the moment somewhat controversial, and discussion will be limited to those elements which were probably in use before the tenth century.

The 'traditional' view, that generally, folk-names in *-ingas*, and *-inga* - are the earliest stratum of English settlement names, and broadly correlate with the initial settlement and phase of pagan burials (e.g. Smith, 1956) has been seriously challenged by several writers in recent years (e.g. Dodgson, 1967; Cox, 1973; Kuurman, 1975; Gelling, 1976, 1978). Detailed studies of certain parts of the country have shown that the distributions of the two things do not closely correlate, in any given area: and it has been proposed that *-ingas* and *-inga* names are
to be connected, rather, with a somewhat later phase, of expansion from the first settlements. We have already seen, however, that one does not necessarily expect a very close correlation when one is dealing with different kinds of evidence (see above, pp. 6-7) and it may be that this is not really a problem; but if the place-name experts' fears are well founded, the question remains as to what type of place-name is to be associated with the earliest settlements. Various suggestions to fill the void have been made. Gelling (Gelling, 1968) demonstrated the antiquity of the element *wīcham*: she notes the proximity of these names to Roman roads and smaller settlements, and very tentatively suggests a possible connexion between these names and finds of laeti material. Her conclusions are that names with *wīcham* belong to 'the earliest period at which English place-names arose' (Gelling, 1968, 97). Apart from *wīcham*, however, it remains a matter of dispute what elements should take the place of -ingas and -inga names as the earliest types. Obviously early are names incorporating pagan elements - names of gods, evidence of ritual, etc. - but these tend to be almost entirely topographical. Cox (Cox, 1973) and Kuurman (Kuurman, 1975), working in the Midlands and East Anglia and the East Midlands respectively, allot this status to names in hām. (Kuurman, specifically, to folknames compounded with hām.) Hām has of course always been recognised as early, but not given primacy over -ingas, -inga-. Dodgson, in his discussions of this element (Dodgson, 1967, 1973) observes
the connexion between *hām* names and Roman evidence (in Cheshire and South-East England). He concludes that these names are generally on the edges of the Romano-British settlement pattern, and, noting that *hām* names do occur in areas where there are no pagan burials, he recognises that the element must therefore continue in use after this practice had ceased. He describes *inga-hām* as a 'late variety' of *hām*, (Dodgson, 1973, 19). Dodgson associates the *hām* names in Cheshire with its 'conquest' by the English in the seventh century. Christian elements are occasionally compounded with *hām*, so its continuing use into the seventh century is really beyond doubt.

In a recent discussion of early place-names in Berkshire (Gelling, 1976) it is proposed that neither the *-inga-, ingas* names, nor those in *hām*, are characteristic of that area where archaeological evidence indicates occupation from the fifth century. Both of these types do occur there, but are, apparently, scarce. The settlement names in this area are mostly topographical, especially *ford* and *ced*, and she suggests that this type of place-name is probably more characteristic of the earliest settlements than anything else. Gelling also emphasises that *word* may be early.

Place names with *-ing* and *-ing-* (as distinct from *-ingas, -inga-, (meaning simply 'associated with', rather than 'of the people of') clearly had a longer period of use - into the ninth century: *-ing-* is frequently compounded with later elements than *hām*, and sometimes with
known individuals of the ninth century (Smith, 1956, 79-80). -Tūn is an element which may have been in use from the time of the earliest settlements, but it certainly continued in use until at least the conquest (Smith, 1956, 83). Gelling holds that most of the names in tūn and -ingtūn "seem to belong to a relatively late stratum in the topography of the county" (Gelling, 1976, 832). She also (1976, 823-7) raises serious doubts as to whether place-names with personal names as a first element are necessarily any earlier than those without; discussing compounds of tūn and byrig, she points out that many of the persons compounded with these elements were thegns, or people in charge of an estate for a time - and that such names frequently arose in the proto 'manorial' set up of the tenth and eleventh centuries rather than in an initial phase of settlement.

Wīc is another element that merits consideration here, although it is not usually considered to be particularly ancient. Nicolaisen (1967, 82-3) has shown that wīc is clearly early in southern Scotland, although he suggests that it is probably connected there with the fairly settled population of the eighth century, rather than with the initial phase of conquest in the seventh century - and some examples are clearly later than this.

Other habitative elements are of less certain validity in establishing early settlement patterns. Ceaster is an early element, which is frequently used for Roman sites, but it does not necessarily denote actual habitation;
burnh continued late in use, and in any case is frequently used, like ceaster for abandoned fortifications. Bodl as a settlement name is characteristic of northern England, particularly the compound bodl-tun - but its period of use is not certain; Nicolaisen (Nicolaisen, 1964, 165) considers it to be 'slightly later' than word.

It is time now to consider how these early elements are represented in Cumbria, and what, if anything, is revealed of the Anglo-Saxon settlement there, and of its subsequent development in the area. Of the place-names formed in one way or another with the suffix -ing-, there are no examples of final -ing, or -ingas; -inga-, the genitive plural of -ingas, does not certainly occur either, although there are some possible candidates. It may be present in the old county name, Westmoringaland, (A.S.C., s.a. 966) - the 'district of the men living west of the moors' (Smith, 1967, XXXVI-VII) but this name could be Scandinavian.

There are four surviving (and one lost) examples of names in -ingham, but it is quite possible that all of these contain the connective -ing- (i.e. -ing ) rather than the genitive plural -inga-. The absence of early documentation, however, may be largely responsible for the lack of evidence in early spellings, for the presence of the genitive plural form. Smith, specifically, so considers four of the known instances - Addingham, Whicham, Hensingham (1956, 84-5) and the lost Eschingham (1967, XXXVII) - and the remaining example, Aldingham, is only
recorded as Aldingeham once, in 1292 - all the other early spellings listed by Ekwall, from Domesday Book till the mid-fourteenth century, are simply of the -ingham form. Dodgson, in his discussions of Whicham, does suggest that it might be derived from the genitive plural, and original Hwitinga-hám (Dodgson, 1967b, 391-2) but seems to prefer the derivation from singular -ing- (391-92) and Dodgson, 1967a, 262). He observes that singular -ing- is occasionally recorded as -inga- in middle English spellings in northern England.

Three of these -ing + hám names are parish names, or former parish names, viz, Addingham, Whicham, and Aldingham. Hensingham was a township of St. Bees until it achieved parochial status in the nineteenth century. There is no record of whatever Eschingham represented. Addingham certainly, and Whicham and Aldingham probably were settlements abandoned or shrunken since the middle ages; Hensingham is now a municipal ward of the Borough of Whitehaven, but was formerly a small hamlet south of the town. All of these names seem to be compounded with personal names, with the possible exceptions of Whicham (Dodgson, 1967b, 392) and Hensingham (Armstrong et al, 1950, 400-1).

There are several names compounded of ing + tún, but only three of these are at all likely to contain -inga- in preference to -ing-. The most likely candidate is probably Hensington, a township and chapelry of St. Bees, recorded as Helsingetane in Domesday Book.8 Ekwall
suggests that this is a true -inga- the first element being hals, 'a neck of land', but Smith prefers a derivation from haesling, a hazel copse, and tun (Smith, 1967, 108). Workington, a parish and town name, is recorded as Wirchingetona once, c. 1150 (Armstrong et al, 1950, 454-5), but all the other forms indicate singular -ing-. Likewise, Frizington, but Dodgson indicates that in this case also the singular -ing- is to be preferred (Armstrong et al, 1950, 336; Dodgson, 1967a, 242).

In the remaining five examples of -ing + tun, - Cumwhitton, Distington, Harrington, Killington, Rottington - there is no suggestion of plural -inga- and they must therefore all contain simply -ing-. The first three of these are parish and village names; the last two are the names of townships and minor settlements. Virtually all of these names (including Workington and Frizington) appear to be compounded with personal names. Distington is the only exception.

There are seven certain, and one possible instance of -hām in Cumbria, in addition to the examples of -ingham cited above. Of the certain examples, Brigham, Brougham, Dearham, Heversham, Holm Cultram and Sebergham are all parish names, and all but Brougham are also the names of present villages. Hames Hall is a minor settlement just outside Cockermouth. The doubtful example, Farlam, is the name of a parish and small hamlet. Two of these hām names are compounded with personal names (Heversham, Sebergham); three (or four) with common Old English nouns (Brigham,
Brougham, Dearham, and Farlam), and one is compounded with a British topographical name (Holm Cultram). In Hames Hall, Hames is the plural of ham (Armstrong et al, 1950, 309).

Tun by itself is a very common element; a total of 135 surviving and seven lost occurrences are recorded in the compilations; but as this element continued in use well into post-Conquest times, it would be inaccurate to treat this element as a whole as representing a pre-Viking settlement distribution. Bailey (1974, i, 400-1, and Map 2) has enumerated those place names in tun which he considers likely to represent "a general indication of the post seventh century spread of Anglian settlement" (Bailey, 1974, i, 23), by eliminating 'blatant examples' of names later than the ninth century. His selective list is followed here.10 Those chosen include 23 parish names, 43 township names, 28 names of other minor settlements, and one lost name. Of all these names, a possible eleven are compounds with personal names (eight reasonably certainly so, three doubtful). In eight cases the first elements are the names of nearby rivers; and the remainder, i.e. the vast majority, are mostly compounded with common nouns, usually topographical or botanical terms. In a few cases, as we have already seen) the first element is an earlier British word.

Ceaster occurs seven times in all, but most examples - i.e. Bewcastle, Muncaster, Papcastle, Palm Castell - clearly denote old Roman forts. There is no obvious
candidate in terms of abandoned fortifications for Hincaster, Casterton, or Castrigg but, as Bailey has observed, a site inhabited only by wild hens is unlikely to have been a settlement. Gelling (1978, 152) states that "ceaster can only be recommended to the archaeologist as a general indication of Roman remains" and notes that there appear to be more than a few instances when no Roman explanation is forthcoming. Hincaster and Casterton are parish names, Cast Rigg is a farm name.

The only known example of word, Routhworth in Kendal Ward, is now lost. Wic merits the same selective treatment as tun: of the eleven known occurrences, at least two cannot be pre-Scandinavian (Renwick and the lost Killerwick, both compounded with Scandinavian personal names) and another two are late in their present forms (Cunswick, Sedgewick) but may be adaptations of earlier names. Two more (Estwyk, Rarewyk) are lost. Urswick and Warwick are parish names. The former possibly takes its name from the nearby tarn; the latter is compounded with warod, a bank or slope. Keswick (Old English cēse wic, cheese farm) is now a major settlement and parish name, but was formerly a township of Crosthwaite. Butterwick is a small hamlet, Grasswick a field name; both names are self-explanatory. Of the doubtful examples, Sedgewick is a township, Cunswick a farm name.

Eighteen or nineteen instances of burh are recorded, but, like ceaster, most of these seem to refer to abandoned Roman or prehistoric sites. This has a wide variety of
meaning in place-names throughout the country (Gelling, 1978, 143) and clearly continues in use until quite late, like tun. The only burhs in Cumbria which may be taken even tentatively as Anglo-Saxon settlement names are those where there are no adjacent abandoned sites, and in at least two cases (Boroughgate and Barrowgate in Appleby and Penrith respectively) the names are clearly too late to warrant inclusion. Burbank, Nentsberry and Turnberry are the only remaining examples; all are farm names.

This is probably more or less the total of pre-Scandinavian English habitational names in Cumbria. These names are listed in Appendices 3 and 4, and mapped on Maps VI and VII. In an attempt to distinguish between the earliest settlements and the later expansion of settlement, only those which are probably as early as the seventh century are mapped on Map VI, i.e. -hām, -ing + hām, and ?inga-tūn. (This latter category is admittedly somewhat dubious but if these place-names do contain -inga- then they properly belong on Map VI rather than Map VII). The ceaster names are here mapped as doubtful. Tūn, ing+tūn and wīc are mapped on Map VII, these being, theoretically later. The selected examples of burh are also marked, but, like ceaster, are doubtful. The two maps together may be taken as representing the pre-Viking extent of surviving Anglian place-names. Because of its later date bodl is not mapped.

The names on Map VI are, not surprisingly, rather few, which does tend to reduce its value as a key to settlement
distribution - although this very shortage is in itself significant. If a concentration can be said to exist anywhere, it is in the Derwent Valley, but in view of the small number of names involved, no great emphasis should be placed on this. The mountainous zones are clearly avoided, and the places named are usually reasonably close to major rivers, or the sea; the absence of demonstrably early names in the Upper Eden Valley is notable; and there are no names close to Carlisle, in Cartmel, or in the Lune Valley, and none in the south-west, between Hensingham and Whicham. This distribution does not really enable conclusions of a particularly positive kind to be drawn. What is clearly not suggested by the distribution is any particular zone or route through which the 'conquest' of Cumbria was accomplished. The distribution, such as it is, stretches from north to south and from east to west, and is by no means confined, or indeed, perhaps, connected - with any of the proposed lines of penetration, be they Roman roads or natural routes.

The total absence of early names from the one part of Cumbria where pagan burials do occur - i.e. the Upper Eden Valley (see below, p.192) suggests either that these burials are not to be associated with an important phase in the settlement of Cumbria by the English - i.e. that there were no English place-names at all in the vicinity at the time when the burials were deposited, or that some other type of place-name was in use. It must not be forgotten that one is dealing with a very few place names and even
fewer burials, and one could perhaps dismiss the connexion (or lack of it) quite legitimately on the grounds of insufficient data; but the concentration of what few burials there are is impressively pronounced; the fact that early habitational names do not occur nearby may well be significant.

A comparison between Maps VI and VII should reveal an expansion around the initial areas of settlement, and the taking over of new areas elsewhere. Most of the individual symbols on Map VI are represented by little groups on Map VII. Tun names blossom in Low Furness, and on the Keer, but not very much in Cartmel; some names do appear in the Upper Eden Valley, but there are prominent gaps, a particularly large one being on the Eastern side of the valley. On the western side tun names keep well away from the valley bottom. North and east of Carlisle there are noticeable concentrations, and also around the estuaries of the Esk, Irt, and Mite. There is no real intrusion into Lakeland, although there are some names along the Western foothills, and the fringes of the Furness Fells — Keswick marks the furthest penetration, inland, from the west. Quite a few names are spread across the northern part of the Carlisle plain, and there is a further concentration of these linking Brigham and Workington. The general preference for low-lying areas, especially river valleys, is a constant factor, but we can see that there are distinctive groupings and gaps.

The absolute validity of the distinctions between the
two maps, especially in the case of any individual name, is obviously open to question. Some names on Map VI are probably later than the seventh century, while it is very likely that at least some of the -tūn names on Map VII could have been formed as early as the seventh century, or later than the ninth century. There are other limitations in the selections made. The maps take no account of topographic names, although it is likely that many such were attached to settlements from the seventh century onwards. Unfortunately there is no way of knowing which ones; to map them all would scarcely clarify the picture. If emphasis is placed on general distribution, however, rather than on specific occurrences (though this is difficult in the case of Map VI, where each 'specific occurrence' represents a significant percentage) the overall picture is unlikely to be very misleading, although the number of place-names mapped must fall far short of the number of original settlement loci.

As in the case of British place-names, a comparison with Devon is interesting. Here there are no examples of final -īng or -īngas either; and only one possible occurrence of -īngahām (Gover, Mawer and Stenton, 1931, XIV). Ḥām is reasonably common,¹² and tūn is extremely common, although many examples are post-Conquest. Wīc is not rare either, although not nearly as common as tūn - again many of the examples are post-Conquest. On the whole, the English element is very pronounced, even in topographical names, Celtic names (of all kinds) forming less than one percent of the total.
It remains now to consider certain names which, although not themselves early may denote earlier settlements. McQueen, in his discussion of 'Kirk' and 'Kil' in Galloway place-names (McQueen, 1956) suggests that in some cases the Scandinavian prefix kirk- (from Old Norse Kirkja, a church) may be a direct substitute for the earlier kil (from Gaelic cill, a church) which is also found in Galloway - i.e. that some place-names in kirk- are in fact the altered names of pre-Scandinavian settlements. Specifically, McQueen suggests that those in which the second element is the prefix mo- (a Gaelic term meaning 'my') and the third a saints name, were originally probably kil- names, i.e. Kirkmadrine would have been originally called Kilmadrine.¹³

Those names in which all elements are Scandinavian however, must, he suggests, be directly of Scandinavian origin, i.e. not substitutes for earlier names. So pronounced is the Gaelic element in Galloway place-names, that McQueen is led to suggest that there was an earlier stratum of Gaelic names (and therefore Gaelic speakers) in Galloway.¹⁴

Jensen (Jensen, 1972) opens up further possibilities as part of a general discussion about Scandinavian names representing earlier settlements in Yorkshire. The appellative Kirkby (Kirkja-by) is a fairly common place-name element there, and she suggests that these names might generally denote the sites of pre-existing Anglo-Saxon churches. She points out that there is positive archaeological evidence in at least one instance to prove this (Jensen, 1972, 227-8).
In Cumbria, there are fifty-four examples of names with *Kirk* as first element, ten *Kirkby*, and five instances of -kirk. However, many of the *Kirk* names are late, or refer to ruins or stone cairns etc; many are minor field names, often lost or unlocatable; some are natural features. Attention shall here be concentrated on those which distinctly refer to settlements. A few of these evidently do incorporate the names of earlier settlements, e.g. Kirklinton, Kirkbampton, Church Town (all on Map VII). These are all clearly inversions compounds of *Kirk* and an (earlier) English place-name.

Many of the *Kirk* names are compounded with personal names, and all of these names are those of well-known saints, popular with either the Irish or the English. The English names are best explained as referring to the dedication of a pre-existing English church, which the Scandinavian settlers incorporated into the place-name. It seems much less likely that a Norse or Norse-Irish population would have chosen names like these. The saints in question are Andrew (two examples) and Oswald - both popular Northumbrian saints. All this is, of course, assuming that these names were formed during the Scandinavian settlement. If they are later than that - and early records are lacking - then the most that can be said is that the place-names incorporate the dedications of the respective churches.

The evidence with regard to the *Kirkby* names is slightly more positive. In two cases, pre-Scandinavian
sculpture is known at the churches concerned - Kirkby Stephen, and Kendal (formerly Kirkby Kendal) (see below, Ch. 7).

As there is no evidence for the use of Gaelic cill in Cumbria (above, p. 88) it can hardly be proposed that Kirk has been substituted for this element in place-names. The original place-name of Kirkoswald may well have been something completely different; all that is suggested here is that the combination of Kirk with an English saint's name may imply the presence of a pre-existing English church.

The Irish saints' names are a different matter. It has been generally accepted, since Ekwall (Ekwall, 1918) that the Irish or Gaelic element in Cumbrian place-names is to be associated with the Scandinavian settlement itself, rather than with any earlier settlement of Gaels, as proposed for Galloway by McQueen. Ekwall's main points undoubtedly remain valid; Irish elements are usually combined with Scandinavian elements, although there are a few place-names that are entirely Gaelic - an interesting example, in view of its geographical situation, is Ravenglass. Still, it cannot be said that there is any positive indication in place-names of a pre-Scandinavian Gaelic population, of either settlers or wandering saints.

One element which must clearly postdate the spread of Christianity in this region by several centuries is the word for a cross, cros, a late Old English loan word from Irish via Norse, which also occurs as Old Norse kross. This word occurs in several Cumbrian place-names, but as
there is not even a single concurrence of a pre-
Scandinavian cross and a 'cross' place-name, there is
really no reason to doubt that it, like other Irish
elements, came into use in Britain at the time of the
Scandinavian settlement in the north-west. It should
certainly not be used as an indicator of the spread of
Christianity. In one instance this element does co-
incide with a later, Scandinavian sculpture (Cross Cannonby),
but in most cases, the crosses in the place-names must be
medieval crosses, or crossroads. The original Old English
word for a cross, crūc, does not occur in any Cumbrian
place-name.

In a slightly different category is 'Tercrosset',
a place-name of British origin, the exact meaning of which
is doubtful, but which may contain as a second element a
word corresponding to the Welsh crosog, 'having a cross'
(Armstrong, et al, 1950, 97). The first element is tor,
a hill. If the 'cross' is to be understood as a sculptured
stone cross, the word can hardly predate the eighth century,
and is therefore probably no earlier than the tenth century.
On the other hand, a wooden cross or a simple incised cross
like that on the Addingham slab (see Ch. 6) might be meant.
No cross of any kind is known from the vicinity.'Tercrosset'
is a farm name.

It remains now to assess the overall implications of
the place-name evidence discussed above. Firstly, it is
clear that only very rarely did British place-names survive
This situation is, as we have seen, comparable with another part of the country conquered in the seventh century, i.e. Devon. In their consideration of the Devon place-names, in order to account for the unexpected shortage of early British names, the editors of the survey (Gover, Mawer, and Stenton, 1931, XVII-XVIII) resorted to the explanation that Devon was decidedly short of inhabitants in the seventh century, because of emigration to Brittany. Whatever the explanation in South-West Britain, however, the notion of a general shortage of Britons would not really accord with what little is known, historically, of the north in post-Roman times. One is therefore thrown back on the supposition that the absence of early British names is probably only accountable in terms of later events.

The disappearance of British or Cumbric as a spoken language from the area is an obvious explanation - early names survive in much greater abundance in Cornwall and Wales, for instance - but is not perhaps a completely adequate one. Quite a few of the later British place-names have survived into modern times, although it is doubtful if the language was spoken in the north-west into, let alone after, the twelfth century. It is hard to believe that the English could have eliminated British as a spoken language so quickly and so completely in the seventh century, as to have brought about the virtual abandonment of all earlier place-names, without eliminating most of the Britons themselves.

This 'traditional' - and now very unfashionable - view,
i.e. that the British population was basically liquidated, will not really serve very well either, unfortunately. As has been shown, settlements of Britons must have survived into Norse times distinct from the later migrations from Strathclyde. In any case, mass genocide would never have been easy in the Cumbrian terrain. It can be suggested that the Britons retreated to the uplands and mountains of the Lake District, leaving to the English the river valleys and the coastal plain, where the names of early English settlements are found. If this is so, however, it is difficult to account for the absence of British names in Lakeland, which is as pronounced as elsewhere.

Alternatively, it can be suggested that the British remained in the lowlands but were quickly integrated with, or rendered subservient to, the English, who renamed their settlements as a general rule when they took control - but this integration cannot have been very complete, for as we have already noted, distinctively British settlements survived.

Neither explanation is wholly satisfactory, and perhaps a combination of these factors was operative. Some areas may have remained more British than others. It is interesting, for instance, in view of the historical notice (see above, p. 55), that early English place-names are very scarce in Cartmel, but reasonably abundant in Low Furness. The implication of this may be that Cartmel was more or less left to the natives, as the less desirable land, although obviously subject to English control.
It would be inadvisable to view every gap in the distribution maps of English place-names in this way. There is no particular reason to suppose any enclave of Britons on the eastern side of the Eden valley, for instance. What evidence there is suggests that the potential of this and other areas of poor land or rough terrain, was first heavily utilized by the Norse settlers (Bailey, 1974, 1,15).

The distinctions made throughout this chapter with regard to the 'status' of the various name types, into parish names, township names and other settlement names, etc. is of uncertain value. Undoubtedly the biggest objection to its utility is that one must assume that these divisions represent significant units when the names were formed. The antiquity of parish and township divisions is much discussed, and very great antiquity (stretching back to prehistoric times!) has been claimed for the township as a basic unit in Wales (e.g. Jones, G.R.J.,1971); in northern England, as we have seen (see above, p.76) it is more usual to discuss the antiquity of large estates. Without assuming anything about this here, it is interesting to briefly consider the relationship between early English names, early British names, and these territorial divisions and subdivisions. The number of the former, it has been established, is small, but those south of the Derwent-Stainmore boundary may be generally considered as being independent of any later repopulation of the area by British speakers. With the exception of Lamplugh, no British habitational name or name referring to a British
settlement, south of this line, denotes either a parish or a township, and this is also true of British non-habitational names, apart from Watermillock and Mallerstang, which are compounded with Old English and Old Norse elements respectively, and are not, therefore, strictly speaking, pre-English. In contrast to this, a large proportion of early English names do refer to these territorial or administrative divisions. Only one name on Map VI does not (Hames Hall); and of the 108 names on Map VII about 26% are parish names, and just under 50% township names; less than 25% refer to other settlements.

Any conclusions drawn from this are naturally of a very speculative nature. Many factors reduce the value of this kind of evidence; but it is possible to speculate that we have some indication that an organised territorial system of settlement and administrative units was in existence before the Norse settlement. We cannot be sure if our settlement names could be themselves applied to a district rather than a specific place; but it is possible that they fulfilled both functions. We have no similar hint of a pre-Anglo-Saxon system of organisation in the British names; but it is possible that a re-organization might involve a renaming of pre-existing territories, rather than fundamental partitioning. Arguments *ex silentio* are frequently invoked in place-name studies, but it is surely best, since we have really very little idea of what controls place-name survival, to refrain from new dogma.
Some place-names in Furness and Cartmel, and a few in South-west Cumbria, are mentioned in Domesday Book. These formed Earl Tostig's estate of Hougun, which is included with the West Riding of Yorkshire (V.C.H., 1901, 336, for text)

re bodl: see note 11a below

This example is a good illustration of the unwisdom of assuming that simply because a settlement has a British name, it must originally have been a British settlement. This is, of course, not necessarily so, unless the name contains a British habitational element

Both of these names are considered by Ekwall (1922, 198, 203) to be 'tūns of the Britons', but Bailey does not include either of these as examples of pre-Scandinavian tūns (see below, 17). They are not shown on Map VII, but, tentatively, Walton Hall is mapped on Map IV, as its occurrence, if genuine, in this part of Cumbria, is of some interest. 'Waltoncote' is recorded late (1503) (Ekwall, 1922, 203). Walton Hall is probably the Wallethun of Doomsday (Ekwall, 1922, 198). In both cases it is possible that the first element is not wāla, a Briton: the two other Waltons in Cumbria have Old English w(e)all, a wall, as first element

This is the usual interpretation of this name (e.g. Armstrong et al, 1950, 78). Jackson, however (Jackson, 1963, 82) entertains the possibility that names like this could have been given by the native Britons as names for the dwellings of their Anglian overlords - in which case the name could well be pre-tenth century

His map of Cheshire (Dodgson, 1973, 2) uses hām names of all types to illustrate this point

This seems to conflict with Kuurman's view that -ingahām place-names may indicate the first of the colonization settlements

There is no village of Helsington, but the medieval village research group lists a deserted medieval village adjacent to the chapel

As already noted (Ch. 3) Workington may well be Derwentmouthe; the place from which the monks of Lindisfarne planned to set sail with the body of St. Cuthbert. (Hinde, 1868, 146) - it being at
the mouth of the Derwent. The *Historia de Sancto Cuthberto* is a twelfth century work, and if 'Derwentmouth' was the only name by which the place was then known, and the name 'Workington' postdates this, it must be very late indeed. However it is possible that Workington was an early alternative name for 'Derwentmouth', or that it referred to a nearby but distinct settlement. As there is pre-Viking sculpture at the church (see Ch. 7) an early site (i.e. pre-tenth century, at least) is independently attested, so the inclusion of the place-name, at least as a sign of pre-tenth century settlement, is not totally misleading.

10 There are slight differences between the selection of names used here, and those on Bailey's list. Names which occur twice, but where it is probable that one settlement is named after the other, are only mapped once, except in cases where the two names are in separate parishes, or name separate townships. For example, in the case of Great and Little Urswick, only the former is mapped, but there are two symbols for Great and Little Clifton (both townships of Workington) and separate symbols for Randalinton, West Linton and Kirk Linton. The distinction is somewhat dubious but it seems best to adopt a consistent practice. All the -linton s could be named directly from the Lyne (the name means tūn on the Lyne) but could also be named from each other.

11 *Routhworth* was in either Helsington or Underbarrow chapelry

11a *Botl* or *Botl* occurs eight times in all; three of the examples are *botl-tuns*; two are now lost.

12 There are problems in distinguishing between *hām* and *ham(m)* here

13 The fact that there is archaeological evidence of an early(ier) Christian site at Kirkmadrine more or less proves that this particular site at least is earlier than its name.

14 The evidence for this is not, of course, confined to names with *Kirk-*, or *Kil-*. The Gaelic element in Galloway place-names is very considerable. Nicolaisen (1970) discusses the principal habitational forms

15 In so far as is known, none of the names are those of popular British saints - but then one might well ask just what saints were popular with the British

15a But there is a Kirkandrews on the Isle of Man, from which the Cumbrian examples could, theoretically have been named as new settlements by the Norse.
Kirkandrews-on-Eden, first recorded 1263; Kirkandrews-on-Esk, first recorded ante 1153; Kirkoswald, first recorded 1167 (Collingwood and Graham, 1925, 23-4)

In connexion with saints names and Kirk-, it should be noted that there are no forms with Kirk-mo- as in Galloway

Hill (1966) connects cross and Kirk names with the spread of Christianity because she holds that the distribution of both elements is along Roman roads. Whether or not Christianity spread along these routes, tenth century place-names such as these can hardly be used in support of the argument!

The survival of British river names is, therefore, exceptional, rather than typical (see above, 3)
CHAPTER 4

Post-Roman Settlement Sites

The title of this chapter is a little presumptive; it is as well to admit at the outset that certain evidence of post-Roman occupation at any native site in Cumbria is, as yet, lacking although it has been claimed. In fact, this is scarcely surprising. The very limited amount of recent excavation, and the lack of comprehensive field survey in many areas mean that dating evidence of any kind is extremely scarce, quite apart from the added problems of attempting to date any site in the post-Roman period. As there are no specific documentary references to sites, or radiocarbon dates from excavations, these problems are particularly acute in Cumbria.

If these problems are faced realistically, however, it should be realized that some sites at least must have been occupied in the fifth and sixth centuries. It would be much more difficult to find reasons why native settlements should have been abandoned wholesale at the end of the fourth century. The pollen evidence can, as has been shown, be interpreted as indicating no great interruption of farming circa A.D. 400 (see above, Fig. 1.1) and the historical evidence shows, if anything, that the post-Roman centuries were the heyday of
the North British. These Britons must have lived somewhere - and the same sort of settlements that were inhabited in Roman times seem to be the most likely places. By analogy with elsewhere, it may be theoretically possible to imply a post-Roman date for certain types of site.

The purpose of this study is to suggest what areas are to be productive in the future, for excavation and research, rather than draw firm conclusions about the known material - by examining the close of the Roman period and the consequences of the break with the empire, generally considering the problems of post-Roman dating and the sites themselves, and tentatively suggesting some which might at some future date provide evidence of post-Roman settlement.

The date of A.D. 410 has been adopted in this study to mark the beginning of the post-Roman period in Cumbria, but in reality this is a somewhat artificial divide. Virtually nothing is known of the events of the fifth century, but it was quite possible for Britons such as St. Patrick to regard themselves as essentially Roman citizens after this date. The exact date of the withdrawal of all Roman troops from Hadrian's Wall and the other forts of Cumbria is neither certain nor uniform; in some cases, however, archaeological evidence for abandonment and historical events can be correlated. It seems clear that forts north of the wall were abandoned by A.D. 369, as a result of the Pict's War - after this date the Roman frontier extended no further than the Wall itself. The distribution of late fourth century Roman coarse pottery
is confined to Hadrian's Wall and areas south of it (Mann, 1975, 35). It has been suggested that the civilian settle­ments outside the forts were also abandoned at this date, and that the civil population moved inside the defended areas of the forts (Richmond, 1958, 124); but although the absence of late fourth century material in the vicus at Houseteads might be taken as indicating this (Solway, 1965, 89), at Vindolanda, it seems clear that a civilian population survived outside the fort after the Picts War (Birley, R., 1973). The date at which the site was finally abandoned is not known but Birley has stated that "there was no reason to suspect that the site was abandoned early in the fifth century".

Lack of evidence precludes conclusions about the vicus of Cumbria; fourth century vicus are attested at Ambleside, Bowness, Brough-under-Stainmore, Brougham, Kirkby Thore, Maryport, Old Carlisle, Old Penrith, Papcastle, Ravenglass, and Stanwix (Richmond, 1958, 117). Excavation has been inadequate and somewhat haphazard, but it suggests that the quantity of late fourth century material varies considerably from site to site. At Ambleside and Brough-under-Stainmore, for instance, most of the pottery discovered from the area of the fort and vicus has been of the late fourth century (R.C.H.M., 1936, 2-3, 48). In contrast, recent excavations have shown that all fourth century material has been virtually absent at Watercrook (Potter, 1976, 184-6) and as yet no late fourth century material has been recorded from the vicus at Ravenglass, although a late fourth century coin has been
found in the vicinity of the fort and *vicus* (Birley, 1959, 14-30). The most recent excavations at Ravenglass (Potter, 1979) did produce some late fourth century material, but were confined to the interior of the fort.

One of the most recent studies of the northern frontier in this period (Mann, 1975) indicates that whatever the fate of the *vici*, the wall forts themselves and presumably those south of the wall, were in use until the end of the Roman period. The exact events of A.D. 410 are still not established but it seems clear that even if there were forces still prepared to hold the north against the incursions of the *Picti* and *Scotti*, the breakdown in administration which took place in this year meant that there was no longer any money with which to pay them; and the usual interpretation placed on this is that the erosion of the artificial economy of the Frontier Zone, dependent as it was on this outside income, must have followed fairly rapidly. In this context the *vici* are seen as essentially market centres, where the salaries of the Roman soldiery, the product of a central treasury, were spent. The economy was not self sufficient; with the withdrawal of this external funding the *vici* lost their reason for existance; and no standing army could be maintained without some kind of surplus.

Against this must be set the fact that at Carlisle, some type of settlement continued to exist; and it is conceivable therefore that some other communities survived on a much diminished scale. One might suspect that some forts could have continued to fulfil a military function.
into the fifth century. The possibility of later occupation or re-occupation in times of strife must always be born in mind; one of the ditches of the fort at Bowness was recut, presumably for defensive purposes, in medieval times (Potter, 1975,40).

The composition of the forces defending the wall is uncertain, although it is considered highly probable that some troops were imported from the continent (Richmond, 1958,125). Epigraphic evidence indicates the presence of Germanic auxiliaries at Housesteads (Swanton, 1973,31), and spearheads (Swanton Type Al) which are derivative forms of a Germanic type (Nydam l) current in the fourth and early fifth centuries, are known from three sites in the region of Hadrian's Wall - Housesteads, Carvoran, and South Shields (Swanton, 1971,30-31). It is in some ways surprising that no archaeological evidence of later Germanic foederati has been found along the wall, or in its immediate hinterland.² One would think that if these were in fact the areas most frequently under attack from the Picti and Scotti that their need of extra troops would have been most pressing. It may be that native, rather than imported, assistance was sought against the enemy. The idea that the defence of the north was handed over to native rulers in the late fourth century was advanced by Richmond (Richmond, 1958,124-130). Although it now seems clear that this did not happen circa A.D. 383 (Mann, 1975, 35), something of the kind must have happened after A.D. 410. The emergence of historic kingdoms with
British rulers in the north is complete by the sixth century (see above, pp.43-4).

There is as yet no dateable evidence of fifth century occupation, but the explanation for this may in part lie with the accepted interpretation of late fourth century material. In the north-west, late Roman pottery - i.e. principally forms of Crambeck and Huntcliff or Signal-Station Ware - seems to have been more or less entirely provided by the kilns of East Yorkshire. It is usually thought that these kilns were some kind of official source of supply, and that production at them would have automatically ceased when the breakdown of administration occurred. Whether this is in fact what happened is unproven; if one is prepared to admit the possibility that production did not cease abruptly in A.D. 410, then it becomes apparent that the sequence of pottery might have a longer lifespan, and that perhaps the very latest forms might be assignable to the earlier part of the fifth century rather than all to the late fourth century. The very abundance of late fourth century pottery might perhaps also be seen as an indication that the timespan allotted to this material is too short. This is merely offered as a suggestion; but if the usual date for the end of pottery production is accepted, then it remains somewhat of a mystery how quickly the knowledge and skills required to produce good pottery were lost - nothing comparable in quality was to be produced in northern Britain for several centuries.
At what stage Roman material actually went out of use, even after production of it had ceased, is another matter for debate. One would expect that normally a complete pot would have a comparatively short lifetime; but if pottery was becoming increasingly rare it was presumably also more valuable and therefore more carefully treated. Pottery that is broken can continue to have uses: the Anglo-Saxons re-used Roman tile as flooring material \((\text{opus signinum})\) in the seventh and eighth centuries. It must be remembered that the date at which a pot was manufactured is not the same as the date at which a sherd or so of it was discarded and incorporated in a layer or feature: even if an object can be reliably dated itself, it does not necessarily give a reliable date to its context. Samian pottery was not manufactured after the early third century but Samian sherds have been found (and not all that infrequently) stratified with much later material, e.g. at the Mote of Mark (Laing 1975b).

At several sites in the south-west, Roman material has been found and considered to be associated with occupation and frequently refortification in late- or post-Roman times. A recent consideration of the problem (Rahtz, 1974, 95-7) in Somerset inclines to the view that Roman pottery was in general use well into the fifth century, though presumably on a declining scale as the century progressed. At the hillfort of Cadbury Congresbury, Roman pottery was associated with the refortification of old defences and also with the construction of a new line of defence. The stratification
indicated that the level which contained Roman pottery was succeeded, at least in some areas, by one which contained only a few hand-made sherds. This was in turn succeeded by a layer which contained imported wares probably of sixth century date. It was suggested that the most likely date for the initial re-fortification and the 'Roman' level was circa A.D. 410-450 (Fowler, 1971, 210). Direct association between the imported wares and Roman material has not been established and is perhaps unlikely; but a sequence is clearly indicated and this hardly prejudices the dating of Roman material to the fifth century.

It seems unlikely that native sites which are strongly fortified were occupied in Roman times, and the sudden appearance of late Roman material at these sites, frequently associated with their refortification, can be fairly reasonably interpreted as a hint that the occupation is post A.D. 410; but unless a sequence can be established it is hardly possible to prove this. Indeed, occupation in the fifth century can only really be demonstrated by finds of sixth century material in later levels. As Fowler has pointed out, "Take away the imports from a site like Cadbury Congresbury and what remains? a collection of ostensibly late-Roman rubbish including metalwork ... should we in fact be reading fifth/sixth century for Late Roman throughout?" (Fowler, 1971, 212).

No finds of post-Roman imported pottery have yet been made in Cumbria, although recent excavations at Lancaster have produced a single sherd of imported ware (Potter, 1976,
The known distribution of these wares, which seem to have been connected with the wine trade, is more or less confined to fairly large sites around the Irish sea (Thomas, 1959). If the native population of Cumbria lived at a bare subsistence level (see below) it is not too surprising that imported luxury goods have not been found on their settlements. The fact that this pottery has only been recognised comparatively recently at many sites coupled with the fact that excavation in Cumbria has been so sparse, hardly makes its non-appearance there a matter of great archaeological significance.

It is in fact unlikely that in a Romano-British context, post-Roman material would differ much from the known range of late Roman material. Indeed the range of objects of known post-Roman date is fairly small. Anglo-Saxon material does of course provide a fairly wide range of objects dateable to the post-Roman centuries, but none of this makes its appearance in Cumbria before the Anglo-Saxon occupation. The standard deviation involved in C.14 dating is usually too large to make this technique of much use in precise dating; post-Roman dates elsewhere do rely heavily on finds of imported pottery. Other types of post-Roman artifacts which do sometimes occur in British contexts - certain types of metalwork and glass, etc. - have been found in Cumbria but all the known examples are stray finds (see below, Ch. 8). Certain types of post-Roman pottery other than foreign imported wares have been identified elsewhere (Rahtz 1974) but it is doubtful if any of these constitute sufficiently
distinctive classes of material as yet, which could be identified as post-Roman in unstratified contexts without other post-Roman material.

Two conclusions can fairly reasonably be drawn from all of this. Firstly, it is clear that the chances of establishing a post-Roman date, even if a site was occupied into the fifth century, are fairly remote in Cumbria. With the sixth century, there is slightly more chance of finding post-Roman artifacts, but probably not on sites which had a very impoverished economy. Here, carbon $^{14}$ is likely to be the only means of establishing the date of the occupation. Secondly, it should also be clear that no site should ever be considered securely dated if only a small area has been excavated, and has produced very few finds. If these finds consist of a couple of sherds of late Roman pottery, the site can hardly be considered securely dated to within the Roman period, although late Roman material itself does not of course indicate a necessarily post-Roman date.

It seems advisable at this stage to take a closer look at the native sites themselves, and how they have been classified and dated. While this is clearly not the place for a comprehensive study of native settlement in Cumbria, a certain amount of consideration of general issues is necessary before those which are relevant to the post-Roman period can be isolated. Undoubtedly one of the most important things to clarify initially is the present state of knowledge.

Native settlements may be considered reasonably abundant
in Cumbria. The location of over 230 examples is known (Map VII) and aerial photography carried out in the very
dry summer of 1975 has revealed many more sites, especially
in North Cumbria\(^3\) (Higham and Jones, 1976). Parts of the
county have been particularly well served. The Royal
Commission on Historical Monument's volume on Westmorland
(R.C.H.M., 1936) contains plans of nearly 50 sites and
descriptions of a few others, plans of which were not
published. The work of Spence in South-West Cumbria (e.g.
Spence, 1937a, 1938,1939) and Hay in the mountain area
(e.g. Hay, 1943, 1944) as well as Swainson Cowper's still
useful work on Furness (Swainson Cowper, 1893) have contrib­
uted plans and descriptions of further sites and Blake's
work on the Solway Plain also included small-scale excavation
(Blake, 1960). On the whole, other excavation and survey
has been sporadic, although other workers have contributed
plans and descriptions of further sites. It should be
realized that the number of sites for which surveyed plans
are available for study must be less than 50% of the known
total, and the amount of published excavation is really
minimal. About two dozen sites, if that, have been excavated
in any sense, and in practically all cases, on the smallest
of scales. No site has been fully excavated, in fact no
settlement has been examined on a large scale at all -
excavation has in almost every case been limited to the
cleaning of walls or the occasional section, the excavation
of the internal areas of one or two hut sites, or the exam­
ination of entrance features. It is very important to
realise this before comparisons are made with other areas; with Northumberland, for instance, where both fieldwork and excavation have so greatly increased knowledge of native sites in recent years. Gaps on the distribution map and the general shortage of data might not be so noticeable if work in Cumbria was on a comparable scale.

As regards classification, the most frequently made distinction is between defended and undefended sites. The former do not as a whole conform to the usual pattern of hillforts, although some sites are strikingly defensive. The principal characteristics seem to be the smallness of the enclosed area, and the frequent use made of natural defences, precipices etc. Approximately 20-25 sites might be put within this category, depending on the criteria used, but published plans are only available for about a third of these.

There are no really large hillforts in Cumbria, comparable with, say, Yeavering Bell in Northumberland or Eildon Hill North in Dumfriesshire. What is probably the best known hillfort, that on Carrock Fell (NY 342,336)(Pl. 4.3) is somewhat atypical with an area of about five acres (c. 2.0 ha.)(Collingwood, 1938, 32); the next largest, that on Skelmore Heads (SD 2743,7516) has an area of about 3.5 acres (c. 1.5 ha.)(Powell, 1963, 6), but some sites are really very small. The enclosed area at Castle Crag, Bampton (NY 4693,1277) is less than .2 hectares (plan R.C.H.M., 1936, 32) and the area enclosed in the fort at Castlesteads on the Helm, Natland (SD 5308,8875) is about
.16 hectares; Castle How, Wythop, (NY 2016,3081) has a comparably small area (Curwen, 1911, plan, 119). These last four sites are good illustrations of how natural as well as artificial defences are heavily relied on. Skelmore Heads is defended by limestone outcrops which form a kind of natural *chevaux de frise* on the eastern, western and southern edges; while the last three sites occupy craggy scarps and promontories - it would be more descriptive to refer to them as inland promontory forts rather than hillforts. Certainly at least with regard to these sites, the nature of the terrain would preclude a larger area being enclosed. One wonders, however, why sites which would have permitted a larger enclosure were not more frequently selected - such hills do exist in Cumbria.

Another peculiarity of a few sites which are sometimes classed as defensive is the siting of the ditch inside rather than outside the enclosing bank - sites such as Cro glam Castle, Kirkby Stephen (NY 768,077), Castle Hill, Dufton (NY 712,230) and Castle Hill, Leck (SD 651,778). The area enclosed is in all cases quite small - less than .8 hectares. At least one Cumbrian site - Castles teads, Natland, has a surface feature which can be paralleled elsewhere; at each end of the fort is a small, rock cut cistern, outside the defences - presumably for holding water (Collingwood, W.G., 1908, 111). Large, rock-cut cisterns are found in several of the north-eastern Scottish forts e.g. Dunnideer (Feachem, 1966, 68, plan, 69). Because of the shortage of plans it is impossible to make firm
statements about the usual number of lines of defence, but Dunmallet, Dacre (NY 468,246) has a second line of defence on the northern side, and the promontory sites sometimes have two or three rock cut ditches. Some sites are clearly univallate, e.g. Skelmore Heads, Carrock Fell. The width and depth of ditches seems to vary considerably; at Skelmore Heads the ditch was 11 ft. (3.34 m.) wide and 3-4 ft. (1.37-1.52 m.) deep. The average width of the main Dunmallet ditch is recorded as being about 27 ft. (8.20 m.) and its depth about 13 ft. (4 m.) (Taylor, 1874, 157). There is not much evidence, superficially, of settlement within forts: there are the remains of a structure and a well, possibly of much later date, within Dunmallet (Collingwood, 1923,226) and circular sinkings on the rampart at Castle Crag, Bampton (R.C.H.M., 1936, 31-2) have been interpreted as evidence of occupation there. West noted 'buildings' and 'vestiges of ruins' at Castle How (Peel Wyke), Wythop (West, 1778, 126) but these are not mentioned in the later accounts of the site (Curwen, 1911; Collingwood, R.G., 1924). Collingwood simply refers to the stone facing of the ramparts, and notes that one of the stones used appeared to have traces of Roman tooling on it5 (Collingwood, R.G., 1924, 80). The absence of hut sites at Carrock Fell has been noted, although there are remains of hut sites and cairns nearby on the slopes of the fell and in the valley of the Carrock Beck. There are two robbed out cairns inside the enclosure (Collingwood, R.G., 1938, 39), and also traces of stone robbing.
Such dating evidence as exists comes mainly from excavations. There is no record of what was discovered in the cairns in the fort on Carrock Fell. Five other sites have been excavated, after a fashion. Castle Crag, Bampton, was partly excavated in 1922 (Proceedings, 1923, 285). No real site plan was published, but floor levels of clay and charcoal were found, and traces of a parapet on the north-east. There were no dateable finds. At some stage before 1923, Castle Crag in Borrowdale (NY 2493,1594) was 'trenched'. Roman pottery, including plain Samian, was found (Collingwood, R.G., 1924, 83) but nothing else is known about the excavation. The site had also been used as a quarry (West, 1778, 96). Maiden Castle, Matterdale (NY 4510,2435) was partly excavated before 1912: a supposed structure was found to be a natural feature (MacLean, 1912, 144).

There are much better records of the two more recent excavations. A section of the rampart of the largely destroyed site at Allen Knott, Windermere (NY 414,010) was excavated in 1963 (Lowndes, 1964a, 6). No dateable finds were discovered but the absence of any ditch facing the rampart at the point of excavation was established, and there appeared to be no trace of a pallisade or timber lacing. The rampart consisted of a core of loose boulders and soil, faced with drystone walling, which survived to a height of four courses. There were no indications of internal structures.

The hillfort on Skelmore Heads was partly excavated by Powell, 1957-60 (Powell, 1963). Again there were no dateable
finds; the bank and ditch were sectioned in several places and the entrance area explored. A timber pallisade which was earlier than the rampart but on more or less the same line of defence was found. Pallisaded enclosures elsewhere have been shown to be of Late Bronze Age or Iron Age date, and frequently precede stone ramparts. On this basis, Powell dated the rampart to the Iron Age. The absence of much silting in the ditch was interpreted as indicating that no great time elapsed between the construction of the stone rampart and its collapse. No traces of internal settlement were found.

Although it too has produced no dateable finds, the hillfort on Carrock Fell has also been dated to the Iron Age by Collingwood (Collingwood, R.G., 1938), on the basis of two considerations: its general form and size, and because he concluded that the rampart had been deliberately slighted; there are several gaps in the defenses at accessible places. He suggested that the rampart was thus damaged by the first Roman armies in the north-west.

The problems of analysing these sites in any kind of general sense are overwhelming. It is very difficult to draw any kind of positive conclusions from the small amount of data and largely negative evidence provided by excavation. One might speculate that the absence of much indication of settlement inside the forts could indicate that they were temporary refuges rather than permanent settlements; at any rate, not permanent settlements for sizeable populations; but this might easily be disproved if any site were to be
excavated on a reasonably large scale. For only three sites, Skelmore Heads, Carrock Fell and Castle Crag in Borrowdale, has any kind of date been suggested, and even in these cases the dating evidence is not particularly conclusive. It would be extremely rash to assign all sites to the pre-Roman Iron Age, however. In fact many sites bear little resemblance to 'typical' Iron Age hillforts. The sites could have a wide range in date; or have been constructed in one period and refortified in another. It is true that there is nothing to support the hypothesis that some of the Cumbrian hillforts were re-fortified in post-Roman times, but it is doubtful if this would be apparent from the known data even if they had been.

At a theoretical level (Collingwood, R.G., 1924, 86) it has already been suggested that the majority of hillforts in Cumbria were constructed to meet the defensive needs of the post-Roman population - Collingwood being of the opinion that pre-Roman or Roman construction were both more improbable; he held that there was virtually no dateable evidence of pre-Roman Iron Age activity in Cumbria and that the nature of the Roman occupation was likely to have precluded the construction of strongly fortified native sites for its duration, at least in those areas controlled by the Romans.

Fair (1943) has suggested that in the late Roman period co-operation between Roman and native led to the native population undertaking a share of the defence; this in turn led to the establishment of native fortresses, influenced by
Roman planning, which overlooked 'ancient trackways' - presumably the native equivalent of Roman roads! This is a somewhat romantic view; nonetheless it seems wise to establish that the idea that hillfort construction or occupation in Cumbria might be post-Roman is not particularly new.

Elsewhere in Britain the use of hillforts in the post-Roman period is established, and it has recently been forcibly argued that sites such as Dunadd, and Castle Rock, Dumbarton, were initially constructed then, and not simply re-used (Stevenson, 1951, Laing, 1975, 1-3). It is clear however that some sites which feature in the post-Roman documentary sources were initially of Iron Age construction, e.g. Traprain Law. In some cases the defences were altered; sometimes smaller defensive enclosures were constructed within the existing system (Laing, 1975, 6-8). From the available information it cannot really be said that the Cumbrian sites have any close parallels among known post-Roman sites elsewhere, but their distinctive features, i.e. the small area usually enclosed and the use made of natural defences - are also characteristic of the nuclear forts and other defensive enclosures for which 'Dark Age' dates have been postulated in Scotland. It is not possible to say anything more definite at the moment.

The undefended settlements of Cumbria, of which over two hundred are known, show considerable diversity. Some sites are simple hut circles, unenclosed; other sites consist of
one or more hut sites surrounded by a circular, oval or rectilinear enclosure. Yet others are large and complex sites with several hut sites and enclosures which do not conform to any set pattern. Settlement sites sometimes have associated field systems, sometimes small rectangular fields, but also quite large enclosures. Aerial photography has often revealed traces of these fields when they were not apparent on the ground. It is usual to assume that the former indicate tillage of some kind, the latter animal husbandry of some kind (Webster, 1969, 88-90).

It has been noted that the defended sites of Cumbria are distinguished by their small area. By comparison, some non-defended sites cover quite large areas. The well known settlement at Ewe Close, Crosby Ravensworth (NY 609,135) (Fig.4.1) is by no means the largest with an area of 1.25 acres (.51 ha.)(R.C.H.M., 1936,83). Another settlement in the same parish covers an area of over 2 acres (.80 ha.) (NY 628,121)(R.C.H.M., 1936,87) while the settlement at Severals, Crosby Garrett (NY 719,061) covers over 3 acres (1.20 ha.)(R.C.H.M., 1936, 76). (Pl.4.5)

The surviving settlements show a marked concentration in certain areas, notably around the village of Crosby Ravensworth, on the limestone area of the Upper Eden Valley, where eight sites, including some of the largest settlements, are within a radius of 3 km. (Collingwood, R.G., 1933b, 223). It is perhaps unwise to draw any positive conclusions about the overall distribution as yet; although little survives above ground in certain other areas, aerial photography has
demonstrated clearly that in fact this is frequently a result of destruction on arable land, rather than special selection of certain types of terrain, for environmental or political reasons (see above, pp.6-7).

Collingwood (Collingwood, R.G., 1933a, 224) made an attempt to estimate the size of population in these settlements by counting the hut sites, and he suggested a population of about 60 for Ewe Close, and a total population of about 200 for the Crosby Ravensworth group. It is difficult to see how any estimate by this method could have validity with or without excavation, as too many unfounded assumptions - i.e. that all hut sites are preserved and were in use at the same time, and that there were no timber dwellings in use concurrently with these, and that none of the structures were animal shelters - would have to be made. Collingwood also noted the presence at some sites of especially large huts - at Ewe Close there was an exceptionally large circular hut with an internal diameter of 50 ft. (15.15 m.), the roofing of which must have presented considerable problems - and there are other examples at Howarcles (NY 627,132) and Burwens (NY 623,123) - and proposed that these were the dwellings of tribal chiefs. It is an intriguing but unprovable theory.

Webster has analysed the settlements of Westmorland on the basis of morphology, using the plans of the Royal Commission (Webster, 1969,1971), and he suggests that his divisions are probably relevant to the other parts of Cumbria as well, although lack of data does not permit a
close analysis of these. Apart from defended sites (his Group I) he defines four other categories:

2) simple enclosed settlements
3) settlements with enclosed nucleus and external earthworks
4) unenclosed settlements of curvilinear form
5) unenclosed settlements of rectilinear form

The distribution of these types is not uniform, and he holds that evolution takes place from enclosed to unenclosed settlements, the unenclosed sites with external earthworks being an intermediate form. Group 2 sites and simple sites of Group 3 are, he suggests, primary: the need was then felt for the whole site to be protected from a hostile or unfamiliar environment by an enclosing wall. The concentration of Group 2 sites is in the mountain area, and this is taken as the area of pioneer settlement. Outside the mountain area, the percentage of Group 3 sites increases: he proposes that these sites represent a phase when the environment is being explored. Sites of Groups 4 and 5 are the settlements of people already in control of their environment. These types are rare in the mountain area but common in the Upper Eden Valley. He also notes the suggestion of Collingwood (Collingwood, R.G., 1924, 250) that sites with rectilinear features have been influenced by Roman planning (Webster, 1969, 80). The broad chronological implications of his theory are, that sites of Group 2 are the earliest, sites
of Group 3 contemporary with and later than these, and sites of Groups 4 and 5 later than sites of Group 3. The last two Groups belong to the same cultural phase in the sequence, though there is some indication that settlements of Group 5 might in some cases be later than those of Group 4, if his notion that intrusive Roman influence acted on the already developed native form were valid.

Few archaeologists nowadays have a simple faith in the evolution of typological forms, and it is opportune here to examine what kind of material has been found on these sites, and how they have been dated in the past. Sites which have produced any kind of dateable material, either in the course of excavations or in the form of chance finds, are not numerous; and far too frequently, 'evidence' of the flimsiest nature is taken as providing a fixed dating point. Usually this is because better evidence is not available, and most excavators feel morally obliged to offer some kind of date for their sites, but even so, the practice is inexcusable. It is surely better to leave the date of a find or a site an open question than to let a date which is simply a guess become established as 'fact'.

The blanket dating Iron Age/Romano-British is frequently allotted to sites identified from aerial photography or field work as if all known sites which could be classed as native settlements must automatically fall within these horizons, and this is also misleading. Indeed, it is a doubtful practice to offer any kind of date for sites identified by these means unless parallels are reasonably numerous and
securely dated, or the site can be identified historically. A brief look at the known dating evidence indicates that these sites had a longer lifespan.

The settlement at Barnscar (SD 135,958) is associated with cairns which have produced two cinerary urns of well known Bronze Age type (Walker, 1965, 53-63) although in other respects it does not differ superficially from other settlements; and the three enclosures with hut circles on Aughertree Fell (@ NY 262,380) are adjacent to a cairn which has produced twelve collared urns (Bellhouse, 1967, 29). The association may, of course, be fortuitous; but the unenclosed hut circle near Woodhead excavated in 1939 (Hodgson, 1946, 162-6) produced a v-perforated button and a ring of Early Bronze Age type; and another site at the White Lyne, Bewcastle (NY 570,808) produced a sherd of Beaker pottery (Richardson and Fell, 1975, 19-21). At the other end of the scale, it is well to recall that a site in Askerton Park was superficially classified as a native settlement until excavation proved it to be a purely medieval site (Hodgson, 1940).

Evidence of Iron Age occupation is meagre, and what evidence there is is dubious. In the course of excavations at Urswick Stone Walls (SD 260,741) in 1906, a tiny fragment of decorated bronze was discovered which was then dated to the pre-Roman Iron Age (Smith, 1907, 95-9). The site is large and complex, however, and it seems unwise to date the entire settlement on the basis of a single find of this kind. A supposedly late pre-Roman quernstone was found at
Sealford, Kirkby Lonsdale (SD 583,783) (R.C.H.M., 1936, 140) but no criteria are offered for the dating of this, and the site was subsequently excavated and yielded some Roman material of the second and early third centuries A.D. (Lowndes, 1963, 88). The two dates are not of course mutually exclusive; the site could have been occupied in both periods - but this case shows how misleading dates based on a single stray find can be.

Many of the other excavated sites have produced Roman material, in variable quantities. The large site at Ewe Close, only a small portion of which was excavated, produced a small quantity of sherds and some glass spanning the second to fourth centuries A.D. but also some medieval pottery (Collingwood, W.G., 1908, 1909). A total of 15 sherds of the second to early fourth centuries A.D. was found at Eller Beck, site C (SD 642,781) associated with a rectangular house (Lowndes, 1963, 86-7). It was established that there were at least two phases of wall construction at this site: a circular hut and a curvilinear enclosure were later enlarged by rectangular cross walls in a different walling technique. Blake's excavations at four sites in the Solway Plain (Blake, 1960) all produced Roman material. At Old Brampton (NY 516,614) a 'great variety' of Roman provincial sherds, and three sherds of samian, were found. The coarse pottery was all dated to the end of the third and the beginning of the fourth century. 'Undateable' coarse native pottery was also discovered, and a squarish structure with drystone foundations. Jacob's Gill (NY 317,478) produced
only six sherds: one was of native ware, and the remainder all from the same coarse red pot. The date suggested for this was "the latter half of the Roman Period". Cobble flooring was found but no clear structures, and only a very small part of the site was excavated. At Risehow, Maryport (NY 031,353) only a small area was again opened; but the excavator was content to date the site to the late fourth century on the basis of a single rim-sherd of Crambeck Ware - the rest of the pottery, of which there was very little, was 'undateable'.

Excavations of three enclosures at Wolsty Hall, Holme Low (NY 106,512) revealed a sequence of buildings and enclosures. The earliest was a large oval enclosure with a pallisade; a large round timber house was associated with it. Hadrianic pottery was found in the upper levels of the enclosing ditch, but a saddle quern had been used as a packing stone for the pallisade and Blake maintained that this enclosure and structure were pre-Roman. Inside this was a circular enclosure, which was "well dated by pottery" to the Hadrianic period. No clearly defined buildings were identified. The latest enclosure, adjacent to the other two, was rectangular, and contained a complex of buildings. One of these was identified as a 'squarish' structure, similar to that at Old Brampton. A "fair amount" of Roman pottery was found, of the late third to early fourth centuries.

Webster's excavations (Webster, 1972, 66-73) at Waitby Intake (NY 755,074) opened up a small section of the north wall of the settlement, and a small part of the interior of
the enclosure. In the tumble outside the enclosure wall a small quantity of late fourth century pottery - Huntcliff Ware - was found. In the settlement on Sizergh Fell, Levens (SD 503,869) the wall of the outer enclosure abuts on a cairn. This was excavated in 1911 (McKenny Hughes, 1912, 400-1) and a crouched skeleton was found with a fibula, ring, and bead which were then dated to the second or third century A.D. This would presumably provide a terminus post quern for the settlement itself. Stray finds of Roman material are also recorded from some sites, for example a Roman type of nail cleaner of bronze, from Severals, Intake I, Crosby Garrett (NY 723,069) (Fell, 1974, 2).

Finds of quernstones or quern fragments have also been noted; a rotary quern from a site in Matterdale (NY 386,194) was found 'in the settlement' (Hay, 1941, 20); a quern of unknown type was found during stone robbing in 1911, at the site at Howerigg, Barbon (SD 624,819) (Addenda Antiquaria, 1912, 431); and what may have been a rotary quern was discovered 'on the site' at Lanthwaite Green (NY 160,210) before 1924 (Mason and Valentine, 1924, 118). Without a fuller description, however, even a rotary quern need not indicate a date more concrete than 'Post Bronze Age'.

Other discoveries are ambiguous: the site excavated in part by Haverfield at Hawkhirst, Brampton (NY 513,612) produced several pieces of 'black rude pot' and some 'non-Roman' (?modern) brick (Haverfield, 1899, 358-60). An urn containing a hoard of third century coins was found in an adjacent pond, and a hoard of horseshoes nearby. The
inadequacies of the excavation were many but the site may have been a native settlement: Haverfield was of the opinion that apart from the coins "there was no need for any of the other material to have been Roman". There seems to be no particular reason to associate the coins with this site, and there are quite a few Roman sites in the vicinity, notably the fort at Old Brampton itself. It has been suggested that this site is 'Dark-Age' (Hogg, 1965,136) but there are no very positive grounds for this suggestion either.

The 'considerable' excavation of a settlement in Kentmere (NY 461,025) in 1935 produced only what is in one place described as a second century paste armlet (R.C.H.M., 1936, 131) - but elsewhere said to be of 'clouded white glass', and it was acknowledged that the type could also be sub- or post-Roman (R.C.H.M., 1936, xxxiii). On at least two occasions when small scale excavations were carried out no dateable finds whatsoever were discovered: at the Hawk, Broughton Mills (SD 240,9223)(Orrom, 1971) and a site in Bampton (NY 490,155)(Hodgson, 1941).

The above is not an exhaustive catalogue of the finds from native settlements in Cumbria but it does include most of the published discoveries, and it is apparent that while in some cases a date for the occupation of a site can reasonably be inferred, in other instances any date is likely to be incorrect, simply because the available evidence does not permit conclusions about the date of the settlement to be drawn with any precision. Given the size of the excavation, one might consider that the dates suggested for occupation at Wolsty Hall, Old Brampton, and Eller Beck site C., may be reasonably accurate; but in some cases sites have been dated by single finds, and in
some instances there is not a proper context for the material, even when it comes from excavations. Sites such as Jacob's Gill, or the settlement on Sizergh Fell, are hardly adequately dated, on present evidence, and Blake's statement that for the site at Risehow, Maryport "a fairly close date in the decades round about 360 A.D. for the occupation" (Blake, 1960, 12) could be suggested, is open to challenge, since it is based on a single sherd of pottery.

It must be emphasised that where material is scarce and excavation restricted, even if material is closely dateable in itself it does not provide a close date for the site; it establishes neither a \textit{terminus post quem} nor a \textit{terminus ante quem} - it simply indicates that the site was in use when the material was available. Even if the context of the material is clear - for example, if it can be shown that it was incorporated in a wall at its construction - it can only date that one context; in the example given, a date might be suggested for the wall in question but not for every wall in the settlement! A single find does not indicate when a settlement was first constructed or when it was finally abandoned.

It is true that virtually all the dateable material is Roman - but this does not necessarily imply that virtually all of these sites were occupied in the Roman period and no other. Roman pottery is in fact usually scarce on native settlements, even when sites have been excavated on a reasonable scale (Jobey, 1960, 27). This is usually interpreted as indicating a low level of subsistence; if this is
the case then it is unlikely that pre- or post-Roman evidence of settlement would leave much trace in the archaeological record. As R. G. Collingwood commented, with reference to Ewe Close:

"We do not yet know what furniture the pre-Roman and post-Roman Britons of our district possessed; there is reason to believe that they had very little of such a nature as to leave clues to the archaeologist. If a village like this had a long life before, during and after the Roman period, it is probable that excavation would yield, as at Ewe Close it did, finds of Roman date and no others."

(Collingwood, R.G., 1933a, 202)

Indeed it seems evident that the emphasis which has sometimes been placed on Roman "influence" on native settlements is a doubtful quantity. It has all too often been blandly assumed that most settlements were indeed occupied in the Roman period and no other. This attitude is clearly reflected in the work of Jones (1975), Higham and Jones (1976), Higham (1978) and Potter (1979). The latter maps virtually all known 'native settlements' (1979, 355) on a map of Roman sites in Cumbria, while Jones (1975) uncritically accepts Blake's dating and a Roman date for the field system at Ewe Close; but this is hardly a realistic model for settlement.

Even at a purely political level the relations between Roman and native in the area are by no means fully understood, and the problem is relevant to the post-Roman issue, as it affects one's view of how the withdrawal of troops from the frontier zone affected the native economy. One might expect that if the native sites were closely connected with the
forts or dependent on them to any considerable extent, then the withdrawal of the army could well have had disastrous consequences for the native population as well as the civil population. In economic terms, this might have involved the loss of a market on which the economy was totally dependent. Now there is reason to think that a close economic relationship between Roman fort and native settlement is no longer a viable proposition.

In 1960, Blake proposed that the distribution of native sites as a whole suggested that concentrations of sites were in the vicinity of Roman forts, and settlements sparse in other areas; and concluded that settlement was deliberately encouraged in the vicinity of roads and forts in order to supply food for the garrisons; and that this was exchanged for Roman pottery. Blake's interpretation of the distribution is almost certainly incorrect, although it is a fairly common assumption, among those who have made use of Blake's distribution map of sites in the Solway Plain. This shows about thirty sites, mostly detected by aerial photography, none of which is more than two miles from a Roman road, and there are small concentrations in the vicinity of Brampton and Maryport, and a fairly large concentration around Old Carlisle. At the time he observed that the aerial survey could have been unduly selective: more recent flying clearly indicates that this was so (Higham and Jones, 1976). Large blank areas between the forts can now be filled with sites similar to those 'clustering around' the forts, and concentrations appear in areas where there are no 'Roman' reasons for them,
across the whole of North-West Cumbria. In any case a survey of a comparatively small area, which used only a small amount of the available data, not including the main concentrations of sites even as they were known in 1959, could not but fail to reveal the true distributional relationship between Roman and native sites. A naive approach to distribution, in which the only siting factor taken into account is distance, is extremely likely to give a false impression.

A much more systematic approach was adopted by Middleton (Middleton, 1966), who attempted to account for other factors, such as intervisibility, aspect, and distance from a water source. Although a close study was only attempted in certain areas, he concluded that in the Upper Eden Valley, "a high number of sites are sited at the furthest possible points from Roman Forts, within the limits of physiographic and climatic suitability", i.e. that the situation there is completely the reverse of that proposed by Blake for the Solway Plain.

It may be that in Roman times some settlement was encouraged in the vicinity of certain forts, but this is not to say that all settlements were the products of Roman policy. On the contrary, it would appear that the majority of known native settlements in Cumbria were sited either without regard to Roman sites, or else deliberately away from them. Two propositions emerge from this. If the distribution of Roman forts is more or less irrelevant to the siting of the majority of native settlements, it can be suggested that this type of site must have been in use for
a period much longer than the Roman occupation, i.e. many sites must have been occupied in pre-Roman or post-Roman times or both. Even if one assumes, as Blake does, that most of the sites were occupied in Roman times, it is clear that the principal siting factor is not, as Blake proposed, the proximity of a Roman fort; one must seek out other explanations. Some sites may have origins in pre-Roman times, as Blake himself suggested at Old Brampton; other sites may have been chosen for the very reason that there were no Roman presence in the vicinity.

It has been argued (Manning, 1975, 114) that evidence for arable associated with native settlements suggests that the Roman army of the Frontier relied on local rather than imported grain for foodstuffs. While it is certainly true to say that there is a considerable body of evidence for grain crops in connection with native settlements, there is no need to link this with the feeding of the Roman army. Increasingly, the importance of arable in the so-called Highland Zone, even in prehistoric times, is being recognised (Bradley, 1972; Jones, G.D.B., 1975), but we have no 'evidence' that this was a marketed resource - indeed, what evidence there is indicates that it was not. The Roman economy was sophisticated and it seems incredible that if in fact the army was relying on local grain, that we should have no evidence for monetary exchange; yet, within Cumbria, there is not a single find of a Roman coin from a native site.
Other indications of 'Romanization' are hardly strong evidence as they do not necessitate any great degree of dependence on the part of either. Roman pottery is found on native settlements, but goods can be acquired through all forms of redistribution, either directly or indirectly, from quite far afield. Some sites have produced no Roman material; it is rarely abundant, as we have seen, and Roman material has been found on Irish sites, which can hardly have had a 'close relationship' with Roman Britain. Influence of Roman planning has been suggested at some sites in the form of rectilinear enclosures with rounded corners (above, p.139). Even if this is so, at sites such as Ewe Close and Kentmere, it need indicate no more than a change in fashion among the native population itself.

Indeed it seems clear that a considerable part of Cumbria was not controlled by the Roman army to any real extent. Stray finds of Roman material are known from Furness, Cartmel and South-West Cumbria, but there is no evidence for any military presence there: no forts are known, and there appears to have been no Roman road south of, Ravenglass. There are several native settlements, and a couple of these have been excavated, without producing any certain Roman material. A variety of types of enclosure and both rectangular and circular huts are known. Collingwood suggested (Collingwood, R.G., 1924, 251) that at least one of these, at Urswick Stone Walls (presumably referring to the rectangular enclosure adjoining the oval site excavated by Dobson in 1906) - was of the Romanized type.
but surely the whereabouts of the site indicate that this form of settlement was not necessarily the product of strong 'Romanizing' policy. Environmental evidence (Chapter 1) clearly indicates clearance in these areas beginning in Romano-British times, which again can not really be safely attributed to the enforcement of Roman Governmental policy, as this could hardly be implemented without a military presence. It seems clear that the pattern of native settlement in areas which were more or less free of Roman military control and in other areas, was more or less the same, so it would be ill-advised to single out the benefits of Roman Government as the raison d'etre of an expansion of the native economy. It can be safely concluded that the relations between the Roman army and the native population in Cumbria were not such as to have rendered the absence of the former an unmitigated disaster for the latter.

Although, as we have seen, no post-Roman material is represented among the finds from native settlements, there remains the possibility that a post-Roman date could be established morphologically, i.e. that a certain type of settlement or feature could be identified as characteristic of the post-Roman period. It is perhaps best now to return to Webster's classification, and see how it is born out by the dating evidence - and if it can help to establish a post-Roman 'type' of site.

It must be observed initially that no absolute dates can be offered for the beginning and the end of the sequence, and as the number of sites whose occupation can be in any
way accurately dated is extremely small, the evidence is hardly conclusive. A date in the second century or earlier is indicated for the oval enclosure at Wolsty Hall, for instance, which would fit into his Group 2; Ewe Close, which he places in Group 3, has produced material of the second, third and fourth centuries; and the site which he excavated at Waitby Intake produced late fourth century material and belongs to Group 5. Partly because no site has been fully excavated, however, it is not possible to estimate the length of occupation for any one site, and it is impossible to say, for instance, that the settlement at Waitby Intake was constructed in the late fourth century, or abandoned then.

The idea that rectilinear enclosures and buildings are on the whole later than curvilinear buildings is indicated at a few sites, but this is hardly enough to justify a rigid typological evolution of settlement form for the whole region. At Eller Beck site C, a development from curvilinear walling to rectilinear walling was established, but the finds from the two features did not enable the change to be accurately dated - they simply indicated that the site as a whole was occupied probably from the mid third to the mid fourth century.

In Northumberland, simple rectilinear enclosures of stone with round stone huts, were occupied in Roman times (Jobey, 1960), and most of the dating evidence consists of second century Roman material. Rectangular buildings are also known, although these are rare, and in some cases at
least probably considerably later than the original occupation. However, these sites do not closely resemble the rectilinear settlements of Cumbria: they are much more regular in plan and their *floruit* seems to be in some way associated with the Antonine frontier.

The sequence revealed by excavations at Huckhoe is more illuminating (Jobey, 1959). Here the earliest enclosure was a timber stockade. This was replaced by stone enclosure walls, associated with the first stone huts, in the second century. Other round stone huts dated by finds to the second, third and fourth centuries were then built, and in the final phase, two rectangular stone structures were constructed. Apart from a range of Roman material, the site produced some wheel-turned sherds which can be paralleled at Dunadd, and are conceivably post-Roman material of the fifth or early sixth century. A rim-sherd of this pottery was associated with flooring connected with one of these structures. The internal dimensions of the buildings were not fully established, as they had been extensively robbed out. As far as could be ascertained, both buildings, which were conjoined, had at least one apsidal end.

Another site where post-Roman occupation is clearly indicated is Fortress Dyke in Yorkshire (SE 179,732). This site consists of a simple sub-rectangular enclosure of approximately .75 ha, surrounded on three sides by an inner and outer bank with an intervening ditch. There are traces of what may be the foundations of a circular hut in the
north-east corner of the enclosure. This site was super­
officially dated to Roman times by Hartley (Tinsley and Smith, 1974,31) because of its general form; the presence of an
inner and an outer bank, its subrectangularity, and the fact
that the surviving entrance is inturned. When the ditch was
sectioned for the purpose of obtaining environmental samples,
however, a lens of peat in the bottom of the ditch which
contained throughout a large amount of charcoal was dated
by radiocarbon to A.D. 630+90 (Tinsley and Smith, 1974,28).
It was suggested that the high percentage of charcoal was
due to the burning of heath to curb its growth. This clearly
indicates farming activity in the immediate vicinity of the
site in post-Roman times.11

It has long been realized that rectilinear buildings are
present in several of the native settlements of Cumbria,
usually in addition to round huts, but there is no clear
dating evidence for any of them. Perhaps the best known
example is that excavated by Collingwood at Ewe Close
(Fig. 4.1) (Collingwood, W.G., 1909). The internal dimensions
of this were approximately 50 ft. x 24 ft. (15.2 m. x 7.3 m.).
The thickness of the walls varied from 16 ft. 10 ins. to 8 ft.
(2.10 m. to 2.43 m.). They were constructed of limestone
rubble with small cobbles, faced with larger stones. The
west wall appears to have been curved. There was a doorway
8 ft. (2.4 m.) wide in the south east corner, and a small
recess in the walling of the west side. Nothing dateable
was discovered: the only finds were four pieces of coarse
brown pot which were found in the rubble of the west wall.
Two enclosures north of this (H.I. and K, on Collingwood's plan) were considered by him to be in some way connected with this building (L). H.I. was approximately 60 ft. (18.2 m.) long, the width varying from about 14 ft. 2 in. to 11 ft. 8 ins. (4.2 m. - 3.5 m.). A party wall, with gaps at the east and west ends, separated it from K, a roughly trapezoidal enclosure, about 60 ft. (18.23 m.) long, internally. Its width varied from about 26 ft. (7.9 m.) to about 45 ft. (13.7 m.). These enclosures shared a common entrance at the west end. The flooring consisted mostly of the bare rock, but where this was very uneven, limestone flagging had been laid down. There was a recess similar to that in L in the south wall of K, but Collingwood held that all of these structures were probably medieval.

At Cow Green (NY 616.121), on the south side of the settlement, are the remains of a later stone (Fig. 4.2) house. It appears to overlie and to have partly robbed out one of the walls of the enclosure (plan, R.C.H.M., 1936, 85). The structure consists of a single room 30 ft. x 16 ft. (1.11m. x 4.86 m.) with a porch or annex at the east end, approximately 4 m. square. The walls, of drystone construction incorporating orthostats, are about 4 ft. (1.2 m.) thick (Collingwood, R.G., 1933, 209-10). The western end is apsidal. A building which somewhat resembles this is known, apparently unassociated with any settlement, in Glencowyndale, Patterdale (Fig. 4.3) (NY 376,184) - although a curved foundation adjoins the north wall, and may be part of a former enclosure (R.C.H.M., 1936, 195; plan, xlvi).
The structure is two-roomed, with a small annex at the east end. Both of these buildings have entrances at the north-east corner, and both are oriented more or less due east-west.

Hogg (Hogg, A.H.A., 1946) has suggested that the site at Cow Green was the 'capital' of Urien of Rheged, partly because of the later building, partly because of the proximity of the Lyvennet Beck (see above, p. 45). The identification is not convincing. The whereabouts of Urien's kingdom is, as has been shown, by no means certain; there is nothing to connect him with Cow Green, and the later structure can not be shown to be of his time with any certainty. In any case, although not very much is known of British capitals in the 'Dark Ages', all the identified examples are strongholds, well fortified. There is nothing particularly defensive about the site at Cow Green. In the present state of knowledge it is completely pointless to try and correlate sites like this with individuals - and a better candidate for the title of Urien's 'capital' - if such was even in Cumbria - could probably be found among the defensive sites.

In addition to the apsidal building there are the remains of at least one, possibly two, rectangular huts at Cow Green, inside the western part of the enclosure. The eastern wall appears to be substantially thicker than the others. At least two rectangular buildings are present at Ewe Locks (NY 611,128). These appear to be definitely later than the main walls of the settlement, which have
been robbed out in their neighbourhood, presumably to build them (Collingwood, 1933a, 209). The double orthostatic walls of the structures remain, but no core has survived.

There appears to be at least one rectangular structure at Burwens (NY 622,122) (plan, R.C.H.M., 1936, 86) and at another site in Crosby Ravensworth (R.C.H.M., 1936, 86) (NY 634,125). At Severals, there are clear traces of a rectangular building against the south wall of the enclosure, and other features are possibly the remains of more rectangular huts.

None of these houses, other than that at Ewe Close, have been excavated; and it is not always possible, using even the best of fieldwork, to distinguish between a simple enclosure and a house site; but there is enough evidence to suggest that rectangular or rectilinear stone buildings are reasonably common, at least among the stone-walled settlements of South-East Cumbria. The only indication of date is provided by analogy; unfortunately, parallels for these sites have a wide range in time and place.

Dates within the Roman period have been established for some rectangular buildings within native sites. At West Gunnar Peak, for example (NY 914,749) where a rectangular structure within a rectilinear enclosure was dated to the second century A.D. (Rome Hall, 1885) and Edlington Wood, Doncaster, where unenclosed huts were associated with third century Roman material (Corder, 1951). At Riding Wood (NY 801,876) a rectangular, crudely
constructed building overlay second century A.D. features; it was suggested that it was constructed some considerable time after these were abandoned, but nothing was found that would date them more precisely (Jobey, 1960, 13-15). No dates could be suggested for similar structures at Mill Knock (Jobey, 1959, 250, footnote) and Ingram Hill (NV 011, 158) although in the latter case it was again thought that the rectangular buildings were built long after the pre-Roman pallisaded site was abandoned (Jobey, 1971, 86).

It is doubtful if any real chronological significance should be attached to morphological analysis of this kind but one of the more interesting features of some of the Cumbrian examples, the single apsidal end, can be paralleled at two sites whose rectangular buildings can be dated to post-Roman times on reasonably secure grounds: the final phase at Huckhoe, discussed above, and the final phase at Traprain Law (Hogg, 1951, plan, 210). This analogy might suggest a post-Roman date for the Cumbrian sites with this feature; but parallels for it can also be found among medieval structures: the houses on Loch Doon, for example, which produced fourteenth century material (Laing, 1975, 26-28). The walls of these structures were of drystone construction; the smaller ?eastern structure appears to have had a curvilinear ?north wall, and the ?western annex of the long building is clearly curved. The probability is also strong that circular hut forms continued in use after Roman times, at least at some sites: at Garn Boduan, a hillfort in Caernarvonshire, circular huts are associated
with the late- and post-Roman occupation levels (Hogg, A.H.A. 1962, 8-9).

In some of the Cumbrian settlements, e.g. Howerigg, Barbon, or Howarcles, Crosby Ravensworth (NY 627,132) superficial traces of any type of hut site, round or square or rectangular, are virtually absent, and this characteristic has been noted at other sites for which plans are not available, e.g. Burton (SD 544,766) and Strickland Ketel (SD 486,944) (Fell, 1974, 4,5). It seems most likely that in these cases dwelling houses would have been constructed of timber. No sites of this type have been excavated, and the possibility must be born in mind that some of them could be the remains of medieval villages. In a few cases however, at least one clear hut site is present, and a medieval date seems unlikely in this instance. At Howarcles there is at least one clear hut circle; but for the size of the enclosure, one would expect several more to have survived. The site at Howerigg overlies the presumed course of the Roman road from Ribchester to Low Borrow Bridge, which has been interpreted as a firm indication of post-Roman date (Lowndes, 1963, 82) but the course of the road is not visible at this point so it is possible that it does not in fact traverse the site.

Post-Roman dates have been suggested for two earthwork sites in Troutbeck Park (NY 423,083) (R.C.H.M., 1936, XLVI-XLVII). The sites are adjacent; one is rectangular, the other trapezoidal and both have internal sub-divisions (Fig. 4.4). Comparisons have been made between these sites
and a building at Tintagel, and other sub- or post-Roman structures. However there is nothing very distinctive about the Troutbeck structures and there is no reason why they could not be medieval or even later in date.

Castlesteads, Yanwath Wood (NY 518,252)(Fig. 4.5) is unique among the settlement sites of Cumbria in that, although not strategically sited, it possesses multivallate ramparts. Three banks and two intervening ditches have survived on the western side; the eastern part of the site has been largely destroyed by a plantation. The site is on a slight knoll but hardly in a very defensive position, and the small area enclosed - about .062 hectares - make it totally unlike multivallate defensive sites elsewhere. Perhaps the closest parallels to this site are to be found among the multivallate ringforts of Ireland. The internal diameter of the enclosed area is about 42 metres; this would be larger than average for an Irish site, but some multivallate ringforts are larger than the rest, and the site at Garannes (Fig. 4.5)(O'Riordain, 1942) is closely comparable in size with Castlesteads. Garannes was proved by excavation to have been occupied in the Early Christian period.

Not far from this site is another (NY 518,260) which, while it conforms to the norm for native settlements in most respects, does seem to have had a second rampart around at least a part of the main enclosure, although traces of both inner and outer enclosing banks are fairly slight (R.C.H.M., 1936, 254-5). Could both of these sites reflect a measure of Irish influence?
There is nothing intrinsically impossible in the idea of some Irish settlement in Cumbria in post-Roman times. Apart from the comparatively well-documented settlement in Argyll, which brought the Scotti proper to Scotland, there is a certain amount of evidence for various influxes of Irish immigrants along the western seaboard of Great Britain in the fifth and sixth centuries, in Cornwall and Devon, in South and North-West Wales, and in Galloway (evidence summarized in Thomas, 1972). The evidence for these settlements largely consists of certain place-name elements and gleanings from epigraphy; no evidence of this type has as yet been identified in Cumbria, but this hardly precludes the possibility that such settlement could have existed and be identifiable by other means. The case would admittedly be much stronger if Irish influence could be detected at more than two sites, but other sites may await recognition.

To return now to the question posed at the beginning of this discussion - it is possible to identify a specifically post-Roman type of settlement? The answer must be, no. While it is clear that certain features at native settlements are later than others, none of these can be shown to be purely post-Roman phenomena - indeed it is clear that most of the 'later' features - rectilinear enclosures, rectangular huts - were already in use in late Roman times in Cumbria, and even earlier elsewhere.

Nonetheless, if any native sites are to be excavated with a view to establishing occupation in post-Roman times, it may be that these sites which offer the best chance of
providing the necessary evidence of continuing occupation; sites such as Fortress Dyke and Dunadd must have their Cumbrian equivalent. Perhaps the most hopeful sites are those with apsidal houses; but only excavation would tell if these are really post-Roman structures, and even excavation might fail to establish this.

It is very tempting to call Castlesteads, Yanwath Wood, an intrusive type of settlement of the post-Roman centuries; but again this awaits supporting evidence. All that can be said at the moment is that if this site is an Irish-type ringfort, then a date in the fifth or sixth century is very probable.

In conclusion, it can be suggested in a general sense a wide variety of settlement type may have been occupied after the Roman era. It seems very likely that some of the Cumbrian hillforts were then in use, while it is not really possible to point to specific instances of post-Roman construction, sites such as Castle How, Wythop, and Castlesteads on the Helm would seem more likely candidates than, say, Skelmore Heads or Carrock Fell. One might hope that with more information it might be possible to recognise some link with the Scottish nuclear forts, but as yet this is simply a speculation. In any event, even if all the Cumbrian hillforts are of Iron Age construction - and this remains an unproven assumption - it is still possible that some were re-fortified or reoccupied at a much later date. We can only speculate as to their function. Elsewhere, it has been
suggested the hillforts may have functioned as the centres or capita of post-Roman estates. The siting of most of the Cumbrian sites in the uplands would seem to indicate that even if this was a seasonal function, we must look at other settlement forms for our lowland centres.

It is also very probable that some of the undefended settlements hitherto dated to the Roman period, were also occupied in the fifth and sixth centuries or even later. We may expect a range of sites - some nucleated, some scattered farmsteads, some enclosed, some unenclosed, in use contemporaneously. The bulk of the dating evidence - by no means a large bulk - consists of Roman material but this is exactly what one would expect in any case. It has been shown elsewhere that late Roman material can be found in post-Roman contexts. It follows that finds of late Roman material can indicate post-Roman occupation, although this is not provable at any one site without the corroboration of later material. There is as yet no corroboration in Cumbria; but it can be suggested that sites such as Risehow, Maryport, and Waitby Intake, both of which produced a very small amount of late Roman material and nothing else, may have been occupied in post-Roman times.

It is disappointing that our knowledge of post-Roman settlement in Cumbria is scarcely more advanced now than in the days of R. G. Collingwood, in spite of the advances made in this field elsewhere. Virtually all the conclusions arrived at here were suggested by him in 1924 (Collingwood, R.G., 1924a) and 1933 (Collingwood, R.G., 1933a); even the
publication of the Royal Commission Inventory, greatly though it assisted by making a large quantity of data easily available for study, did not really put post-Roman settlement on a more tangible footing. It seems that the problem of establishing dates in the fifth and sixth centuries will afflict the study of these settlements for some time to come.
Notes

1. The dates for St. Patrick's birth and death remain a matter of some controversy, the main debate being as to whether his career is to be placed in the earlier or later half of the fifth century; but he was undoubtedly a fifth century Briton. Hanson has argued (Hanson, 1968) that events in Britain would have made it impossible for Patrick to have considered himself a cives in the later fifth century, but it is doubtful whether enough is known of the later fifth century for this assumption to be made. Much would depend on where Patrick was brought up; and Banna Venta Berniae has not been satisfactorily identified. Hanson discusses the possibilities (Hanson, 1968, 113-6) and concludes that it was probably 'somewhere in the Lowland Zone of Roman Britain' - but whether this is suggested by his choice of the earlier part of the century for the saints' career or not, the possible identifications for the saints' birthplace are quite widespread and by no means confined to the Lowland Zone (see above, pp.62-3).

2. The archaeological evidence for Romano-Germanic laeti and foederati is more or less confined to the south and east (e.g. Hawkes and Dunning, 1962).

3. The Gazetteer prepared in connection with the Northern Archaeological Survey does not adopt a standard format in listing these sites, but it lists about 220 sites which could be included in this category, and (at least!) a further 10 sites are published which are not included in this gazetteer. Middleton (Middleton, 1966, 2) quotes the figures of 101 sites for Westmorland, 109 sites for Cumberland and 23 sites for Lancashire-North-of-the-Sands, with an additional 23 sites known from aerial photographs. Unfortunately he does not supply a list of sites, or quote his source for these figures. Several other workers (e.g. Higham and Jones, 1976; Potter, 1979) have produced maps based on the fruits of aerial photography, also without comprehensive lists.

4. Various types of classification of the defensive sites have been attempted, e.g. Middleton (Middleton, 1966) divides the defended sites of northern England into hillforts, promontory forts, cliff-site forts, ring sites, oval sites, irregular sites, and rectilinear sites. The small number of defensive sites in Cumbria hardly warrants the use of such an elaborate classification in this study.
5. If this could be established, it would indicate a post-Roman date was probable for this site. Parallels for the use of Roman masonry in a hillfort can be found at the nuclear fort at Ruberslaw, which incorporated a quantity of Roman stone in the walling (Stevenson, 1951, 196) possible from a signal tower (Laing, 1975, 8). No Roman site is known in the vicinity of Wythop, however, which raises doubts as to the origin of the tooling.


7. But this site is problematical; Miss Clare Fell has suggested to the writer that the site may have been the remains of a burial cairn, rather than a settlement site.

8. Blake quotes a figure of 40 sites, identified from aerial photographs, and about a further dozen "either presumed from tradition or identified in field work (Blake, 1960, 1) - but on the map which he publishes only 29 native sites are plotted.

9. At Urswick Stone Walls some undated red pottery was found. One might suppose that if this was conceivably Roman it would have been labelled as such; but from its description (Dobson, 1907, 91) it could be Roman pottery.

10. The sherds in question are not of A or B ware, and the dating is tentative (Charles Thomas in Jobey, 1959, 258-261).

11. This Radiocarbon date is not necessarily very close to the date of the construction of the site. The soil buried under the upcast from the ditch had different pollen percentages from the basal peat lens, which must in any case postdate the actual construction. Tinsley and Smith made no estimate of how long a period must have elapsed to account for these differences using the environmental evidence; they accepted the suggestion that the site was constructed in Romano-British times and simply proposed that it was sporadically in use until A.D. 630±90; the total absence of any deposits in the ditch which would indicate Romano-British activity was accounted for by the suggestion that the ditch was regularly recut. The ditch would have had to have been very accurately recut, however, for all evidence of this activity to have totally disappeared; the recutting of the ditch would seem a pointless activity in any case as the site was clearly not defensive; Indeed it may have been simply an animal
enclosure (Tinsley and Smith, 1974, 32). It seems much more probable that the absence of environmental evidence of Romano-British activity can be best accounted for by supposing that it never existed, and that the site was constructed not long before the date of the organic deposit in the base of the ditch; in this case, the burning of the heath would surely indicate clearance by the new arrivals who built the site.

12. On Collingwood's plan, the western end appears as a flat, 3-sided apse (Collingwood, 1933a, 211). This form is no longer apparent on the ground.
CHAPTER 5

Pagan Anglo-Saxon Burials

The fact that pagan Anglo-Saxon burials are recorded in Cumbria is sometimes overlooked. Jackson, for instance, has stated categorically that "there is, in fact, no archaeological evidence whatever for English occupation of the country west of the Pennines in the Pagan period" (Jackson, 1953, 215); none of the former component counties are included in Meaney's gazetteer of early Anglo-Saxon burial sites (Meaney 1964), nor are any shown on the O.S. map of Britain in the Dark Ages (O.S. 1971). It is true that accounts of all of these burials are inadequate, but some are not so inadequate as to merit being dismissed out of hand. If some of these descriptions referred to burials in other parts of the country, where pagan Anglo-Saxon interments are more the norm, their nature might well remain unchallenged.

Antiquarian accounts of the burials are unfortunately virtually the only surviving evidence - in no instance are the grave-goods still available for inspection,1 and in only two cases have illustrations of the original finds survived. The only records of the others are brief verbal descriptions. Canon Greenwell is the principal source of
information (Greenwell 1877). He describes five burials, all in Westmorland, as pagan Anglo-Saxon, or post-Roman, although only three of these were his own discoveries, the other two being old finds, already published elsewhere. His examples will be described separately, along with the other possible instance, and then an attempt made to assess the dating evidence, and the group as a whole. All these burials are listed in Appendix 5a, and mapped on Map IX.

Burials which are obviously not Anglo-Saxon, but which have been so described by fond antiquarians, are not included unless the error has crept into recent publication, or its source is well known. These are listed in Appendix 5b. The burials described by Canon Greenwell are as follows:

a) Those which he himself discovered.

**Crosby Garrett** (NY 706,067) (Greenwell, 1877, 387)

The burial was in a tumulus, identified by R.C.H.M. (1936, 78) as being at the above location. It is not marked on the O.S. 6" map, or visible now, and is presumably robbed away. The site is less than a mile east (1.60 km.) of the Severals settlements, and a short distance north of the parish boundary with Ravenstonedale. There were three other cairns nearby (now robbed away: R.C.H.M. 1936, 78) and several others on the east side of the Scandal Beck, on the far side of Severals, at a general distance of just over a mile (1.60 km.). The tumulus would have been on open moorland, just above the 1000'
(305 m.) contour, and the limit of modern enclosed farming.

The cairn was about 34'-36' (10.67-10.97 m.) in diameter and about 4' (1.21 m.) high. Various parts of several skeletons were found in the fill, although no skeleton was entire; these were considered by Greenwell to be the primary burials. The secondary, ?Anglo-Saxon burial was found "at the centre, and only 1' (0.30 m.) below the apex of the cairn". The body had been cremated but the bones were identifiable as those of a young person of either sex, of "about the age of puberty". The accompanying grave-goods consisted of an iron knife, buckle, shears, and bridle-bit. This is the only useful information contained in the original account of the burial, categorically defined by Greenwell as "undoubtedly that of an Angle". Small drawings of the finds were made in the Accessions Register of the British Museum when they were acquired, along with the rest of the Greenwell collection, in 1879. These are reproduced (enlarged) in Fig. 5.1, and will be considered in greater detail below (pp. 186-88).

Kirkby Stephen (NY 770,066) (Greenwell, 1877, 384-5)

The barrow in which this burial was found was close by the Eden, on the common, between the 600' (183 m.) and 700' (213 m.) contours. There are other cairns in the vicinity, but this one stood apart. It was 28' (8.53 m.) in diameter, 1\(\frac{1}{2}\)' (.46 m.) high, and composed of stones and earth.

The primary burial was a cremation deposit, under the centre of the mound. Cutting this and also the natural
surface, to a depth of $2\frac{1}{4}$' (.69 m.), was a 'hollow', which contained a wooden coffin, oriented north-west - south-east. This was 6' (1.83 m.) long, $2\frac{1}{4}$' (0.69 m.) wide at the north-west end and $1\frac{3}{4}$' (0.53 m.) wide at the south-east end. Two circular holes were pierced through the bottom, 2'' (5 cm.) apart, $3\frac{1}{2}$' (1.06 m.) from the north-west end.

The 'coffin' was apparently hollowed out of a single plank of wood, and very decayed. Greenwell states that "across the North-West end was placed a short plank, and two others, each $2\frac{1}{4}$' (0.76 m.) long, were laid on either side at that end, thus making the coffin at this part, where no doubt the head of the body had once been, rather deeper than it was elsewhere". It is difficult to visualise exactly what is meant by this arrangement: perhaps the planks were laid on top of the hollowed-out wood. The 'coffin' was without a lid or cover, nor is there any mention of an actual body in Greenwell's account, although the dimensions of the coffin indicate that it was designed for an inhumation. It contained two objects. At the north-west end were the remains of a small, shallow, thin bronze bowl, "so much destroyed by oxidation that it is impossible to restore its shape", and south-east of this, where Greenwell suggested the chest would have been, was a bluish glass bead, "thickly splashed with red and yellow". The only other finds, in the fill of the barrow, were a leaf-shaped arrowhead - presumably to be associated with the primary burial - and a flint chip. As in the case of Crosby Garrett, small drawings of the grave-goods (i.e. the bead, bowl and arrow-
head) survive in the Accessions Register of the British Museum (Fig. 5.1).

The coffin was covered by blue clay, the sides of it being packed with 'very yellow' clay. Greenwell tentatively suggested that the burial was 'post-Roman', and probably Anglian. Some later notices, however, - which must be based on his account - describe it as Roman (e.g. Collingwood, W.G., 1926, 3; Ferguson and Swainson Cowper, 1893, 525).

Orton (NY 665,090) (Greenwell 1877, 394-5)

The cairns in which the supposed Anglo-Saxon burials were found was one of a scattered group, on moorland, on a south-facing slope, just above the modern limit of enclosed farming and the 1000' (305 m.) contour.

The barrow was 49'-50' (14.93 m.-15.24 m.) in diameter and 4' (1.21 m.) high (R.C.H.M. 1936, 191), although it had been disturbed prior to Greenwell's visit, so the original dimensions may have been different. This previous burrowing had revealed three adult inhumations, the bones of which were found scattered about. At the centre of the cairn, in a rock-cut cist, 8' (2.44 m.) long, 5' (1.52 m.) wide and 2' (0.61 m.) deep, was a crouched inhumation, oriented north-south, with a chert tool, and some charcoal. This was presumably the primary burial. Three secondary burials (apart from the disturbed skeletons) were found by Greenwell himself. These were extended inhumations "laid on their backs in shallow graves, on the sides and not much below the surface of the mound" - a middle-aged man, an old woman, and a child. There were no accompanying grave-goods.
The bodies were roughly oriented with the heads to the west or north-west. The adult graves had stones set on edge along the sides and behind the heads of the bodies. Again, Greenwell seemed satisfied that these secondary burials were Anglo-Saxon.

The other two burials described by Greenwell are as follows:

Asby (? NY 647,119) (Greenwell 1877, 386)

Reference to this burial are confusing: it is by no means certain that all describe the same interment. The earliest notice may be in Hodgson's history (1820, 152): he observed that "at Sayle Bottom, a mile from Great Asby, are several tumuli, differing in size and form; some circular, and 12 yards (10.97 m.) in diameter, others nearly rectangular, 12 yards (10.97 m.) long and 4 (3.66 m.) broad. At the higher end of them a deep trench seems to have been cut and a brest-work raised of rough stones; and at the lower end, a similar brest-work". He then goes on to say that "A tumulus in the neighbourhood of Garthorne Hall (i.e. Gaythorne Hall) was opened some forty years since, and several human bones, and a large sword found in it."

The next mention is by Whellan (1860, 724). He simply notes, re Asby Winderwath, that "about twenty years ago, a quantity of human remains, as well as implements of war, were discovered here. Greenwell states that in a cairn at a place "called Sail Bottom" some time before his visit, workmen looking for stones had found an extended
skeleton beneath a large stone, with an iron knife at its waist, from which he infers that the burial was that of an Anglo-Saxon.

Collingwood (1926, 6) tentatively identifies both Greenwell's barrow and Hodgson's with one on Asby Winderwath Common, a mile from Gaythorne Hall (above Grid. Ref.) implying that both of these at least, are accounts of the same discovery; but there are several things against this. Firstly, Hodgson does not identify the tumulus at Gaythorne Hall as one of the Sayle-Bottom group: one rather gets the impression that the tumuli were distinct. Secondly, forty years before Hodgson was writing would make the date of the original discovery circa 1780 - surely an overlong time for Canon Greenwell to describe as "some time previous to my visit". Thirdly, though he was probably familiar with most previous antiquarian writings, he quotes no source for his information; his account seems to be independent of anything in Hodgson or Whellan but it gives more detail. Greenwell was not above 'interpreting' information he received at second hand in a liberal way, but it is doubtful if even he could have produced his own version out of Hodgson's and Whellan's information combined - nor is it likely that he would have picked up a vivid oral account if the original discovery had in fact been made as early as 1780. It seems quite likely that two separate burials at least are involved, if not perhaps the abundance of weaponry implied by Whellan. Even allowing for the kind of discrepancies
usual in antiquarian writings; it is difficult to reconcile Greenwell's version with either of the two earlier accounts, and it is perhaps best to simply take it as it stands.

If Collingwood's identification of the barrow is correct, then the site is on open moorland, just above the 1000' (305 m.) contour and the modern limit of enclosed farming.

**Warcop (WY 733,171) (Greenwell 1877, 385-6)**

The tumuli, marked by the O.S. at the above location are generally considered to be the relevant mounds described by Greenwell and others. They had been ploughed out by 1936 (R.C.H.M. 1936, 240). They were right by the Roman road from Brough to Carlisle, on rising ground, at about 500' (152 m.) O.D., less than 2 km. north-west of the Eden. Greenwell only observed two barrows, but most other accounts (e.g. Whellan, 1860, 772; Bulmer, 1885, 282; Nicholson and Burn, 1777, 609) state that there were three.

The largest of the barrows was opened in 1776 at the request of the antiquary Bishop Lyttelton. The earliest accounts of the discoveries appear in *Archaeologia* (Preston, 1776, 273) and in Nicholson and Burn's history (1777, 609-10)). Both accounts purport to be original letter(s) sent by Preston to the Bishop, but the 'letter' in *Archaeologia* is clearly a paraphrase. It is not certain whether it is based on the account printed by Nicholson and Burn (published a year later) or another, broadly similar letter. There are differences between the two in
both wording and content, and each contains some information that the other does not.

"Within half a yard (0.46 m.) of the surface" of the top of the barrow, the labourers found "a piece of an urn". This led to the discovery of a "small urn or vessel" set in a larger one. It contained a small quantity of "something white, like ashes". Beside the urn, but at a greater depth, was a double-edged sword, just over 2' (0.61 m.) long, $2\frac{1}{2}$" (6.3 cm.) wide, with a "curiously carved hilt". On the other side of the 'urn' was what is in one place (Nicholson and Burn, 1777, 609) described as "an halbert or some such instrument" but elsewhere (Preston 1776, 273) called a spearhead. There was also another object, which Mr. Preston "did know what to make of". In the account in Nicholson and Burn's history, the sword is described as "almost destroyed with rust". In the description of the finds in Archaeologia, it is stated generally that "All these instruments were nearly destroyed by rust".

A yard (0.91 m.) below these finds was an inner cairn of stones; underneath this cairn was a cremation deposit, without grave-goods or container, apparently more or less directly under the urn.

Greenwell interprets all of this data after his own fashion; he states that the grave-goods with the urn were a sword, a spearhead, and possibly an iron knife; and that the burial was an inhumation. In other accounts, the story is even more debased: in Whellan (1860, 771) and Bulmer
it is stated that "urns, bones, ashes and an iron urn" were found, of a British Chieftain!

Hodgson (1820, 156-57) gives another version of this burial, without quoting any source of information. On the whole, his description of the manner of burial accords well with the early versions, but he lists the grave-goods as being "a sword, with a curious carved hilt, two feet (0.61 m.) long, and two inches and a half (6.3 cm.) broad, the haft three inches and a quarter (8.3 cm.); and the heads of two spears; fragments of a helmet and umbo of a shield three inches and three quarters (9.5 cm.) in diameter". This really does sound as though he had information from a source independent of the two early accounts; but there is no way of knowing if his data is more, or less, accurate than these. Preference should probably be given to the latter, on the grounds of their much earlier date.

Brigg Flat (? NY 5,2) (Near Morland, in Shap parish)

The existence of another possible Anglo-Saxon burial is suggested by an iron spearhead, exhibited by the vicar of Shap in the museum formed at Carlisle in 1859. The description of this object in the catalogue (Catalogue, 1859, 13) states that it was "found with bones of deer, etc. in a tumulus near Morland, called Brigg Flat, parish of Shap, Westmorland; also a bronze ferule. The socket of the spearhead is open at one side, resembling the fashion of weapons of the Anglo-Saxon period". While there
is no specific evidence of any body here, it is reasonable to suppose that the spearhead probably did come from another barrow burial. Efforts to trace it, or to locate its findspot more precisely, have been unsuccessful.\(^2\)

Other burials about which little is known may have been Anglo-Saxon, but there is really too little evidence to suggest this positively in any individual case - for instance, the burials with 'swords' in Furness, at Pennington and Lindal-with-Marton (Tweddell and Richardson, 1880, ii, 171). It should not be automatically assumed that all such inadequately recorded finds are prehistoric - but again, there is no better reason for assuming them to be of later date. Finds of stray objects (see Chapter 8) may have come in some cases from burials, but there is no actual evidence of this.

The Greenwell burials and the Brigg Flat spearhead pose more tangible problems. It must now be decided if any or all of these are acceptable as pagan Anglo-Saxon burials. The loss of the grave-goods, and the inadequate record is a severe handicap to positive identification. One must perforce resort to the nature of the burial rite itself, and the sketchy descriptions and small drawings of the finds, and see what indications of period these provide.

Firstly, with regard to the rite: all the burials are in cairns or mounds, and in four cases are known to
be secondary interments. Crosby Garrett is positively recorded as a cremation, Orton and Asby as inhumations. Cremation is indicated in the original accounts of the Warcop burial (in spite of Canon Greenwell) and inhumation is indicated by the Kirkby Stephen coffin, although there is no recorded evidence of a body. There is no evidence as to the rite at Brigg Flat. Only two of the Cumbrian burials have any claim to being primary interments, i.e. Asby and Brigg Flat - and in both cases it is simply the inadequacy of the record rather than any kind of positive indication, which permits us to suppose this. It is quite likely that these too were secondary burials. With the exception of Orton, all the burials seem to be isolated, but in view of the scanty records, too much reliance should not be placed on this.

The fact that most of the burials are secondary is not in itself any kind of dating evidence. Burials of this type are common in pagan Anglo-Saxon contexts from the mid-sixth century onwards, at least in certain areas (Meaney, 1964, 18-19); but secondary Bronze Age burials are frequently met with in cairns of original Bronze Age construction, or even earlier barrows. Most of the known secondary Anglo-Saxon barrow burials are inhumations - secondary cremations being extremely rare, however. It is therefore somewhat remarkable that two of the Cumbrian secondary burials seem to have been cremations, i.e. Crosby Garrett and Warcop. No receptacle to contain the cremation deposit was recorded at Crosby Garrett, and this
is also a fairly unusual feature in barrow burials, although examples are known.  

The inhumations all appear to have been extended rather than crouched. Orientation is only specifically noted at Orton and Kirkby Stephen, in both cases north-west - south-east; the heads were to the north-west at Orton, and Greenwell suggests the same at Kirkby Stephen, on insufficient evidence. This is a doubtful guide, however, as only Christian orientation is fairly strictly controlled. Prehistoric, Roman, Anglo-Saxon and Viking burials all exhibit a considerable range in orientation, although within some cemeteries or areas, some specific direction was often followed in Anglo-Saxon times (see below, p.360). Within Bernicia inhumation was the general rule for burial within the Pagan period, although there are not many sites known in the north and west. All the early Anglo-Saxon burials in Northumberland and Durham listed by Meaney (1964) are inhumations, whether these occur singly, or grouped in cemeteries - some of them in barrows. In Lancashire, some cremations have been recorded (Meaney, 1964, 143) but all of these are dubious. In Deira, cremation and mixed cemeteries do occur, but inhumation is the predominant rite; and large numbers of burials are recorded as secondary interments in barrows, e.g. at Driffield, where there are two secondary inhumation cemeteries in prehistoric barrows (Mortimer, 1905, 271-84; 286-293). In these cemeteries both flexed and extended skeletons were found. Wood coffins are also known in
Pagan Anglo-Saxon contexts in Yorkshire, e.g. Sewerby (Meaney, 1964, 300-1).

Thus, while it can be stated that there is nothing in the form of burial that is inconsistent with an Anglo-Saxon date, it must be made clear that there is nothing exclusively Anglo-Saxon about any of these rites. Both cremation and inhumation burials, in primary and secondary contexts in barrows are well attested for prehistoric Cumbria; and Viking burials are also found in tumuli. Bronze Age inhumations are usually crouched, but instances are known of both extended burials and coffins, with or without grave-goods. Bronze-Age cremations are frequently, though not always, in urns; in fact it must be said that the cremations at Warcop and Crosby Garrett are unusual, if Anglo-Saxon, in their geographical and chronological context.

Our knowledge of the grave-goods is based, as we have seen, on brief descriptions. Only in two cases are these amplified by illustrations. Where verbal accounts are the only source, our information is really too limited to allow any positive judgement as to period or type. All that can be assessed is the balance of probabilities.

At Orton there were no grave-goods. While this in no way precludes the interments there being Anglo-Saxon - most Anglo-Saxon cemeteries have at least some burials without grave-goods - it can scarcely be said to establish the fact. The Brigg Flat spearhead was positively
identified at the time of its display as 'resembling' Anglo-Saxon weapons, on the grounds that it had a split shaft. Anglo-Saxon spearheads do generally have split shafts, but the type is not exclusively Anglo-Saxon, even in the north-west. The pattern-welded spearhead found in the old lake bed at Kentmere in 1942 (Fell 1957) is one such, but in most other respects is thought to resemble Viking spearheads of the eleventh century. It has been suggested that this is an Anglo-Saxon copy of a Viking weapon, probably made in the tenth century. Split sockets are not characteristic of Viking weapons on the whole, however, so although it is impossible to be certain, an earlier date is perhaps more probable.

With regard to Asby-iron knives are very common with Anglo-Saxon inhumations - "more frequently found, in fact, than any other object" - (Meaney, 1964, 17) and in many cemeteries male burials especially are accompanied by this alone; but the burial itself is not strictly dateable on these grounds. It can hardly, for obvious reasons, be pre-Iron Age. Virtually nothing is known of Iron Age or native Romano-British burials in Cumbria, so it is a little futile to seek comparisons there; but it is not very likely that the burial is Roman. The site is distant from any known Roman fort, and it is in any case unusual to find weapons with orthodox Roman burials (Collingwood, R.G., & Richmond, 1969, 167) - although a small knife would hardly qualify as a weapon as such. A short knife was among the grave-goods in the Viking inhumation at Ormside, however, and a
largish dagger was found with the inhumation on Beacon Hill, Aspatria (Rooke, 1792, 112-3) so the possibility of a latter date cannot be dismissed, although Viking graves in the north-west are usually richer than this.

Turning to the Warcop burial, there is, as has been demonstrated, some confusion as to what the original grave-goods were, and what they were made of. The fact that a sword was found is testified to in all early accounts, and there is therefore no reason to doubt its existence, or its general appearance, as the descriptions more or less tally in this respect. Taking the objects in the eighteenth century accounts first, however, there is more than one difference. The second object was, as we have seen, described once as a halberd and once as a spearhead. One is forced to conclude that the object in question was probably in an unidentifiable condition at the time of its discovery, and there is little point in suggesting what it might have been at this remove. The same applies to the 'something' that Mr. Preston did not know what to make of. Another difference between the two early accounts is of doubtful significance: in the Nicholson and Burn account, only the sword is described as rusty, no clue being given as to the nature or condition of the material of the other objects. In the account in Archaeologia, however, all three objects are rusty. In the normal sense one would expect 'rusty' to be used of iron objects only, so it seems fairly safe to assume that the sword at least was made of iron.
The grave-goods as listed by Hodgson - apart from the sword - were two spearheads, fragments of a helmet, and a shield boss or umbo, of which he gives the diameter. He says nothing about rust, but he notes the pottery, and its position relative to the other finds, as in the early accounts. His account leaves no doubt at all that he is talking about the same barrow at Sandford, and the difference in grave-goods is inexplicable. It is hardly justifiable to maintain that his account is the more accurate simply because he lists more finds, however, although the fact that he supplies more detail about the sword and gives a measurement for the umbo is a point in favour of his reliability. He would certainly have been familiar with Nicholson and Burn's history, and it is a little puzzling that he offers no explanation for the different information. He may have simply confused or conflated the finds from the Warcop burial with another, elsewhere, although he is quite clear about the position and dimensions of the barrow, and that it was opened in 1766.

The presence of iron effectively rules out a pre-Iron-Age date. The same points re Iron Age, native Romano-British, and Roman burials, noted in connexion with Asby, apply here. On balance, a Viking grave, or an Anglo-Saxon one, are the most serious possibilities.

Swords do occur in rich Anglo-Saxon graves, but are familiar in Viking contexts too. Hodgson's spearheads, helmet and umbo could belong to either period; helmets are extremely rare in Anglo-Saxon burials, and, to date,
unknown from Viking graves. Pottery, however, is rather inexplicable in the latter context, and for this reason an Anglo-Saxon date is perhaps to be preferred, though, as has been noted, weapons are uncommon with cremations. But the position of the pottery, i.e. a smaller vessel inside a larger one, is of fairly frequent occurrence when pigmy or grape cups are found in association with Bronze Age cinerary urns, and this raises further doubts as to the precision of the original account: this clearly implies that the grave-goods were found at a lower level than the 'urns' and would seem to rule out the possibility that they did not properly belong with them, but with, perhaps, an even later, intrusive burial, the human remains of which did not survive. While this burial may be Anglo-Saxon, it is best not to suggest too positive a preference for period.

Turning now to Crosby Garrett and Kirkby Stephen, more positive identification is possible. Though the small drawings made in the Register (Fig. 5.1, reprod.) are no substitute for study of the original material, they do help to limit the field, at least in the case of Crosby Garrett.

The finds from here consisted, as we have seen, of an iron knife, a buckle, a shears, and a bridle-bit. The knife was short, $3\frac{3}{4}$" (9.5 cm.) long, and composed of a blade and tang. Knives like this are the usual Anglo-Saxon kind, though not confined to the pagan period. The buckle was more or less kidney-shaped, and had a curved tongue, hooked simply round the back. There was no attached plate -
or else this did not survive. This is a common Anglo-Saxon type of buckle, although the Crosby Garrett specimen is a bit larger than most, with a width of $1\frac{3}{4}$" (4.1 cm.). The shears is perhaps the most interesting find. It was $5\frac{3}{4}$" (14.6 cm.) long, the blades (about 40% of the total length) being at right-angles to the plane of the 'handle' in the usual way. The upper handle was simply decorated, along its whole length with alternate groups of three incised lines, and incised Xs. The horse-bit, 10" (25.4 cm.) long, consisted of two rings, nearly 3" (6.8 cm.) in diameter, connected by two flat bars with loops at each end.

All of these grave-goods could be later than the Pagan period, but would fit well in a pagan Anglo-Saxon burial. Admittedly there are virtually no distinctive features, but it is possible to find parallels for all the material within the Yorkshire cemeteries - and of course, elsewhere. Small tanged knives, like that at Crosby Garrett are extremely common, examples occurring in most groups of burials. Buckles like that at Crosby Garrett are also met with frequently; these are usually somewhat smaller, but larger ones do occur (e.g. at Driffield, Grave No. 1; Mortimer, 1905, Pl.XCVII, Fig. 761). Shears are also known, though these tend to be in female graves e.g. grave no. 24, Driffield (Mortimer, 1905, 281, Pl. CII, Fig. 803). It is possible to find an almost exact parallel for the decoration on the Crosby Garrett shears on a bronze tweezers from the cemetery at Cheesecake Hill, Driffield (Mortimer, 1905, 286, Pl. CIV, Fig. 836) and a similar pattern on a strap-end from Driffield, grave no. 28, and also, another
strap-end from Driffield, grave no. 18 (Mortimer, 1905, 282, Pl. CII, Fig. 816, and 280, Pl. XCIX, Fig. 786, respectively).

Bridle-bits are not very common in pagan Anglo-Saxon cemeteries, but there are a few examples in the Yorkshire cemeteries which resemble closely (insofar as one can tell from the drawing) that found at Crosby Garrett. Indeed it is possible to parallel three of the grave-goods at Crosby Garrett (knife, buckle and bridle-bit) in a single grave - No. 10 in the cemetery near Garton Gatehouse in the Garton Slack Group (Mortimer 1905, 250). This contained two bridle-bits, both very like the Crosby Garrett example (Pl. LXXXVI, Figs. 659 and 660) though slightly larger - the diameter of the rings were 4" (10.2 cm.) and 3½" - 3¾" (8.9 - 8.3 cm.) respectively, an iron knife (Pl. LXXXVI, Fig. 657) and three iron buckles (Pl. LXXXVI, Fig. 658; Pl. LXXXVII, Figs. 662-3).  

It is true that none of these finds are, in themselves, closely dateable types, but they make a convincing enough assemblage, and it seems reasonable to accept the Crosby Garrett interment as a genuine Anglo-Saxon burial, of perhaps the late sixth or early seventh century, by analogy with the Yorkshire cemeteries quoted as parallels. It is just about possible that the grave was Viking, but less likely. While the bridle-bit and knife could be paralleled in Viking graves, and the buckle is not very distinctive, the decoration on the shears tips the balance in favour of an Anglo-Saxon date.
Unfortunately the Kirkby Stephen material is not as clearly illustrated as the Crosby Garrett finds. The bowl was clearly badly decayed: only the upper part was drawn, in profile. The Register reads "Bronze remains of this bowl with turned-out edge, and probably with a slight boss in centre inside. Diam. of Mouth 5" (12.7cm.). The drawing suggests a vessel rather deep in proportion to its width, but the bowl was described, when discovered, as shallow; the complete shape can only be guessed at. The bead is described as "glass, globular bead, translucent blue, splashed with yellow and red". Diam. \( \frac{3}{2} \) (1.3 cm.).

Beads are common enough finds in Anglo-Saxon cemeteries; bowls, though hardly common, are sometimes met with in rich graves. The drawing of the bowl is really too inadequate to make a search for close parallels very worthwhile, however. No obvious parallels are, indeed, forthcoming. The comparatively narrow shoulder and relatively deep outturned neck exclude the vessel from the normal types of bowls - hanging-bowls, etc. usually met with among Anglo-Saxon grave-goods. The bowl from Ewelme, Oxon. (Brown, G. B., 1915, 473, Pl. CXVII, 5) is comparable in size, however, and has a rather high, upright collar above a rounded body, a little like the Kirkby Stephen bowl, though not outturned. One might also tentatively suggest that it might have been a metal binding for a vessel, rather than the container itself. Alternatively, the vessel could be a Roman bronze, although the situation of the barrow
makes an actual Roman burial in the normal sense unlikely. The vessel could have been acquired through trade or looting by the native population, or the Anglo-Saxons, although Roman material is most abundant - naturally enough - in the earlier pagan burials.

The bead is not closely dateable on description alone. Globular blue glass beads, often decorated or splashed with other colours, are common in Anglo-Saxon graves, most frequently in groups suggestive of necklaces or armlets, but single examples often accompany skeletons. Beads like this are known from Roman times - at least - onwards, and are by no means an exclusively Anglo-Saxon ornament. The most likely possibility for the Kirkby Stephen grave is that it is either some kind of native interment contemporaneous with the availability of Roman material, or that it is Anglo-Saxon. It is not really possible to be more precise.

Of all these burials the Crosby Garrett interment is the most acceptable. Outright acceptance of the rest is in each instance bound to be a bit arbitrary. In no case is an Anglo-Saxon date to be totally excluded; in no case is it provable. In the writer's opinion, however, the most acceptable burials are those which conform to the normal rather than the abnormal forms of Anglo-Saxon burial, although in view of the sketchy nature of the evidence, even this judgement contains a large measure of subjectivity - i.e. Asby, Kirkby Stephen and Brigg Flat. The
burials at Orton had so few distinctive features that it seems best to withhold judgement on them. With regard to Warcop, the conflict between the early accounts raises too many problems for a simple solution - all that can really be said is that if it was an Anglo-Saxon grave, then it was exceptional and atypical. Further work, or fuller information may cause this selection to be altered or added to, but at any rate it is clear that there is at least some evidence for Anglo-Saxon activity west of the Pennines in the pagan period; bearing this in mind, the acceptance or rejection of any individual site must be seen, in perspective, as of less importance than the existence of the group as a whole.

It remains now to view this group in the general context of pagan burials in the north, and Cumbrian history. As is clear from Map IX, all the interments are situated in the upper Eden Valley, within a few miles of each other. Two of the sites are close to the Eden itself, on the east bank, i.e. Warcop and Kirkby Stephen. The remaining three of which the sites are known, i.e. Asby, Crosby Garrett, and Orton, are on higher ground, all above the 1000' contour (305 m.) on open moorland, on the western side of the valley. This unpromising terrain may account for the survival of the barrows into modern times, but should not necessarily be seen as the result of deliberate selection on the part of the Anglo-Saxons. First, they may have preferred, and used, other barrows on better land, which have been destroyed without record for agricultural
reasons in the distant past. Secondly, it must be remembered that in any case most, if not indeed all of the burials were secondary interments in pre-existing prehistoric barrows, so the availability of these was a siting factor. The barrows selected varied considerably in size - from 28' (8.53 m.) in diameter and 1 1/2' (.46 m.) high at Kirkby Stephen to 50' (15.24 m.) diameter at Orton, but this again simply shows that the whole of the available range of prehistoric barrow sizes was acceptable. This being the case, the fact that the Crosby Garrett barrow is near the Several settlements, or that the barrow at Warcop is just by a Roman road, may not be of direct significance.

Little information on the age or sex of the persons buried is available, though in some cases this can be implied from grave-goods. The Crosby Garrett grave was probably male, judging by the finds, and the same sex is indicated at Brigg Flat, Warcop and probably Asby. The grave-goods at Kirkby Stephen could conceivably belong to either sex. The length of the coffin suggests a male, but the absence of any grave-goods more characteristically male could be interpreted as implying a female grave - so sex is indeterminable here. The 'mixed population' at Orton represents a more familial kind of grouping. Apart from these however (and it must be remembered that these are the most doubtful of all the burials) - the emphasis is clearly on the masculine element. The burials are so few in number anyway that too much should not be made of this point, but it could be seen as suggesting that they
are to be connected with some military foray into the Upper Eden Valley, rather than with a large - or even small - scale settlement by the Anglo-Saxons in the pagan period. The absence of any of the early types of settlement name in the area has already been noted (see above, p.105).

Militating against this, however, is the fact that considerable trouble must have been taken over at least some of the burials. Soldiers in haste to bury their dead are unlikely to have had the time or the inclination to carefully hollow-out wooden coffins, or light funeral pyres. Cremation itself is indeed a bit unexpected in any context.

The location of the group in the Upper Eden Valley clearly suggests penetration via the Stainmore Gap from Deira. It has already been noted (Ch. 2) that this can hardly have taken place before the reign of Edwin; by which time the conversion of Northumbria had already begun. It is most likely that pagan practices continued for some time after this, however, especially in areas remote from royal control, so there is nothing inexplicable in finding pagan burials after this time. It is impossible to know when these practices would have ceased, but presumably at any rate before the end of the seventh century. The analogies made with the Deiran cemeteries have already indicated a date in the late sixth or early seventh century. There is no reason, though, why a mid seventh century date, or even one a bit later, should be ruled out.
The absence of pagan graves elsewhere in Cumbria may be simply fortuitous. 'Statistics' based on small numbers like these carry little conviction. The clustering of sites in the same area, however, does suggest that the Upper Eden Valley may have been settled before the rest, just before pagan practices ceased entirely. The expansion into other areas must have followed in step with the spread of Christianity among the heathen English.
Notes

1. The grave-goods in the barrows opened by Canon Greenwell were acquired by the British Museum, but are most unfortunately now lost. All efforts to trace the other grave-goods have been unsuccessful. There is no clue in the literature as to their whereabouts.

2. Brigg Flat is not listed, even as a field-name, in Shap (Smith, 1967, 164-82).

3. Everything in this burial is described as being in a very decayed state, but it is nonetheless odd that the coffin should have withstood the ravages of time better than the corpse.

4. Only one site is listed in the O.S. map of Britain in the Dark Ages (O.S. 1971, 44). This is not an exhaustive compilation, however Meaney (1964) includes a few more examples.

5. E.g. Cold Eaton, Derbyshire (Meaney, 1964, 75) which is recorded as a primary cremation in a barrow.

6. The only ones not classed as dubious by Meaney are the two cremation urns from Ribchester - but there are good reasons for thinking that the original provenance of these was elsewhere (information from Mr. Kevin Brown).

7. The other grave-goods indicate that this was a female grave, although identification of the skeletal material was impossible as the grave was badly damaged.

8. The other finds in this grave consisted of a small bronze buckle (Pl. LXXXVII, Fig. 664), four iron rings (Pl. LXXXVI, Fig. 661), the remains of an iron bodkin (Pl. LXXXVII, Fig. 665) and a small organic container with bronze fittings (Pl. LXXXVII,Fig. 666), as well as animal bone.
CHAPTER 6

The Early Christian Evidence

The term 'Early Christian' has been used, in the title of this thesis, to cover, in a loose chronological sense, various types of evidence, some of which bear no specific relation to Christianity as such, such as place-names and settlement sites. The choice of this term has already been briefly discussed in the introduction (above, pp. 12-13). Here, most of the material evidence for early Christian practice will be examined in detail. Anglo-Saxon sculpture is considered separately in the next chapter.

The use of the term 'Celtic' to describe this material has been specifically avoided - as Thomas has said, "there never was a Celtic church" (1971, 5). It is possible to distinguish, at a theoretical level, between the evidence for Christianity in Cumbria prior to its incorporation into the orbit of the Northumbrian church, and evidence of the late sixth, seventh and eighth centuries, and some monuments - e.g. the Anglo-Saxon sculpture - clearly belong to one phase rather than another; but the assumption that other types of monument, e.g. curvilinear churchyards, or certain types of cemetery - are exclusively pre-Northumbrian or non-English, is unwarranted. The dating evidence, such as it is, permits no such distinction.
In an earlier chapter (above, pp. 56-72) reference has already been made to the various controversies about the immediate post-Roman church. As we have seen, although the population considered itself (or at least a certain section of it) Christian in the sixth century, virtually nothing is known of ecclesiastical structure or organization. The historical evidence for St. Ninian and St. Kentigern, the best known of the North British saints, is of the most dubious kind as regards their efforts in Cumbria, and is generally discounted; and there is no other evidence of a convincing nature for other saints' missions, although these have been inferred from very suspicious data.

The archaeological evidence for Christianity in Roman Cumbria is set out in Appendix 6, but detailed consideration of it is here unnecessary, although reference will be made to individual monuments or objects, where this is relevant. This material falls outside the strict scope of this thesis, and in any case it has been fully examined by Toynbee (1953), Frend (1955), Wall (1965, 1966) and Thomas (1968, 1971). The evidence from sites connected with 'traditions' of Ninian and Kentigern is examined in Section 1. These are the kind of sites for which an Early Christian date has often been presupposed; here tacit assumptions are avoided, and an attempt made to set down what is actually known about the sites in detail but without elaborate conjecture.

There is at least one sculpture of non-Anglo-Saxon type in Cumbria, and this is fully discussed in its context in Section II. The Addingham slab is perhaps the only
Christian monument which can really claim a pre-Anglo-Saxon date; but even here the doubtful validity of clear-cut divisions into Anglian and post-Roman in a cultural rather than a chronological sense is demonstrated, as the site has produced sculpture of both Anglian and Viking type.

Section III deals with cemeteries and single burials for which a pre-Conquest date and a Christian context is probable or possible. As will be seen, dating evidence does not usually allow any kind of distinction between post-Roman and Anglo-Saxon or even later types, although sometimes the context or some specific detail permits a closer definition. One or two very doubtful sites are also included in the discussion.

Churchyards with curvilinear boundaries are considered in the next section. The ground for presupposing that such cemeteries are necessarily early are dubious, and on morphological grounds alone, one or two churchyards where there is no evidence for even a pre-Reformation church must be admitted to the fold; but in view of the poor documentary evidence for many of Cumbria's medieval churches, this is not damning, although some sites are suspicious. The shapes of the churchyards on Figs. 6.6-6.1 are taken generally, from the first edition 6" map of 1864-6 (pub. 1867) which is the earliest overall cover of the county on an adequate scale; many have been altered considerably since then.

The last type of Early Christian monument discussed is the holy well. These are numerous in Cumbria and a
full discussion of each site is hardly warranted in view of the limited use which can be made of the information; indeed, considerable difficulty was experienced in presenting the necessary data in an acceptably concise form. The solution arrived at was to tabulate the information about each site with full references (Appendix 9a, 9b) but to confine discussion to more general issues. It may seem, nonetheless, that the space devoted to holy wells is disproportionate, but it is difficult to see how this could have been avoided, without omitting the background to and basis for the research.

I. St. Ninian and St. Kentigern
the Archaeological Evidence

The documentary evidence for the careers of these saints has already been discussed (above, pp.56-68). While it is clear that there is by no means a strong a priori case for numerous early ecclesiastical sites connected with them, it is often simply assumed that some church sites which bear dedications to Ninian or Kentigern or are in some way connected with them do date from the fifth or sixth century (i.e. Henshall, 1958, 274; O.S. 1971, 12 & map; Simpson, 1945, 81) and it seems advisable to examine the evidence from these places fairly closely.

The specific 'evidence' for St. Ninian's activities in Cumbria is confined to the dedications - or names - of four holy wells and one church. Two wells, St. Ringan's
well, Loweswater, and St. Ninian's well, Briscoe, are apparently unconnected with churches or indeed sites of any other kind. One of the wells, called Ninewells, is beside a deserted church dedicated - uniquely, for Cumbria - to St. Martin of Tours - at Old Brampton. The fourth well is across the river from the parish church of Brougham, Ninekirks, which is also now deserted, although still in good repair. Attention has naturally concentrated especially on these last two sites.

**Old Church, Brampton**

The dedication of the church at Brampton is not recorded before the late eighteenth century (Graham & Collingwood, 1925, 14) and Ninewells makes its first recorded appearance in 1704 (Ferguson (ed.) 1877, 161). A 'St. Martin's Oak' north of the village of Brampton was noted on a map of 1603, however (Whitehead, 1889, 199) so the association with St. Martin can be brought back to at least the early seventeenth century, but this is hardly sufficient claim to a fifth century origin. Admittedly, absence of even medieval documentation for the dedications of the church and well does not itself mean that neither goes back to an early tradition; but further evidence for this is required.

The connection between Ninian and St. Martin is noted by Bede, as we have seen (H.E., 111: 4), who simply states that the church and see of Whithorn were called after the latter. The theme was later elaborated by Ailred.
his *vita* of Ninian, who claimed that the saint visited Martin at Tours, and imported stonemasons from there, to build his church of *Candida Casa*. Discussions of the site at Brampton have centred more or less exclusively on the dedications themselves, and as to whether it is possible, probable or unlikely that the juxtaposition of a well dedicated to Ninian and a church dedicated to Martin does really indicate an Early Christian church site, or whether these require no such explanation (i.e. Simpson, W.D., 1945, 1950; Thomas, 1968, 94-100; 1971, 13-22; Wilson, P. A., 1968). For what it is worth, it should be noted that 'Ninewells' does not necessarily incorporate the later, widespread form of the saint's name - i.e. *Ninianus* - and so it is conceivable that it derives from an earlier and *genuine* tradition, but the point should not be laboured upon as no early spellings of the name are known (Wilson, P.A., 1968, 132). The name 'Rinnion', which is derived from the form used by Ailred, is said to be popular locally (Wilson, P.A., 1968, 132n) and may indicate a local cult associated with a late tradition. There is other, archaeological evidence which can be brought to bear upon the issue, however, as a certain amount of excavation has taken place in the vicinity.

The siting of the church is itself striking (Fig. 6.1). It is 1.6 km. west of the town of Brampton, on a rather steeply sloping promontory above the Irthing. Ninewells was outside the churchyard, immediately to the north of the church. The adjacent farm of Old Church incorporates
a ruined pele tower; but there is no superficial evidence of nucleated settlement in the vicinity of the church. Finds of medieval pottery in some quantity from the fields in the area are recorded by local fieldworkers however, and the probability of a deserted medieval settlement of some kind is strong.

Nonetheless, it is clear that at an early stage the main focus of settlement at Brampton had shifted to the east, presumably beginning at least with the erection of the large twelfth century motte in Brampton town. The old church remained in use as a parish church until 1788, however, when it was largely dismantled (Whitehead, 1889, 173); the only part now standing is the twelfth century chancel. The church itself is on the site of a Roman fort on the Stanegate (Simpson & Richmond, 1936). This fort was presumably abandoned and demolished on the completion of Hadrian's Wall, and its occupation was therefore limited to the early decades of the second century A.D. Positive evidence of this from finds is lacking, but associated with the site was a Roman auxiliary tilery, 1.3 km. to the east, excavated in 1963 (Hogg, 1965) the pot from which indicated activity centred on the first quarter of the second century; and there is no archaeological evidence of later activity.

Several native settlement sites are known from both aerial photography and excavation in the vicinity. Those at Hawkhirst and Brampton have already been discussed (see above, pp.142-4). Other, similar enclosures are known from
recent flying, but nothing of a definably 'Early Christian' nature has as yet been revealed either from the air, or on the ground.

It must be clear from all this that there is no material evidence for any 'Ninianic' church at Old Brampton; and the circumstantial evidence is certainly open to dispute. No connection can be demonstrated between a fort abandoned in the early second century for strategic reasons and Roman or sub-Roman Christianity, nor is there any link in turn between the latter and a settlement deserted in the middle ages. It may be that further evidence may become available and strengthen the case, but at present Old Church Brampton's connections with early Christianity do not stand up well to close scrutiny.

Ninekirks, Brougham

Ninekirks is the parish church of Brougham. It stands in a bend of the river Eamont, on a low river terrace, close to the bank. The place is now secluded, and remote from modern settlement. The ground rises to the south and east, and the site is partly hemmed in by cliffs on the opposite bank of the river. The church is disused, but in good repair. It is obviously in an inconvenient place for the community it serves, however, and the chapel by Brougham Hall is now the principal church of the parish.

The siting of the church with respect to this and other sites is shown on Fig. 6.2. As can be seen, the Roman road from Brough runs through the valley about
1.5 km. to the south. 2 km. west of this is the fort of Brocavum, and Brougham Castle. There is no real centre for the scattered hamlets of the parish; Brougham Hall and the chapel are about 1.8 km. to the west of the fort and castle.

The three caves of Isis Parlis are close by the church, on the opposite bank of the Eamont. They have long suggested analogies with other early hermitages and monastic sites (e.g. Heelis, 1903, 354, 1914, 339) but local tradition maintains that they were the home of the Giant of Penrith, called Sir Hugh or Owen Caesario, or sometimes Tarquin (Heelis, 1914, 342; Rawling, 1976, 17-18). They were well known to antiquaries: they feature in Lelands Itinerary (VIII, pt. 2; Heelis, 1914, 337) and in later editions (i.e. post 1610) of Camden's Britannia. It would seem that much of the rock face has since collapsed, thus reducing the size of the caves: Sandford stated (c. 1670) that there was room for 100 men to live (Heelis, 1914, 338) which is incredible if the caves were originally of their present dimensions. Some collapse is also indicated by excavation: the largest cave was explored in 1913 (Heelis, 1914, 342). Digging revealed a deposit 2' (0.61 m.) thick "entirely of decomposing stone and vegetable matter" although there were also small fragments of charcoal in the fill near to the floor. The only find was a pipe stem "highly glazed ... in almost the last spadeful of soil". There is therefore some evidence to show that the caves may have been
inhabited, but nothing to indicate that this "occupation" was particularly early - indeed one rather suspects that it was not. Gibson, writing circa. 1695 or 1722, noted that one cave - presumably the largest - once had iron gates "which were standing not many years since" (Heelis, 1914, 338). The hinges were apparently visible in the mid-nineteenth century. The 1913 excavation failed to find any traces of them; this might be interpreted as a further indication of the constant collapse of the rock face.

The documentary evidence for Ninekirks is confusing. The earliest reference to the name 'Ninekirks' itself appears to be in 1583 (Bouch, 1951, 80) but there are earlier notices of the parish church of Brougham, which show that in medieval times it was known as St. Wilfrid's church. One fourteenth century will, for instance, requests burial in the church of St. Wilfrid of Brougham (Ferguson, 1893a, 142). The possibility that it is Brougham chapel which is in fact meant is remote: a late fourteenth century document published by Nicolson and Burn but now lost (1777, 1, 390-1) which contains the earliest reference to the chapel, makes it clear that burial was still not permitted there; and a similar situation is revealed at the end of the seventeenth century (Bouch, 1951, 82-3). This dedication to St. Wilfrid was transferred to the chapel at some much later stage. The ambiguity is blatantly demonstrated as late as the early eighteenth century in the inscription on the Bird Chalice, which reads:
"ex dono Jacobi Bird in usum sacrasanctae Eucharistiae in ecclesia Sancti Wilfridi de Brougham vulganter appelata Ninekirks in comitatu Westmorlandae."

(Heelis, 1903, 355)

The earliest notice of its present dedication is in the late eighteenth century (Graham & Collingwood, 1925, 18), by which time Ninekirks was known as St. Ninian's. Both church and chapel were entirely rebuilt by Lady Anne Clifford in the middle of the seventeenth century but there are thirteenth century tombstones at Ninekirks. There is no evidence that the chapel at Brougham was actually in existence ante 1393 (Bouch, 1951, 87) although it is probable that it was erected somewhat earlier, perhaps in connection with the castle, which dates from the late twelfth century. The chapel had clearly by the late fourteenth century taken over many of the functions of the parish church - we are told that "from thenceforth all manner of sacraments of the church shall be administered at the Chapel of Brougham, except burials" and this strongly suggests that the parish church was by then remote from the community it served, and that the chapel at Brougham was convenient.

The site of the early medieval settlement is uncertain. There is a reference in a charter of circa. 1230 to a 'town' of Brougham. Bouch affirms (1951, 83) that the place-names mentioned in the same charter indicate that this 'town' was near the parish church rather than the chapel and castle; but there is also a slightly later document which records the boundary of the barony in 1284
(Bouch, 1951, 83), which refers specifically to the 'walled church' of Brougham, but omits all mention of the town. This document also indicates, apparently, that the church was by this time incorporated into the forest of Whinfell, and Bouch has proposed, from these two points, that there was originally a village of Brougham, by Ninekirks, but that in the mid thirteenth century it was destroyed and incorporated into Whinfell forest.

While this is possible, it would seem on the whole more likely that the main medieval settlement was connected in some way with the castle. The exact date at which a fortress was first erected on the site is uncertain, but the existence of a motte and bailey ante the late Norman keep has been proposed (Curwen, 1922, 144) and in any event, the latter would appear to have been standing in 1189. One would perhaps expect the removal of the village in connection with this rather than half a century or more later; and it is conceivable that the 'town' of Brougham referred to in the charter of c. 1280 was by the castle or present hall rather than by the church. The siting of the castle at the junction of the Eamont and Lowther along the main route through the valley was obviously strategic, and need bear no relation to earlier settlement; but the development of nucleated settlement, or even a planned village nearby would be a logical consequence. In any event there is no evidence for a village at Ninekirks after the mid-thirteenth century, and it is at least open to doubt that any such existed before this.
Whatever one might suppose about Ninekirks and the castle, it is clear that there was at least a nucleated settlement by Brougham Hall, although there is little trace of any such surviving there today. Machell recalls its demolition by the landowner circa. 1670, the stones of the buildings being re-used as field walling (Simpson, 1874, 64).

Unlike Brampton, the Roman fort of Brougham, within which the medieval castle stands, was occupied until at least the end of the Roman period: indeed Birley has observed (1932, 134) that the "great bulk of the material (found by H.M. Office of Works during the restoration of the castle, especially the clearance of the moat) belongs to the very close of the Roman occupation". There is also evidence for an extensive vicus east of the fort (Birley, 1932, 136). Excavation at the site has been limited to areas within the fort itself, involving the clearing up for the Castle. A Roman cremation cemetery was partly examined east of the fort in the 1960s.

Bouch (1951) has suggested that, initially, the Roman fort and vicus were the main settlement; when Ninian visited Brougham, he built his church away from the main village, in the bend of the Eamont, 4 km. to the east. Eventually the political disturbances of post-Roman times induced the inhabitants of Brougham to abandon their village, and seek refuge in the secluded site originally chosen by the visiting saint for his church; and later still, this was in turn abandoned in favour of a new site, to the west.
of the castle, the folkname Ninekirks preserving the original dedication to St. Ninian although the church was later rededicated to St. Wilfrid.

This interpretation, although it has become the 'accepted' view of many, rests basically on the assumption that the connection with Ninian, preserved, as we have seen no earlier than the late sixteenth century, is genuine. If this is denied, then the rest is really just contention; the remoteness of the church from modern or medieval settlement remains remarkable but is by no means unique, even in Cumbria, and it is hardly necessary to explain it in terms of the missionary or other activities of fifth century saints. The connection with Ninian remains unproven, and must so remain until the very unlikely event of further historical evidence coming to light; but other evidence, not considered by Bouch, does indicate that, nonetheless, the site may prove to be of very considerable interest for the post-Roman, pre-Conquest history of Cumbria.

The first discovery of pre-Conquest material was made in the middle of the nineteenth century. It was published (Way, 1847) but has attracted little attention until its recent republication (Bailey, 1978). In October 1846, three burials were found in the course of repairs to the Brougham burial vault in the chancel of Ninekirks. Two of these were overlain by medieval grave-slabs with inscriptions. One of these graves had the remains of an iron spur around the left heel, and some iron fragments of what may have been a stirrup; its legs were crossed. The
third grave lay alongside - and presumably parallel to - the others. It too was covered by a slab, undecorated, 6 (1.83 m.) long and 20" (50.80 cm.) wide. It was observed that this skeleton was "somewhat smaller than the rest". The great interest of this grave lies in the object found at the side of the skeleton - now unfortunately lost, a decorated horn mount, probably of eighth century date.

At the time of discovery, it was thought that the object came from the grave of one of the "Saxon ancestors" of the de Broham family. The placing of an object of this kind in a Christian grave is unexpected, however - it would not appear to have any obvious ecclesiastical use, whereby it might be connected with the grave of a cleric, for instance - and it is also possible that the grave in which it was found was no earlier than the others beside it. In this case, the circlet can only be considered a stray find, the grave a secondary context. It is possible that it was found in the course of digging this grave, and incorporated, accidentally or deliberately, into the fill; but there is no way of establishing the point at this remove.

The gilt circlet is the only unambiguous evidence for pre-Conquest activity at Ninekirks, but there is other evidence which must be considered in connection with the problem. A hoard of Roman coins was discovered circa. 1914 in the course of grave digging in the churchyard. These remained unpublished until 1956 (Bouch, 1956). The exact circumstances of the find were not precisely recorded, but 23 coins in all were recovered. They comprised one
normal worn third century coin, 21 very debased barbarous radiates - i.e. copies of third century regular issues, and one other, of an apparently non-Roman type, for which possible continental analogies in the sixth century could be found. The coins were published as a 'Dark-Age' hoard, but a recent reconsideration (Casey, 1978) indicates that the group is in fact best dated to the late third century. Even if the hoard does not constitute evidence for sub-Roman activity at the site, however, the fact that the present cemetery was used as a hiding place within the Roman period is of some interest; there is no other Roman material known from the site.

Of even greater significance is the view of Ninekirks obtained from the air (Fig. 6.3; Pl.6.2)(St. Joseph, 1978). Immediately east of the churchyard, an oval enclosure is clearly visible (A). This has a rectangular annex on its western side (Aa), and three rectangular structures show clearly as cropmarks along the southern side of the enclosure (A1, A2, A3), while north of these, towards the centre of the enclosure, there are possible indications of a fourth, slightly longer building (A4). This enclosure abuts on the edge of the river terrace. Other crop marks east and west of it, also above the river terrace, may also be of significance. To the east is a much smaller, sub-circular enclosure, with a ?annex to the south (B), and to the north of the churchyard there are indications of a largish rectangular enclosure (C). Other crop marks are of doubtful significance: on the lower terrace, north
of the enclosure, a short linear feature is apparent; and two similar lines are partly visible running east from the main enclosure (A), but these are not associated with any entrance feature - indeed, no break is clearly distinguishable anywhere in the enclosure, although the boundary is somewhat vague on the north-eastern side, and the original entrance may have been here.

A variety of interpretations are possible for these features. The cluster of timber buildings suggests a settlement site, and by analogy with elsewhere, it is tempting to offer a sub- or post-Roman date for these, while the form of the enclosure suggests parallels with early ecclesiastical sites in Ireland. The case must not be overstated, however; most of the Irish sites are considerably larger than this, with areas of two or more acres (0.80 ha.). The Ninekirks enclosure is only slightly bigger than the nearby churchyard, with an area of about 0.38 ha. It does fall within the size range of Cumbrian curvilinear churchyards, however, and some of the Irish enclosures have smaller, inner banks, although there is some evidence here that these were earlier, secular habitation sites, re-used by the ecclesiastical community - i.e. Nendrum (Lawlor, 1923). On the other hand, the crop mark enclosure does not contain the present church, and there is no demonstrably churchlike structure among the timber buildings. It may be that the church has always stood on its present site, and the adjacent enclosure represents a detached area, perhaps for the
domestic buildings; but in this case, the analogy with Irish monastic sites is scarcely valid, and it is just as possible that one is dealing with an entirely secular settlement – perhaps even the deserted medieval village postulated by Bouch at Ninekirks. Very little is known of early medieval buildings in Cumbria, but the possibility that the timber structures are considerably post-'Ninianic' cannot be ruled out. Stone was probably not used much for domestic buildings in the north-west before the later middle ages.

Conversely, it may be that the site is an earlier, rather than a later settlement. Crop mark enclosures like B – and perhaps also even A, without the internal features – are of fairly common occurrence throughout North Britain and are often simply labelled Iron-Age-Romano-British, as we have seen (above, p.140), and the coin hoard could be seen as reinforcing evidence for this. Buildings such as A1, A2, A3 do not find close parallels among the Romano-British structures so far excavated in Cumbria, but this is hardly surprising, in view of the number of the latter.

Definite judgements as to the nature of the site are at this stage premature. Ninekirks' claim to being an Early Christian site founded by Ninian have been cursorily dismissed (Thomas, 1968, 97); but it would seem better, in view of the scattered but suggestive archaeological evidence, to leave the issue open. The connection with Ninian may be impossible to prove; but leaving Ninian
aside, the fact remains that a) Ninekirks did support an early enclosed undocumented settlement of some kind, and b) there is evidence of at least pre-Conquest activity there. The problems of post-Roman dating in the north-west have already been discussed at length and there is no need to return to them here; but it is doubtful that, even with careful excavation, a fifth century date or an ecclesiastical context could ever be proven. Nonetheless, the site is at least more promising in that respect than Old Brampton; and there is at least a chance, one way or another, that excavation here might reveal something about pre-Conquest sites in Cumbria.

Sites connected with St. Kentigern

St. Kentigern has undoubtedly received less attention than St. Ninian from more recent historians of the early British Church, although earlier writers had no scruples about assigning to him an extensive pastoral mission in Cumbria (e.g. Lees 1883). Later writers are more sceptical, and W. G. Collingwood (1926a) although he did not discount the possibility that the churches dedicated to the saint may have been pre-Conquest foundations, nonetheless held that no Cumbrian church dedications had survived from post-Roman times.

Eight churches in all are dedicated to St. Kentigern or St. Mungo in Cumbria. The building of that at Crosthwaite, Keswick, is actually contemporarily described by Jocelyn of Furness in his late twelfth century Life, and there is no evidence from the site itself of anything earlier than this. There is therefore no reason to doubt that this foundation
actually dates from the twelfth century and no earlier, and the reason why St. Kentigern was selected as the patron is merely evidence that he was a popular saint in the area at the time, which is in any case demonstrated by the fact that Jocelyn was at that very moment writing his life. The claim that the saint had passed that way and set up a cross is most probably a blatant fiction invented by his hagiographer as an explanation of the place-names. We have already shown that cros does not appear in Cumbrian place-names before the tenth century. Collingwood's suggestion that the inhabitants of a 'British Village' on Vicarage Hill acted as the preservers of a tradition of the saint's passage is quite untenable. There is absolutely no dating evidence to link the finds on Bristow Hill with either the seventh or the twelfth century or any date in between, and the record of the original discoveries does not even support the view that there was even a settlement site there (Rawnsley, 1904).

The other churches dedicated to St. Kentigern are Aspatria, Bromfield, Caldbeck, Castlesowerby, Grindale, Irthington and Mungrisdale. Aspatria and Bromfield are adjacent parishes north of the Ellen and the northern foothills of the Lake District. Aspatria is a largish village; Bromfield is somewhat smaller and appears depopulated. Both churches possess important collections of Viking sculpture: at Aspatria, seven monuments are represented (Bailey, 1974, ii, 25) and at Bromfield there are at least three (Bailey, 1974, ii, 66-71). This dates
the sites themselves to at least the tenth century, but unfortunately there is no evidence that the dedications to St. Kentigern are anything like as old; indeed, neither is known before the Reformation (Graham and Collingwood, 1925, 17-18). Bromfield possesses a well in a field to the north of the church known as St. Kentigern's or St. Mungo's well. This was provided in the late nineteenth century with a circular stone vaulted superstructure (Lees, 1887, 336). There was at least one holy well at Aspatria, known as the Bishop's or Helly Well, also in a field to the north of the church there; there is no evidence that this was ever dedicated to St. Kentigern, so even if the existence of this well can be considered a mark of the antiquity of the church - a possibility more fully explored below (p.269) it can hardly be held up as evidence for the activities of the saint.

Caldbeck and Castle Sowerby are adjacent parishes in the northern foothills of the Lake District. Caldbeck is a small village; there is no nucleated settlement at Castle Sowerby, but the Medieval Village Research Group list a deserted medieval village adjacent to the church. There is no evidence of this known to the present writer and there are no pre-Conquest sculptures known at either place. The earliest reference to the dedication at Caldbeck appears to be in 1231 (Graham and Collingwood, 1925, 19). There is a reference to a church at Castle Sowerby in 1191, but the earliest mention of the dedication
is in 1362 (Graham and Collingwood, 1925, 19). There are holy wells near both churches. That at Caldbeck is near the church, on the banks of the river Caldew, and is known as St. Kentigern's well. That at Castle Sowerby is in the vicarage garden. It has a stone well head. Collingwood and Graham call it St. Kentigern's well (1925, 19) but Lees, writing in 1883 (334) states that the well is "probably the saint's well, but has lost the name".

Grinsdale and Irthington are both on the line of the Wall although neither are associated with forts. The former is about 4 km. west, the latter 12 km. east of Carlisle. Both churches are in small villages. McIntire (1944) states that there was a St. Kentigern's well at Grinsdale, destroyed by the Eden; but it is clear that he is simply misinterpreting a statement of Lees (1883, 333) who suggests that the absence of the saint's well here may be thus explained. There is a well at Irthington, but it is not dedicated to St. Kentigern; it is known as the Ha' well, and rises in the churchyard boundary (Lees, 1883, 333). Neither dedication is known from pre-Reformation documents, although there is a reference to a church at Irthington in 1169 (Graham and Collingwood, 1925, 22).

Mungrisdale is a chapel of Greystoke, on the banks of the Caldew, in the eastern foothills of the Lake District. It is certainly the most doubtful of all of these churches: there is no indication of a pre-Reformation church here, and indeed no indication that
the church was ever actually dedicated to St. Kentigern - no such dedication had been recorded for it even in the late eighteenth century (Graham and Collingwood, 1925, 24-5). There is really only the place-name, which does appear to incorporate the personal name Mungo. The early seventeenth century chalice is inscribed Mounge Griesdell but this is not necessarily a pointer to the dedication of the church at that date. 6 km. north-east of Mungrisdale is the only other place in Cumbria connected by its name with St. Kentigern - i.e. Thanetwell (NY 397, 350). This is apparently named after the saint's mother, St. Thaneu; but to date there is no evidence of a site of any great antiquity here.

It is plain that the 'evidence' for St. Kentigern's activities - if indeed it might be deemed such - is of a most unsatisfactory kind. There is nothing at any site which lends any rational support to a seventh century date - apart from the proliferation of holy wells, which must be considered a very doubtful prop (see below). It is true that there is pre-Conquest sculpture at two sites, but none of this is pre-Viking. Indeed the case rests entirely on the dedications themselves, and these constitute the weakest link in the argument, for only three of these are recorded before the Reformation.

Nonetheless, it must be remembered that dedications to Kentigern or Mungo are rare in England, and the concentration of eight sites in Cumbria is marked - in fact the distribution is even more striking: as Collingwood
observed (W.G., 1926a, 51-2) all are to be found in the northern part of the county, between the Lake District and the Border. This invites a comparison with the distribution of British place-names; and may be a hint that the cult of the saint is similarly connected with the reflux of British speakers into northern Cumbria when it was taken over by Strathclyde in the tenth century, as Collingwood has suggested (1926a). Alternatively, it is possible that the Cumbrian cult of the saint is later than this, and contemporary with or even post-dating Jocelyn's vita and the building of the church at Crosthwaite. While it would be rash to lay much emphasis on Jocelyn's omissions, it is nevertheless interesting that he mentions only one of St. Kentigern's churches in Cumbria: this provokes the speculation that all the others postdate his writings.

II. The Addingham Cross-slab

This is a simple crudely-shaped limestone slab, incised with a linear cross. The cross has few distinctive features; it is roughly equal-armed, and probably had expanded terminals: this is only clearly apparent now on the lowest arm. At the time of its discovery, it was noted that there were "holes at the four ends of the cross, and other, shallower holes between the arms". These are no longer distinct. Bailey (1974, ii,9) observes that the carving is done in pocked technique, and that it
is set in a shallow panel. The slab itself is about 1.4 m. high, and .38 m. wide, tapering to about .30 m. at the base. Originally it would have stood upright.

The slab was retrieved from the old site of St. Michael's church, Addingham (flooded by the Eden in the late fourteenth century) in 1913, when the river level fell (Gordon, 1914, 333). A cross of the Viking period had been taken from the same site in the nineteenth century (Collingwood, W. G., 1913, 166), and it is very probable that the Anglo-Saxon cross-shaft fragments at Addingham Church are from the same place.

This monument is usually included in the general series of incised linear cross slabs, found throughout the non-Anglo-Saxon areas of Britain, and in Ireland. Examples of this type are reasonably common in Wales and further west; less so in northern Britain. Inscriptions associated with some of the other crosses clearly indicate that these slabs are funereal.

The Addingham slab is probably of the late sixth or seventh century. Examples are known in later contexts elsewhere, but Bailey has argued (Bailey, 1960, 40-1; 1974, 18-19) that the erection of an Early Christian monument of this kind is unlikely to postdate the Anglo-Saxon settlement, or at any rate the introduction of the free-standing cross. Even if the cross-slab was carved at a later date, it is clear that it belongs to a basically non-Anglo-Saxon cultural tradition.

Considerable importance has been attached to the slab,
illustrating as it does a sub- or post-Roman tradition of stone carving in the north-west. However, it must be emphasised that it is the only example of its type in Cumbria; it can scarcely be claimed that the erection of this type of monument was of frequent occurrence in the area. One would naturally expect more than a sole survivor, if there had originally been many such carvings.

Thomas (1968, 100) has suggested that the slab reflects Irish influence, but the type is common in Wales and Man and there is really no reason why it should not reflect more immediate influence from closer to hand, although perhaps ultimately from the west. There is nothing characteristically Irish (as distinct from Manx, Scottish, or Welsh) about either the form of the cross itself, or the slab. At any rate, it can hardly be maintained that it derives from the background of Roman Christian monuments in Cumbria. (Appendix 6) It must be an intrusive type, and its links are clearly with the Celtic-speaking world.

Another factor which divorces the Addingham slab from immediate sub-Roman Christianity is its comparatively late date - as we have seen it is unlikely to predate the late sixth century. Monuments of much earlier date, with Christian inscriptions, do occur in the north-west - the earliest probably being the Latinus stone at Whithorn, and the Erigomaglos stone at Chesterholm (Wall, 1965, 205, 210), both fairly certainly fifth century monuments. Stones with inscriptions of this kind undoubtedly derive
ultimately from a Roman Christian background, though it is odd that so few are found within the Romanized area itself. No stone with an Early Christian inscription is known from Cumbria, however, although the Chesterholm stone is not far to the east; but slabs like these must in any case be considered a rare type: only about a dozen are known from North Britain, and few of these are as early as the fifth century. This being the case it is difficult to see how the Addingham slab can be considered as strictly relevant to the immediate state of post-Roman Christianity, let alone its territorial organization. The site of the old church is now inaccessible; St. Michael's well, now to the west of the river, but formerly on the east bank, is clearly to be associated with it, but nothing is now visible of church or churchyard. The latter was apparently used for burials in the late sixteenth century, and Hutchinson (1794, i, 282) reports the remains of houses by the river, and a tradition of a village by the site. Irregular surface features near the river bank may be the remains of buildings, but could be simply due to the collapse of the bank, slightly upstream from the well. The continuity between post-Roman, Anglo-Saxon and Viking Christianity at the site is clearly indicated by the later sculpture. Bailey (1974, i, 25) has suggested a monastic context, at least for the Anglo-Saxon, but there is really no way of knowing what kind of site was contemporaneous with the slab. The place-name belongs to the earliest stratum of English names (see above, p.100) in Cumbria.
The great interest of the slab undoubtedly lies in the fact that it is the only field monument in Cumbria dateable to the immediate post-Roman centuries, and is positive evidence of Christian practice there in that period. But the very fact that it is the only known example is surely of equal importance.

III. Early Christian burials and cemeteries

The number of recorded Early Christian burials and cemeteries is small; in fact, in only three or four cases has an Early Christian date been actually suggested for any of the burials or groups of burials considered here. However, it has been possible to isolate, from among the many casual finds and chance references to human bones and odd graves in antiquarian accounts, a few, which might well in the circumstances have been described as Early Christian. Unfortunately in most of these cases the reports are too inadequate to establish the point.

The evidence for each site is best considered separately; it is set out in Appendix 7; but there are some general considerations which apply to the sites as a whole. The most important of these is, naturally, the problem of identification. The context of any burial is frequently an important factor in determining its date, but in the case of Christian graves it is usually decisive, as the
absence of grave-goods means that no dateable finds will normally be present. Broadly similar methods of burial have been used by Christians in Britain from the earliest times until the present day. The body is normally extended on its back, with the head to the west, without grave-goods, and is usually associated with similar burials in cemeteries. There are some variations on this theme, however, and extended east-west orientation is not exclusively Christian; it is reasonably common in pagan Anglo-Saxon graves, and also occurs in Roman cemeteries. In the well-known early cemetery of St. Hilds, Hartlepool, excavated or otherwise discovered at various stages in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, the bodies were aligned north-south, but the accompanying gravestones or pillow-stones leave no room for doubt that the burials are Christian, almost certainly associated with St. Hild's monastery (Scott, 1956). Occasionally, Christian graves contain 'grave-goods', such as beads, as at Jarrow (Cramp, 1976, 13) or even weapons, as in Southampton (Holdsworth, 1977, 59) but such instances are atypical. These practices seem to reflect residual pagan custom in an otherwise Christian community, but it is by no means certain that graves like these are themselves actually pagan interments. Likewise, graves without grave-goods can be pagan - Prehistoric, Roman, Anglo-Saxon. The information that an individual grave or even groups of burials are extended, or without grave-goods, or oriented east-west, is insufficient to make them Christian, but these factors combined,
especially if there is some other evidence, may be seen as a positive indication. In the absence of direct historical or epigraphic evidence, an Early Christian date is virtually impossible to prove.

A combination of factors enables the identification of many Early Christian cemeteries throughout Britain and Ireland, and two main types have been identified by Thomas (1968, 107-8), the 'dug-grave' cemetery, and the long-cist or lintel-grave cemetery. The two types of grave are not mutually exclusive, and both are sometimes found together in the same cemetery. Sometimes there is an indication - such as a minor shift in alignment for instance - that one type succeeds another; in other cases no such distinction seems justifiable.

The dating of long-cist cemeteries is problematical, and the opinion that many of these sites are not Christian at all is difficult to refute on present evidence; but Henshall's judgement (1958, 269) based on a general review of the Scottish cemeteries - that long stone cists are mainly of the fifth to eighth or ninth centuries, still stands as the most balanced view. These sites have a widespread distribution, in Scotland, Ireland, Wales, the Isle of Man, and South-West England, but the concentration of sites round the Firth of Forth is marked (Thomas, 1968, 120); dug-grave cemeteries are also found in all of these areas.13

Dug-graves are simply rectangular or coffin-shaped cuts into the natural ground, long enough and wide enough
to permit extended burial. Long cists are constructed of stone slabs, laid on the base and along the sides of these cuts, usually with similar stones for lids, like stone coffins. Usually the bases, sides and lids are each constructed of at least two or three slabs, rather than a single stone, but this is largely explicable in terms of the kind of stone locally available; where this is easily found in large slabs, cists constructed of single slabs are known, as at Birsay. Cemeteries vary considerably in size; numbers from 5 to 500+ are recorded, but in practically every case, cemeteries were only partially excavated; in some instances only a rough estimate of the number of burials was made. It would therefore be misleading to try and deduce an 'average size' from the Scottish evidence.

It is reasonable to expect both of these kinds of cemetery in Cumbria, and the dearth of well defined sites is a little surprising. The cemetery noted by Hogg (1961) in Caldergate, Carlisle, is perhaps the strongest candidate. This was revealed in the course of sewer laying in May 1959. The burials were more or less confined to the middle of the street (NY 395, 560) but there were indications that the cemetery stretched to the south. The sewer trench was only 5' (1.52 m.) wide, but 40 skeletons were found, 8' (2.44 m.) below the modern surface. They were immediately overlain by a 2' (.61 m.) layer of humus, which in turn underlay 6' (1.83 m.) of road metalling. Fluviallate gravels underlay the skeletal remains to a
depth of 13' (3.96 m.), the maximum depth of the excavation. All the burials were oriented east-west, with heads to the west. The absence of coffins, cists, or grave-goods was specifically recorded. At the time of their discovery, Hogg dated them to the tenth century, largely because Roman levels - at a point some distance from the cemetery - were found at a depth of 12'-14' (3.66-4.27 m.); and because the street itself is thought to date from the twelfth century; but such a precise date is hardly justifiable on present evidence. The cemetery is almost certainly Christian and pre-Conquest, however; and while little reliance should be placed on the relative level of Roman material elsewhere, one would naturally expect a lapse of at least a couple of centuries - or at least sufficient time for memory of the site to be obliterated, and for the accumulation of the layer of humus. If the information in Florence of Worcester's chronicle can be relied on, and Carlisle was virtually deserted between Halfdan's raid and 1092, a pre-Viking date may be indicated.

Considering the width of the cutting, the burials appear to have been rather crowded, perhaps indicative of a sizeable population. The site is outside the medieval walled city. It may have been outside the limits of the Roman town, although these are not precisely known. There is no known church with which the interments can be obviously connected. No analysis of the skeletal material was made.

Other sites are open to a greater variety of interpretations, but in all cases it is at least possible that
the burials concerned are pre-Conquest and Christian. There is at least one other possible instance of a dug-grave cemetery. The place-name evidence for Eaglesfield has already been discussed: the site under consideration may therefore have been connected with some early ecclesiastical establishment. It has recently been fully reconsidered by Mr. P. A. Wilson (1978). Attention was first drawn to it in 1814, when what was clearly a Viking burial was discovered at a place called Tendley Hill or Endlow, just less than 1 km. north-west of Eaglesfield. This discovery remained obscurely published for over a century. However, references to the place are met with in various county topographies, but these contain little useful information. The earliest is apparently in 1847 (Mannix and Whellan, 1847, 577). Whellan (1860, 297) later reports that 'several human bones, teeth, and instruments of war have been found from time to time, at a place called Endlaw". Later, Dickinson refers to the "limestone bluffs of Hotchberry and Tendlay, where six skeletons and a sword have been found" (Dickinson, 1878, 343). In 1949, Cowen drew attention to a Viking sword in the museum of the Society of Antiquaries of Newcastle-upon-Tyne (the Black Gate), and established that it originally came from Eaglesfield. His publication brought the site to general notice and accounts of the original discoveries made there came to light in notes made by a local antiquary, one Henry Dalton, in 1841 (Cowen, 1967). Dalton had transcribed a report of the
discoveries from the Cumberland Pacquet of the 14th October, 1814, and added observations of his own, to the effect that many more burials had been recently (i.e. c. 1841) discovered at the site. These had a maximum depth of 16" (40.64 cm.), and although it is not specifically stated, it is reasonably clear from the terminology used that they were extended inhumations. The actual number is unknown - 'a great many bones'. Most burials would seem to have been adult - 5'-5' (1.52-1.84 m.) long, but one was only 3' (.914 m.) long. It was observed that the graves were shallower at the head end. They were cut partly through the soil, which was only 8'-10" (20.32-25.40 cm.) deep, and partly through the natural limestone. The orientation was not specifically recorded in Dalton's notes, but Paul Wilson has pointed out that east-west can be inferred from the direction of one grave with reference to the siting of the cemetery.

Cowen dismissed the possibility that the site was a Viking cemetery, on the grounds that the later burials bore no resemblance to that found in 1814. He dismissed the former as apparently 'much later' than the Viking period; he does not appear to have considered the possibility that they might be earlier, but there is nothing in Dalton's account which indicates to the contrary, and it seems on the whole more probable that there is some connection between the Viking grave and the other burials; the most obvious explanation is that in Viking times a pagan grave was inserted into a pre-existing Christian
cemetery. Several instances are known of Viking graves in Christian cemeteries within Britain (Wilson, 1967) and one certain and one doubtful occurrence in Cumbria - at Ormside (Ferguson, 1899) and Rampside (see below) respectively. This, taken with the onomastic evidence for an early ecclesiastical site at Eaglesfield, does strongly suggest that the Tendley Hill is an early Christian cemetery. It is unfortunately now quarried away.

Another site which may have been an Early Christian cemetery was found in 1911, during the laying of a water-pipe in a pasture field at Hyning, near Beatham Green, Heversham (SD 492, 864). The pipe trench cut across the legs of four skeletons; the entire burials were later exposed with some care (McKenny Hughes, 1912a) although no plans or photographs are extant. All four skeletons were extended east-west, with heads to the west and were without grave-goods. They were unevenly spaced, in a row, the distance between the graves varying from 1'6'' (.457 m.) to 4'9'' (1.45 m.). All were at a depth of about 2' (.61 m.). One grave was distinguished from the others by a stone setting of large slabs and stones placed around the head; the bones in this grave were apparently 'small and thin, some of the teeth much worn'. The bones in another grave were 'larger and stronger' than the others. The skulls were apparently crushed, which may indicate some disturbance of the burials after they were interred. The only find on the excavation, apart from the bones, was a small
sherd of reddish pottery with criss-cross markings. This may or may not have been associated with the graves. It was observed by the excavator that it "was probably in the soil, and had nothing to do with the interments".

McKenny Hughes explained these graves as medieval plague burials, but the care taken in laying them out, and more especially the stone setting, makes this unlikely. An Early Christian date is offered for them here, although there is no real dating evidence; the sherd of pottery might have been Roman, but could also have had a much more recent origin. The nearest church is at Heversham, 4 km. to the south.

The cemetery at Roosebeck has been claimed as early Christian (Clack and Gosling, 1976; M.A.S. SD 26 NE 3) but very little is known of the site, and it must be considered doubtful. Seven ?extended inhumations were found, "arranged in two rows, the feet of one row to the heads of the other" (Tweddell and Richardson, 1880, ii, 17). There is no indication of orientation nor is there any supporting evidence in the form of place-names or associated field monuments; indeed the only recorded chance find in the vicinity is a stone axe-head (Tweddell and Richardson, 1880, ii, 17). The context of the discovery - building construction, in 1870 - provides a terminus a quo of no value whatsoever; in fact there is really no evidence to date this site at all.

There are two candidates for long-cist cemeteries, both doubtful. The evidence for these is confined to
references in antiquarian topographies. Their nature was not established at the time of discovery, but in both cases the context suggests an Early Christian date.

Jefferson (1842, 67) gives us the earliest reference to the burials at Moresby, but his notice is brief and Whellan's account is more informative. The latter (1860, 420) reports the discovery of 'several' burials when the fireplace of Moresby Hall (NX 983, 210) was removed, 'some time previously'. The skeletons were found 'embedded in the floor, ... each being enclosed between four stones or slates'. Nothing else was found with them. The bones were reburied in the adjacent cemetery, but the spot is no longer marked. By itself, the information given is hardly enough to justify postulating an Early Christian date. 'Skeletons' implies inhumations, but there is no clue as to their number, position, or orientation. The construction of the cists is somewhat against their being long-cist graves - primarily, the fact that they are made of only four slabs, i.e. single slabs formed the sides of the cists. The sides of long-stone cists usually require more than one slab, although, as noted, the number of slabs used seems to be largely determined by the kind of raw material available. They are usually also roofed. On the other hand, the long sides of short cists frequently only require one stone; and burials of this kind, containing crouched inhumations, may be indicated. Short cists are usually roofed by a capstone or covering slab as well, however, and this type of flat, short-cist cemetery is
otherwise unknown in Cumbria. The absence of grave-goods is inconclusive; but what tilts the balance slightly in favour of an Early Christian date is the siting of Moresby Hall. It is immediately east of the Church of St. Bridget, Moresby, which is just outside the south-east angle of the Roman fort of Moresby. The hall itself is also outside the fort. Moresby Hall was erected tempus James I, but there is documentary evidence for a separate manor of Moresby since the time of William Rufus. The present hall may therefore be on the site of a much earlier manor house. The present church was built in 1822; no church at Moresby appears to feature in medieval documentation (Graham and Collingwood, 1925, 24) but the Early English chancel-arch of an earlier church stands in the present churchyard, within the fort (Collingwood, W. G., 1923, 258) so it is clear that there was at least a medieval church on the site. The proximity of fort, church and cemetery may be fortuitous; and it is at least possible that Moresby Hall was built on the site of a long-abandoned prehistoric cemetery; but the concurrence is a little striking, and there is some other evidence of post-Roman activity in the form of a hand-pin, and a glass spinning whorl, both chance finds, and now in the British Museum (see below, p. 330). The provenance of these is simply 'from Moresby'; they might have come from the fort, the hall, or any place in the vicinity; but they do lend some weight to the case for a post-Roman cemetery.

Coin evidence indicates that the fort was occupied
into the fourth century (Birley, 1949, 70). There is some indication that the Roman cemeteries of the fort were to the north-east, along the road to Papcastle (Birley, 1949, 71-2); but there is no reason why there should not have been such a cemetery to the south-east, and the interments at Moresby Hall are in an obvious place for such a site. A late or post-Roman cemetery perhaps connected with the fort but remaining in use for some centuries after A.D. 400 can tentatively be proposed; the evidence is indeterminate.

The second possible long-cist cemetery is at Rampside. Tweddell and Richardson observed that at Rampside church (SD 238, 674) "there have been found from time to time in the churchyard, great blocks of granite and other stone, which have been used, it is supposed in the construction of the rude vaults which are occasionally found" (1880, ii, 170). They mentioned specifically the discovery of one particular skeleton, beneath one of these slabs, in a wooden coffin with iron hinges. Attention was again drawn to the site in 1909, when a broken sword of Viking type, dating to the second half of the ninth century (Cowen, 1949, 75) was found in the course of grave digging, at a depth of 2'6" (76.20 cm.) (Gaythorpe, 1910, 301). There was no direct evidence of a body associated with it, but it has been generally accepted that it came from a Viking grave (Cowen, 1949, 75). It is now in Barrow museum. Another iron sword or dagger had been found circa. 1854-5, again in the course of grave digging. It is now lost and
too little is known about it to be sure of its date, but it may have been another Viking burial. It was apparently about 1' (30.48 cm.) long, and 1" (2.54 cm.) wide, with a straight guard about 3" long (7.62 cm.), and a 'tongue' or handle - the pommel did not survive (Gaythorpe, 1910, 300). The discovery of the sword aroused interest in the site in general, and Gaythorpe describes some of the stones used in the construction of the 'rude stone vaults'; one, of 'lava' - measured 5' x 4' (1.52 m. x 1.22 m.) and was 1' (30.48 cm.) thick. Others were $2\frac{1}{2}'-3'$ across (76.20-91.44 cm.) and weighed 5-8 cwt. (254-406.4 kg.). These are connected by him with a tradition of the burial of drowned sailors. He also adds that when the old chapel - constructed circa. 1621 - was pulled down, in 1840, bones were found beneath the foundations, and dark outlines like the shapes of two coffins, and some very corroded iron hinges, were observed, beneath the walling.

Little is known of the history of Rampside church, indeed it is not absolutely clear that there was a chapel here at an early date, although there was apparently a monastic grange, attached to Furness Abbey, which might have had an associated chapel: there is some place-name evidence for this (Gaythorpe, 1910, 298). At a later stage it would appear to have been a chapel of ease of Dalton: architectural details of this early church are wanting, but Gaythorpe, quoting from Close's MS. (1910, 299) records that the doorways on the south and north sides had pointed arches. The chapel was not made
parochial before 1650, and it would seem unlikely that it
had rights of burial in medieval times. There is a
medieval grave slab built into the churchyard wall, how­
ever, which might have been found covering a burial
(Gaythorpe, 1910, 300). The burials in the 'rude stone
coffins may therefore be of medieval date, but it is also
possible that here, as at Eaglesfield, a Viking burial was
inserted in an earlier churchyard; long-cists do occas­
ionally occur in medieval contexts, however.

Apart from these cemeteries, there are a few certain
occurrences of isolated long cists in contexts which
suggest that they are early Christian, or at least pre-­
Conquest. Both are comparatively modern discoveries and
are therefore correspondingly better documented.

Perhaps the most significant is that found in the
cemetery of the Roman fort at Beckfoot (NY 088, 488) in
1957 (Bellhouse and Moffat, 1959, 61-2). This appeared
end-on in the cliff face. It was oriented east-west, and
measured about 5' x 2 1/2' (1.52 x .76 m.). Its mode of
construction is not absolutely clear: it is not certain
whether there were stones lining the base for instance;
but it was without a covering slab. The stones were set
in clay. The stratification was apparently clearly
visible. The Roman levels were cut, so that the cist
appeared below them, but it did not appear to cut any of
the levels above. The depth from the modern surface is not
specifically recorded, but was apparently sufficient to
ensure that the feature was not recent. There were no
'certain traces' of a body, and no grave-goods. The cist was vandalised after its discovery, so there are no published plans, drawings or photographs available.

The context of the cist clearly suggests a late or post-Roman date and a Christian burial seems very likely although it may be that it was simply a pagan grave without grave-goods. The dimensions given indicate a cist wider and perhaps a little shorter than usual but they do not present insuperable difficulties; a double grave may have been involved. No other burials of this type are known from the Beckfoot cemetery.

Another long cist was found during the installation of heating pipes in Kirkby Stephen church, circa. 1950 (Bouch, 1956) and is now consolidated in the north aisle. It was 9' (2.74 m.) from the south wall of the south transept, at a depth of about 3' (0.91 m.). The cist is 6½' (1.98 m.) long and 1½' (0.46 m.) deep. It tapers considerably, being 9" (22.86 cm.) wide at the narrowest end and 1' 10" (55.88 cm.) wide at the widest part. It was constructed of long, narrow stones, three along each side, one at the foot, and one at the head. These were placed upright in the ground and covered with large, flat slabs. The illustration (Bouch, 1951a, facing p.208; pl.6.1) shows a feature briefly touched on by Bouch, which is of some interest. It is clear that there was a definite stepped arrangement of stones at the shoulder, so that the head was closely surrounded by short slabs: thus the 'shoulder' of the cist is the widest part, the head end
is as narrow as the foot. No mention is made of any slabs on the base of the cist, nor are any apparent in Bouch's illustration, so presumably there were none. The workmen who discovered the slabs thought that they had been bonded together with cement. This seems very unlikely, but it is possible that some kind of clay bonding was used. The orientation is not specifically noted in the account of the discovery, but east-west can be fairly safely inferred. The skeleton in the cist was apparently male, at least 6' (1.83 m.) tall, with very broad hips. No trace of anything other than bones were found. Other bones were noted in the vicinity, but none of these were associated with stone-lined graves.

The type of grave is, as we have seen, characteristic of pre-Conquest rather than post-Conquest burial rites; but the arrangement of slabs round the head of the body recalls later, medieval coffins rather than the usual form of cist. Many medieval coffins, hollowed out of single stones, are 'head-shaped' at the west end, although the type is not common in Cumbria.15 Perhaps the closest parallel for the Kirkby Stephen cist is at Whithorn Priory, where two long cist graves, dated by reliquaries found with the body to circa. 1200 A.D., had single 'head shaped' stones at the west end.16 However, the depth of the grave may argue for an earlier date: Bouch observes that the present floor level is thought to be more or less the same as that of the Norman church; medieval graves are usually fairly shallow, and a burial 3' (.914 m.) below the Norman
surface might be considerably earlier. There is no reason
to doubt that there was an earlier church, and presumably
also a burial ground, as there is a large collection of
pre-Conquest sculpture from Kirkby Stephen, including two
fragments of Anglo-Saxon work (see below, p. 308). Bouch
thought the cist pre-Conquest; but its date must remain
doubtful.

Even if all the sites discussed above are Early
Christian cemeteries, there is no escape from the con­
clusion that such cemeteries are rare in Cumbria. The
distribution of sites (Map X) may be considered to have
little significance, as so few sites are represented,
although obviously all sites are to be found in areas
suitable for settlement. The shortage might be explained
in various ways: it may be that there were originally
very few cemeteries serving a small and highly localized
Christian population. Alternatively, it can be proposed
that there were many Early Christian burial sites, but
that these have remained undetected. The most obvious
explanation for this is that the abandonment of early
cemeteries was the exception rather than the rule, and
that in most cases, pre-existing sites continued in use
during the period of Northumbrian rule in Cumbria and
into the middle ages. As is evident, there is no way of
subdividing the cemeteries into Northumbrian and pre-
Northumbrian categories on the dating evidence alone;
and it is proposed that if the latter were ever very
numerous, then the continuity between one period and another was very considerable. As we have seen, at Addingham, the early Christian grave-slab comes from the same churchyard as Anglian and Viking cross fragments, and we know that sites with sculpture continued in use as parish churches into medieval and modern times. A similar measure of continuity may have been the norm for early churchyards without sculpture. At Moresby, for instance, the cemetery may simply have shifted slightly, rather than been actually abandoned.

This situation may be contrasted with that in southern Scotland, where abandoned sites are common. It is possible that there are at least as many early cemeteries in other areas, and that explanations for the abandonment of sites in this area must be sought, rather than reasons for the superficial shortage of early cemeteries elsewhere. The two sites at Parkburn and Lasswade are a case in point. The former is a long-cist cemetery; the latter, a church with Anglo-Saxon and Viking sculpture. The two sites are less than a mile apart, and Henshall has suggested (1958, 271) that a move to Lasswade took place in the eighth or ninth centuries, when the cemetery at Parkburn was abandoned.

It is true that most early cemeteries are shallow, and among the excavated sites, although examples with several hundred graves are known, there is little evidence that burials were periodically disturbed by the superimposition of others above them. This suggests that once the capacity of a cemetery was reached, a new site was chosen,
rather than that the same area was re-used; and it is significant that many of the largest sites appear to be unenclosed. The reason for this may be simply practical, however; burials in cists are inconvenient to disturb, and these constitute the majority of excavated sites. One would expect cist cemeteries to have a more limited lifespan than those with dug graves; there is no strong reason why the latter should not remain in use, unless custom or circumstance dictated otherwise; and there is at least one dug-grave cemetery - Cannington, Somerset (Rahtz, 1977, 56-9) where the burials appear to span several centuries. The reasons for the large-scale abandonment of cemeteries elsewhere are not strictly relevant to Cumbria however; it seems best now to examine the positive side of the problem and see what evidence there is for the antiquity of some of Cumbria's present churchyards.

IV. Curvilinear Churchyards

The morphology of churchyards is now seen to be of increasing relevance in the search for more Early Christian sites. The shortage of abandoned and disused cemeteries in Cumbria has already been observed (above, pp. 239-40); it remains a possibility that early cemeteries could be distinguished, even if still in use, by some
definitive characteristic. There is no longer much doubt about the fact that most of the earliest Christian cemeteries, if they were physically enclosed at all, be they dug or cist, were normally surrounded by a circular, or at any rate curvilinear boundary (Thomas, 1971, 50; Laing, 1975a, 377-80). Most of the published work on these cemeteries concerns abandoned sites in Scotland and Ireland, but it seems reasonable to expect that the same pattern might hold true for cemeteries in other areas, and that Early Christian burial grounds elsewhere in Britain may also have been surrounded by a circular or oval enclosure. One might, optimistically, expect to find traces of these early enclosures around cemeteries which remained in use as parish churchyards into modern times.

Unfortunately, one is hardly entitled to claim that all such are necessarily early sites; there was presumably nothing to prevent a medieval or later church from having a curvilinear churchyard too. There is reason to believe, however, that rectilinear churchyards were uncommon and unpopular, at least in the highland parts of Britain, until the Conquest, but that they came into greater vogue with the middle ages. They are of course the general rule in modern times.

One might reasonably wonder how valid is the study of modern churchyards, when it is supposed that the early forms were dying out from the Conquest onwards. Traditionalism is strong with regard to burials, however, and it is notable how comparatively infrequently old boundaries
are actually destroyed. The same small area may be re-used again and again over generations until the level of the ground inside the churchyard is considerably higher than that without, before new ground is taken over and used for burial. It is only in comparatively recent times, and with specific regulations as to the depth of graves and number of burials which must be observed, that extensions to cemeteries at regular intervals have become the norm.

As will be shown (below, 281-7) it is clear from the very nature of the Anglo-Saxon sculpture - much of which is commemorative, and would properly belong in a churchyard - that many of the Cumbrian parish churchyards must contain burials which date from at least the eighth century, and it seems most unlikely that the number of sites with early sculpture, plus those cemeteries discussed above (pp.223-41 ) comprises the total of early burial grounds. The problem remains of identifying which churches without sculpture are of a comparable antiquity. These sites might well only be detectable along the lines suggested above; and while it cannot be claimed that a curvilinear churchyard boundary is a sure indication of an early cemetery, it can at least be taken as a hint that the churchyard is of some antiquity. The hypothesis can best be tested by a closer inspection of those churchyards which fall within the category, to see if there is any significant correlation between circular or oval cemeteries and other evidence of a more concrete nature.
The earliest comprehensive mapping of the county at a scale adequate for the purpose is the 1st edition of the Ordnance Survey 6" map, of 1865-6. All the churchyards of both parish churches and parochial chapels have been examined on these; the results are set out in Appendices 8a-8c, and drawn in Figs. 6.4-6.44, at an enlarged scale. These are taken directly from the 6" maps, but features which are irrelevant are omitted, and contour lines are not shown. All sites have been followed up on more recent maps and, where possible, checked in the field; but as is clear from the tables, a large percentage have lost their curvilinear boundaries since the mid-nineteenth century.

The sites selected are mapped on Map XI. The distribution is without obvious significance, apart from a general reflection of the fact that mountainous parishes are usually larger and there are therefore fewer chapels and churches there; but the absence of sites in the south-west part of the county is notable, although no valid explanation springs to mind.

While criteria of 'circularity' are bound to be somewhat subjective, it is probable that at least those thirteen sites where the early boundary is more or less complete are hardly open to challenge. Churchyards where the boundary is still evident, but has been partly removed by extension or other alteration, are slightly more numerous: there are nineteen good examples. These cemeteries are less useful than those in the previous category for the
purpose of analysis, however, as it is not always clear what the original dimensions of the churchyard would have been, and it is therefore impossible to assess the area of the original cemetery correctly. For this reason, no attempt has been made arbitrarily to interpret the original shapes, and the area quoted is that of the cemetery shown on the map. The third category, of sites which may possibly incorporate part of a curvilinear boundary, could admittedly have probably been extended indefinitely; few churchyards are entirely confined within straight walls, and it would be stretching the point much too far if all but these were included. The seven sites which have been selected have at least some definite indication of an originally curvilinear enclosure: but in some cases it was impossible to decide whether this was dictated by purely topographic reasons - as at Crosby Garrett (Fig. 6.13) or by some other arbitrary factor, such as a road intersection - Kirklington (Fig. 6.13) or its position with respect to adjacent settlement (Kirkcanbeck: Fig. 6.13). In other cases, at Melmerby (Fig. 6.14) and Waberthwaite (Fig. 6.14) the churchyard itself is not markedly curvilinear, but the pattern of adjacent field boundaries suggests that it once was. At Waberthwaite (Fig. 6.14) the shape of the area which includes the churchyard and vicarage garden hints at an original oval enclosure surrounding the church, but the actual area in use for burials comprises only half of this. Although two sites with Anglo-Saxon sculpture have thus made their way into the 'doubtful' list, every effort
has been made to avoid any selection a priori in favour of sites for which there is already early evidence.

The maps do not indicate what the churchyard boundaries were actually made of - i.e. whether they are fences, stone walls, banks and/or ditches, or banks surrounded by walls or fences. Where alteration has taken place, this is not possible to ascertain. The presence of large trees in a boundary does indicate considerable maturity, however, and therefore, where these are indicated on the original maps, they have been transferred. As one might naturally expect there are fewer signs of ancient cemeteries in the larger towns and villages, where pressure of population must have decreed extensions to the original enclosure at an earlier stage, while the tastes of the townsfolk would incline more to neat railings and walls than scraggy banks and ditches covered with vegetation. A ditch and rampart on the eastern side of the churchyard of Dalton-in-Furness are noted by West (1774, 343), which suggested to him the rampart of a Roman fort, but there is no evidence of this or of any circular enclosure around Dalton churchyard on the early maps. 19

Some sites are so situated as to make a bank superfluous. Ormside churchyard, for instance (Fig. 6.6) is on a small hillock with fairly steeply sloping sides, which appear to have been artifically scarped; and this may also be the case at Crosby Garrett.

Although, as noted above, it may be sometimes true that the layout of the paths, streets and houses which
surround a churchyard may have itself determined the shape of the latter in some instances, sometimes a street or village plan reinforces the impression that the boundary in question is of some antiquity. The marked and unnecessary bend in the road to the west side of Loweswater churchyard, for instance (Fig. 6.6) is notable; the bend has been straightened out on the east side. The same is true of the road running south of Skelton churchyard. In other cases the road has disturbed or destroyed the original boundary, but the form of the churchyard is apparent in that part which abutts onto it, as at Crosby-on-Eden (Fig. 6.9), Harrington (Fig. 6.10) and Lorton (Fig. 6.11). One or two sites have managed to preserve their original shape, irrespective of the roads which surround them, and appear like small circular islands, such as Kentmere (Fig. 6.5) and Pennington (Fig. 6.6). Others have remained undisturbed because they are outside any particular route, being connected to a main road by a short separate road or trackway, such as Beckermet St. Bridget (Fig. 6.4) and Distington (Fig. 6.5).

The area of the enclosure is probably only really meaningful in the case of those cemeteries which are virtually or entirely complete; but certain things are immediately apparent, even from this small group. First, although, overall, there is a considerable range in size—from 0.716 ha. at Barton (Fig. 6.4) to 0.103 at Kentmere, most of the sites fall within the range 0.150-0.350 ha. Those sites which are only partially curvilinear fall more
or less within the same range, although they average out at slightly larger, which is perhaps no more than to be expected. It is interesting, however, that the three really suspicious sites in this latter category - Winster (Fig. 6.12) which first appears in the eighteenth century and was probably not built before then; Troutbeck (Fig. 6.11) where there is evidence - though not conclusive evidence, that the church was first built in the mid-sixteenth century (Graham and Collingwood, 1925, 27); and Ambleside (Fig. 6.8) which does not appear to have had the right of burial before the latter part of the seventeenth century - all fall at the short extreme with areas of 0.046 ha, 0.110 ha. and 0.134 ha. respectively. Barton is exceptionally large: only one other site in Appendix 8a is even half as big - Skelton (Fig. 6.6) - and only Watermillock Old Church (Fig. 6.12), of the incomplete examples, has anything like a comparable area (0.508 ha.) although Appleby 'Bongate (Fig. 6.7), Dent (Fig. 6.9) and Harrington (Fig. 6.10), are slightly larger than Skelton.

This range, from 0.150-0.350 ha., must represent some kind of norm for these churchyards in the north-west. It is clear that they do not approach in area the much larger curvilinear - or occasionally rectilinear - enclosures surrounding the Early Irish monastic sites(20), although they may be compared with the enclosure on Church Island, Valencia, for instance (O'Kelly, 1958) and with other small enclosed cemeteries. There is no evidence at any site for a large enclosure surrounding the smaller one,
at least on the ground. Whether or not these would prove detectable from the air cannot be known until the necessary flying has been done.

The distinction is not perhaps of such importance as might at first appear. The two types of site are not in any case mutually exclusive, and it is clear that lay people were sometimes buried in monastic cemeteries, although it is not certain that this was the general rule. Our cemeteries may not equate with the large enclosures associated with monasteries in Ireland, but it is possible that in other parts the 'normal size' for a monastic enclosure was much smaller. At least one Cumbrian Anglo-Saxon monastery can now be shown to have had a circular enclosure round the church - Dacre (Fig. 6.9) - although this only survived on the southern side; and Heversham was certainly also a monastery, although doubts can be entertained about the significance of the curving cemetery (Fig. 6.13).

The average area may be taken as a reflection of the size, if not the nature of the population that the cemeteries served; but it is really impossible to assess this numerically. If the community buried in the cemetery were not exclusively monastic - and as we have just seen, there are no sure grounds for assuming that it was, though this may sometimes have been the case - the only alternative is that those buried were mostly ordinary lay-folk; but as we really have no idea how densely burials were concentrated, or how long an area was left undisturbed after burial before new graves were inserted, or even, since the distribution is
certainly not complete, what kind of area was served by any one cemetery - there is no constant factor against which others can be compared. Even analogy is of little use, since a negligible percentage of Early Christian cemeteries elsewhere have been excavated in their entirety, and it is in any case virtually impossible to establish, without independent dating evidence from individual graves, exactly how long an abandoned cemetery remained in use. It may be observed, that since many of the cemeteries were in use throughout the medieval period, and must have proved adequate for their purpose then, that the pre-Conquest population served by a cemetery was probably directly comparable. This can only be true of the smaller villages, however. Indeed, the reason why early cemetery shapes were lost in places where there was definitely pre-Conquest sculpture and presumably also pre-Conquest burials, such as Kendal, Carlisle, Penrith, and Workington - was surely because the medieval population was larger and needed a larger cemetery - although it is also possible that many of these sites with sculpture were in fact originally monastic only.

Sometimes, in spite of an expanding population, the village cemetery can grow no larger, simply because houses and streets are in the way. In this case the main cemetery attached to the church may fall into disuse, and a new area is chosen for burials on the fringes of the settlement. In such circumstances the size of the old cemetery would distort the size of population represented.
All the churchyards in the Appendices 8a-c are now or have been burial grounds, but as has been observed, there are at least three cases in which it is very doubtful that this privilege extended back into even medieval times. By no means all of these cemeteries are attached to parish churches, however, for several are associated with parochial chapelries. Generally it can be seen that, apart from the doubtful cases, these are chapels of parishes which appear to have been of some importance and antiquity: Crosthwaite was a chapel of Heversham, an Anglian monastery; Kentmere and Loweswater are chapelries of Kendal and St. Bees respectively, both important parishes and centres in their respective districts in the middle ages, and both the possessors of pre-Conquest sculptures. Embleton and Lorton were both chapelries of Brigham, which has a large collection of pre-Conquest sculptures, and was formerly an enormous parish, comprised several chapelries and extended over most of the Derwent Valley and the fells and foothills of North-West Cumbria. It might properly have been considered a sort of mother church for this area. Watermillock and Matterdale were chapelries of Greystoke, another important and extensive parish. It is also notable that two sites - Ireby Old Church and Watermillock - are now abandoned, the latter since the fourteenth century.

It remains now to assess the supportive evidence for an early date for these cemeteries. In most cases there is no positive indication of a pre-Conquest date and in many instances there is no certain proof of even a pre-
Reformation date. Eight of the complete sites and sixteen of the incomplete sites find no mention, so far as is known, in medieval documents. Of the former, there is no other early evidence from Loweswater; Distington likewise has no pre-Reformation fabric, but has fortunately pre-Conquest sculpture. Of the latter, there is no pre-Reformation fabric at Grinsdale or Langwathby. But even medieval evidence is in any case inadequate for the purpose; pre-Conquest material is sufficiently rare in Cumbria for any sizeable correlation to be of some consequence.

Of the total of 39 sites involved, 3 have remains of pre-Conquest, or at any rate Late Saxon architecture - Ormside, Appleby Bongate and Crosby Garrett. None of this is necessarily pre-eleventh century, but there is other evidence - a Viking burial and the Ormside bowl at Ormside, and a hogback at Appleby Bongate, which indicates that one is here dealing with pre-Conquest churches. Pre-Conquest sculpture is known at Beckermet St. Bridget, Distington, Dacre, Harrington, Heversham, and Waberthwaite. There is nothing else in the way of early evidence, unless one includes the fact that Cliburn, Embleton and Lorton are included on Wessington's list of churches erected in honour of St. Cuthbert, at places along the route taken by the monks who carried his relics when the community left Lindisfarne in A.D. 875 (Raine, 1828, 44). This list was compiled at some stage in the first half of the fifteenth century; its validity is doubtful, but there is no doubt that the community did keep early records, and it is conceivable that some such might incorporate genuine information,
which was passed on to Wessington. If one includes these sites, then about 30% of the curvilinear churchyards have some claims to a pre-Conquest origin, quite apart from the morphology of the churchyard itself. This reinforces the impression that these sites may be considered a pre-Conquest type, although the concurrence of cemetery and other evidence is hardly large enough to prove the point irrefutably. Moreover, this type of cemetery may have been in some cases exclusively secular, but was certainly in some instances monastic, although not comparable in area with some monastic enclosures elsewhere. Unfortunately the fact that the sites are still generally in use as burial grounds makes them unpromising material for excavation and research in the immediate future. But the recognition of the type as relatively widespread in the north-west does suggest that the survival of early cemeteries into modern times may be commoner than has sometimes been supposed.

V. Holy Wells

Holy wells constitute a very dubious class of evidence in the present context. Water plays a considerable part in Christian symbolism: Christian Baptism, involving either total or partial immersion in water, naturally associates it with the cleansing and purifying of the soul; but the cult of holy wells is not essentially Christian practice. The
ritual veneration of sources of water - wells, springs, and rivers - is certainly of great antiquity, in Britain and elsewhere. The Wilsford shaft - which might or might not have been a well - is perhaps the earliest dateable example. This contained some Late Bronze Age pottery (Ashbee, 1963).

Several pits, shafts and wells have been found to contain ritual deposits of Iron Age or Romano-British material (Ross, 1967, 50-9); and, apart from the archaeological evidence, the veneration of wells, springs and rivers by the Celtic-speaking peoples is clearly attested in the surviving mythology of Ireland, and in contemporary classical accounts of Celtic practice (Ross, 1967). Superstructures were occasionally built for sacred springs at an early stage, for example, Coventina's well at Carrowbrugh.

That this reverence for certain sources of water was later incorporated into Christian tradition in Ireland and Britain is scarcely to be denied. The advice of Pope Gregory to Mellitus (Bede, H.E., 1: 30) is well known:

"The idol temples of that race (i.e. the English) should by no means be destroyed, but only the idols in them. Take holy water and sprinkle it in these shrines, build altars and place relics in them. For if the shrines are well built it is essential that they should be changed from the worship of devils to the service of the true God. When this people see that their shrines are not destroyed they will be able to banish error from their hearts and be more ready to come to the places they are familiar with, but now recognising the true God."

(Colgrave and Mynors, 1969, 107)

These counsels were presumably intended to indicate general practice: an example of their practical application
in Pictland occurs in the *Vita Columbae* (II;11); Adamnan relates how Columba blessed a pagan ritual well and drank from it; thereafter the well had curative properties, whereas previously those who had used the well "came away leprous or partly blind, or else infirm or affected by some other disease" (Anderson, 1922, 1, 57).

On the other hand, the fact that this veneration was not always considered respectable or desirable is clearly indicated by one of the laws of Cnut, which specifically prohibits the worship of idols, "namely, if one worships heathen gods and the sun or the moon, fire of flood, wells or stones, or any kind of forest tree" (Whitelock, 1955, 420).

Holy or magic wells are often associated with early saints in the Welsh and Irish *vitae*, or are found at churches which bear their dedications, although there is rarely evidence of the antiquity of the association. For instance, in the Life of St. Brynach, a twelfth century composition (Wade-Evans, 1944, XI) we are told that the saint, after he had been wounded by his enemies:

"went to a well, which was near, and going into the water, washed away the blood. Wherefore unto this day that well is called *Fons Rubens*, red well, where also, in honour of the saint, the merciful God bestows many benefits of health on the infirm"  
(Wade-Evans, 1944, 7)

In the life of St. Cadoc, a work, at least in part, of the eleventh century (Emanuel, 1952, 217), the saint's activities involve him on more than one occasion with sacred or otherwise extraordinary wells and waters. His
baptismal water became a spring of mead (Ch. 1, 6; Wade-Evans, 1944, 30-3, 34-7); and during a journey through Cornwall, he miraculously made a spring appear by striking the ground with his staff. This spring subsequently had healing properties; and

"after the Cornishmen had perceived that by divine pity frequent recoveries of health of both sexes were incessantly being effected at the same well, they built a little church of stone by the fountain, in honour of St. Cadoc."

(Ch. 31; Wade-Evans, 1944, 95)

These lives are not, unlike Adamnan's Vitae Columbae, early records, although it is possible that at least some early traditions are incorporated in them. The most that can be said, however, is that, at the time they were written, it was thought appropriate that wells miraculously invented or used by saints should be attributed curative or supernatural properties. Of greater antiquity than these lives, and therefore more important evidence for Wales, is the site, at Penmon, Anglesea, of the sixth century St. Seriol's well, hut and chapel. The visible remains are not necessarily as old as the traditional date of the saint, but there is no reason to seriously doubt that the cell, at least, is a pre-Conquest type (Craster, 1953, 31-2) and at Ffynnon Gybi, Caermarthenshire, there is a similar cell and chapel arrangement (Jones, F., 1954, 27).

The cult of wells continued, both within and perhaps also without the Christian tradition, into the middle ages, and, at least in some areas, into modern times. Well chapels of medieval construction are known from many parts of
Britain, e.g. Capel Erba and Capel Begwdin, Carmarthenshire (Jones, G. R., 1971); Gosforth, Cumbria (Collingwood, W.G., 1902) and St. Anne-in-the-Wood, Brislington, Somerset (Hope, 1893, 149). They are particularly common in Wales and Cornwall (Hope, 1893, 9-38). Occasionally legends connected with some wells concern medieval or even later personages, e.g. St. Dominic's well, Chapel Farm, Cornwall; St. Thomas a Beckett's well, Derby (Hope, 1893, 37, 56, 57). This cult of wells was by no means confined to the so-called 'Celtic' parts of Britain; Hope records several examples with medieval traditions from the south and east. At the Reformation, the formal veneration of wells within official Christianity fell into disrepute, being regarded as a 'superstitious' practice - at least in most parts of Britain. This has, naturally enough, resulted in the loss of much of the folklore associated with the cult; and wells which had once been considered sacred, or at least special, were used for ordinary domestic purposes. The Reformation penetrated little into Irish rural life, however, and the veneration of wells continues, to the present, within the framework of ordinary religious practices. It is also certain that in many of the more remote parts of rural Britain, the power or efficacy of certain wells and springs continued to be respected without the approval of the local clergy, until at least the end of the nineteenth century (Ross, 1968, 257). Sometimes wells continued to be focal for secular feasts and fairs, or for general merrymaking, on particular days of the year.
It would certainly be ill-advised to claim that all the holy wells known today are survivals from pre-Conquest, let alone pre-Christian, times. If the practice has a very long lifetime, one would expect some sites to fall into disuse and be replaced by others in the natural course of events. There are difficulties, also, in trying to define what exactly constitutes a holy well, and what does not. O'Danachair (1955, 195) has defined a holy well as "a well or spring where prayers and ceremonies of a Christian religious nature have been performed in recent times". This definition is really too restricted for the purpose in Britain. The Reformation, and the ensuing loss of folklore and custom attached to wells means that there are very few records of 'Christian' ceremonies at wells here in recent times, and medieval records of this type of custom are by no means abundant. It is only really possible to define holy wells in a very general way, and include, as Jones has done (Jones, F., 1954) all wells which bore saints names, or were regarded as having magical or curative properties, or which attracted other rituals - not necessarily Christian; often apparently meaningless or social rituals. This loose dictum will probably lead to the inclusion of a few bogus members, but in view of the fact that all knowledge of many genuine holy wells must be irretrievably lost, these are unlikely to substantially affect statistics, or alter the general impression. The use of a broad definition like this poses problems of its own. Spa wells, and the drinking of mineral waters, were
very much in vogue in Britain from the late seventeenth century onwards, and curative properties were undoubtedly attributed to these without any 'superstitious' connotations. It is often difficult to distinguish from the recorded evidence for ritual or cures at some sites, exactly whether or not a genuine holy well is involved. In some cases, it is even possible that the pre-Reformation holy well was later known as a spa or mineral well, the properties of the former attaching themselves to the latter quite respectably. The picture is further confused by fond antiquarians who adorned and entitled spa wells and perfectly ordinary wells with picturesque superstructures and romantic names.

It is clear from this brief résumé that no direct connection between known holy wells and Early Christian sites can automatically be assumed. Many such wells may reflect the 'superstitious' or other practices of an earlier or a later - perhaps much later - age. Nonetheless, it is at least likely that in Cumbria, as elsewhere, pagan sites were indeed put to Christian use by the earliest saints, and that this may have influenced the siting of the local church, when it was built. Unfortunately, there is really no reason why the erection of a church in the vicinity should not have happened at any later stage. The only *terminus ante quem* is the Reformation. Wells used for domestic purposes are frequently found near churches, and sometimes these have names like 'church well' or 'priest's well', while wells which bear saints' names are often simply reflecting the dedication of the nearby church, and are in
ordinary use. It is really impossible to be certain, without folklore evidence, if either of these types are genuine holy wells.

Bearing these things in mind, it is time now to consider the evidence for well cults in Cumbria, and to see how it relates to the more acceptable types of Early Christian evidence, without making any initial assumption that any such connection actually exists. The basic data is tabulated in Appendix 9a, which contains those wells, 142 in all, which are considered to be certainly or probably genuine holy wells. In Appendix 9b are listed wells which have been described as holy wells, but which are, for various reasons, to be rejected. The more doubtful wells in the former are marked X.

The associations considered are, primarily, with known ecclesiastical structures, either churches or chapels; and where these have curvilinear churchyards, this is noted. The associations with sculpture include all pre-Conquest monuments, since it seems a reasonable hypothesis that at least some sites where only Viking sculpture is known probably date, nonetheless, from Anglo-Saxon times (see below, p. 318), but sites with specifically pre-Viking sculpture are marked with the symbol I. Associations with some other types of site are also noted, but proximity to or distance from modern settlement - other than churches and chapels - is not considered, as this is hardly relevant to the purpose of the exercise. Where any ritual or customs are known in connection with specific wells, this is also
noted, under the broad headings of gatherings, cures, baptisms and other, but there is not much of this kind of evidence; what is known will be considered in greater detail below.

Much of the information tabulated is from sources which must be considered frankly dubious. The only excuse for this is that these are often the only sources available. The study of holy wells unfortunately attracts the attention of some writers who are at best, given to high flights of romanticism, and at worst belong to the lunatic fringe. A great deal of the evidence is probably inaccurately recorded or not specific enough to be of much use.

Only four references to holy wells in Cumbria have been traced in medieval records.21 The earliest references to most sites are contained in the late eighteenth century county histories and topographies of Hutchinson (1794) and Nicolson and Burn (1777). By this time, spa wells were popular, and selectivity must be exercised. Hope (1893) notes several Cumbrian holy wells, and McIntire published (1944) a list, intended to be complete, of holy wells in Cumberland. This list was not very selective, and was later revised by Fair (1952) for West Cumberland. In addition, many holy wells are mapped by the Ordnance Survey. These are the principal sources of information about holy wells in Cumbria, although many wells are also mentioned casually in other contexts. While there is no reason to doubt the basic reliability of the Ordnance Survey grid references, wells which have not been recorded
in this way are in some instances impossible to locate with any precision on maps or in the field.

Holy wells are found generally throughout Cumbria in all areas which might be considered attractive for settlement (Map XII). Major gaps in the distribution, in the Lake District and Pennine areas, are scarcely surprising; and minor concentrations and gaps - for instance, the cluster round Penrith - are scarcely more than would be expected in a map of this kind. The general uniformity of the distribution, apart from this, is perhaps best seen as indicative of the long survival of the cult into recent times. There is no obvious 'British' connection - with for instance the distribution of British place-names; the only thing that the map clearly demonstrates is that the well-cult was widespread and popular.

Most holy wells are in the general vicinity of settlements, in fields and on river-banks, etc. though it is of course impossible to know how this reflects their general accessibility in former times. Many holy wells are now in ordinary use, although their curative or other special attributes are not forgotten. This may not have been so, however, when the well cult was practised. Evidence from other areas suggests that holy wells were often set aside, and would not normally have been important sources of water for the locality (O'Dannachair, 1958). The majority of Cumbrian holy wells (i.e. about 65%) are not in the vicinity of churches or chapels; but undoubtedly ecclesiastical structures form the most constant association on
the tables. Apart from the two wells associated with medieval monasteries, 27 wells are certainly and three possibly, associated with parish churches - i.e. about 20% of the total. A further 14 are certainly and 6 possibly associated with chapels - i.e. about 10%-15%. Sometimes these wells are within the churchyard itself - e.g. Ninewells, Brampton; St. Andrews well, Kirkandrews. The Holy Well, Irthington, rose on the churchyard boundary; but in most instances the holy well is found outside the actual churchyard, though within a short distance of it, e.g. St. Helen's well, Asby; the Priest's well, Bewcastle; St. Cuthbert's well, Edenhall. Two wells are directly associated with church buildings: there was a well inside Carlisle Cathedral, and the water of St. Oswald's well, Kirkoswald, emerges at the west end of St. Oswald's church, rising, apparently, at the east end, and flowing beneath the building (Whellan, 1860, 571). Carlisle Cathedral was first built in the twelfth century and St. Oswald's church was, originally, an early Norman church. If one assumes that the siting of the church building directly over the spring was deliberate - and this seems inescapable, particularly in the case of the latter site - then it can be proposed that the holy well must have had some attraction for the church builders, at least at the time of the original construction; but although, at Carlisle, the discovery of pre-Conquest sculpture in the immediate vicinity of the cathedral clearly indicates a pre-Conquest church there, there is no way of knowing if this, too, covered the spring; and a town like Carlisle would in any case have had several wells.
Most wells associated with chapels are within fairly short distances of them; the Chapel well in Gosforth parish, however, rose within the ruins of the chapel. This is a clear example of the type of well chapel discussed above; Smardale well and chapel may be another example of the same.

There is usually evidence that these churches and chapels are pre-Reformation foundations, in the form of references to them in medieval documents and charters, etc. (Graham and Collingwood, 1925) or the standing evidence of pre-Reformation architecture (Cox, 1913; R.C.H.M., 1936; Pevsner, 1967). It is true that some of the chapels are known only as sites, but there is little reason to doubt that these, too, were built in medieval times; only one or two sites pose problems in this respect - there is no evidence of any pre-Reformation foundation at Burnside, for instance, where there is a St. Oswald's well; but it is possible that there was an unimportant and therefore unrecorded chapel here.

Although all this can be taken as an indirect pointer to at least a medieval date for these wells - which is hardly more than one would have expected - it is difficult to find evidence for anything earlier, except in certain specific cases. There is no significant correlation between holy wells and circular churchyards, for instance: Beckermet St. Bridget, Dacre and Heversham, are the only examples of concurrence, and the holy wells at the first two sites are dubious, while the curvilinear nature of Heversham is in
doubt. The sites of the wells at Dacre and Beckermert St. Bridget are lost, and the existence of the latter has been doubted (Fair, 1952). The Addingham cross-slab comes, as has been shown, from the vicinity of a holy well, but as it is the only Early Christian monument of this type in Cumbria, it would be foolish to draw any connection between these and holy wells in general.

Associations with pre-Conquest sculpture are slightly more promising, but hardly conclusive. Pre-Conquest sculpture is present at 10 of 30 church sites which have, or may have, holy wells. This, superficially, looks too striking a concurrence to be just coincidental - bearing in mind the fact that only 38 out of the 150 or so parish churches in Cumbria actually have pre-Conquest sculpture. However, a closer look shows that in 4 cases the 'holyness' of the wells is in doubt (Beckermert St. Bridget, Bewcastle, Carlisle and Dacre). If these sites are discounted the correlation is much less impressive. Three of the 10 sites have Viking sculpture only; 5 more have both Viking and Anglian; and Anglo-Saxon sculpture only is present at 2 sites. Since Viking sculpture is considerably more abundant than Anglian in Cumbria, this ratio is a little surprising; but as the numbers involved are small, its significance should not be stressed.

The folklore and customs associated with holy wells in Cumbria are neither abundant nor reliably recorded. It is possible, that, in some cases, the folklore of one well has been transferred to another, or generalizations made
without supporting evidence: but it is fair to say that on the whole the 'legendary lore' of the holy wells of Cumbria accords well with what is generally known about well practice throughout Britain and Ireland.

Many wells were resorted to for cures, often for specific complaints, e.g. the water of Clifton well was considered good for sore eyes (Hodgson, J., 1820, 115-16); cures were sometimes sought by means other than the drinking of the well water - Taylor (1903, 26) describes a well near Cartmel into which pins were dropped by people seeking a cure. Other wells were thought to be effective purgatives, or just generally 'good' for health. Festive gatherings, most often in the month of May, are recorded at some wells, especially in the Penrith area, and sometimes sugar was mixed with the well-water on these occasions. An annual fair was held at St. Catherine's well, Eskdale, on St. Catherine's day. Most of the customs associated with cures and gatherings concern wells which are not near churches or chapels and on the whole these customs belong to secular folklore; The use of well water for baptisms is recorded in a few cases, for wells near churches, but this seems to be the only specifically Christian ritual; and there is no evidence of more ancient ritual either. No cursing wells are known for instance, but one well - Margaret Hardie's well, Melmerby - was reputedly associated with a witch.

Just over 50% (i.e. 76) of Cumbrian holy wells are dedicated to saints, or otherwise incorporate saints' names. (e.g. Annetwell, Carlisle, Powdonnet well, Morland) In
many cases these dedications reflect the dedications of neighbouring churches, but there are also many wells remote from these which are apparently called after specific saints. Some of these may be simply recording the names of secular owners, e.g. Mikel well, Gleaston (? called after Michael le Fleming, an early Norman landholder in Furness) or Patrickeld, at Calder Abbey - ? called after a local family called Patrickson (Fair, 1952; McIntire, 1944, 6). The popularity of certain saints is surprising: St. Helen, for instance, has no less than 9 wells named after her: some of these wells are at or near the sites of ruined chapels but there is not a single standing church in Cumbria with a dedication to St. Helen. There appears to be a connection between well cults and St. Helen elsewhere, however, as many wells throughout Britain and Ireland are dedicated to her. Other popular saints are the Blessed Virgin (dedications occur as either St. Mary or Lady Well); St. Michael; St. Andrew; St. Patrick; St. Ninian; St. Mungo or Kentigern; St. Cuthbert; St. Anne and St. Oswald.

The antiquity of many of these dedications has been argued, but all of these saints were popular throughout the medieval period. The only two with any 'local' affinities are St. Mungo or Kentigern and St. Ninian: and there is considerable evidence that there was a revival of the cults of these saints in the twelfth century, as we have seen (see above, p. 218). Indeed it can be fairly safely said that neither folklore nor nomenclature provide any secure basis for the supposition that there is a real connection
between holy wells and early Christianity: there are no names of otherwise obscure Cumbrian saints, for instance, preserved in the dedications, nor has evidence of these survived in local traditions and customs.

Wells not associated with churches and chapels are occasionally found near other kinds of sites, but no consistent pattern emerges. There is little enough to show that the proximity is not usually fortuitous. Many of these sites are medieval: a couple of holy wells are associated with medieval monastic sites - e.g. Lady Well is at the site of Whitefriars, in Appleby St. Michael. A hospice and chapel was built for pilgrims to St. Mary's or St. Winifred's well at Brough-under-Stainmore (Market Brough), in 1506 (Collingwood, W. G., 1926, 2), but there is no evidence for any earlier associated structure; St. Nicholas' well, Carlisle, was connected with a leper hospital. St. Helen's well at Cockermouth, and St. Andrew's well at Culgaith are reputedly near the sites of 'hermitages'; Robin Hood's well, Lanercost, is near a ?pele-tower; a couple of wells are near Roman forts, and one or two more are adjacent to 'native' sites - the Roman fort at Old Brampton is just by Ninewells (see above, Section 1) and there is a doubtful holy well by the Roman fort at Maryport, while Elfa How well is within a short distance of the Aughertree Fell enclosures, and the Dropping well in Levens Park may have been near the site of 'Diana's temple' (a ?native site ). Two holy wells - St. Cuthbert's well, Blencogo, Bromfield, and St. Helen's well, Newton, Gosforth - were near large standing stones or
boulders. Both of these have now disappeared. One holy well - Friar's well, Beckermet St. Bridget - is by an old drove road; another - Cold Keld, St. Bees - by a corpse road. Mark Anthony's well, Kirkland is just by cultivation terraces (Goodchild, 1886), St. Ninian's well, Edenhall is near the caves of Isis Parlis, just across the river from St. Ninian's church at Ninekirks (see above, & Fig. 6.2). As we have seen, it has been suggested that these caves were the saint's retreat (Heelis, 1914) and have been 'explored' for corroborative evidence, but this has not been found. While this is perhaps the most promising of all of these 'associations', the well is not directly connected with the church - it is not really near it and is certainly not easily accessible from it, being on the other side of the Eamont; and it is in a different parish.

To return to the question initially posed - i.e. as to whether the study of holy wells adds anything to our knowledge of Early Christian Cumbria, it must be admitted that it is of little relative value. The problems of deciding on any kind of real 'date' for wells themselves are insuperable. If a well is a constant spring, there is no reason why it should not have been in use from time immemorial - continuing to provide water, irrespective of what is built around it, or thrown into it, or even if neglected. Without excavation, the only way in which a well can be 'dated' is by 'association' and this method is doubtful, as real association can rarely be proved. While it can be suggested, on the positive side, that holy wells may in some cases have
influenced the selection of church sites (and this can really only be argued forcibly for those wells which are actually within churches) and that the concurrence of pre-Conquest sculpture and holy wells may signify that this sometimes took place during the Early Christian phase; it is not really possible to go beyond this. On the negative side, it is clear for instance, that the majority of holy wells never attracted ecclesiastical structures of any kind; the association with pre-Conquest sculpture may be coincidental, and in any case, does not take one back beyond the eighth century, by which time the initial conversion phase was certainly over. Overall, the contribution of holy wells to Early Christian evidence is negligible. At best they constitute perhaps the worst kind of supporting evidence - but the well cult is of such antiquity and longevity, that on their own they do not really constitute evidence at all.
1. St. Bees is discussed in the next chapter in connection with the pre-Conquest sculpture there.

2. This information has been received from local residents.

3. I am grateful to Professor N. K. St. Joseph, who has flown the site on several occasions, for this information.

4. Excavated by Miss D. Charlesworth for the Department of the Environment, as yet unpublished.

5. The grave slab covering this identified it as that of a crusader, Udard de Broham. It contained, in addition, a small cone of coloured glass of east Mediterranean origin - perhaps a souvenir? (Way, 1947, 60).

6. Efforts to trace the object locally and in Cumbrian museums have been unsuccessful to date. The finds from the other grave were apparently once kept at Brougham Hall.

7. I must thank Professor St. Joseph for discussion about this. (St. Joseph, 1978)

8. Most of the better known of these sites are illustrated by the photos. in Norman and St. Joseph, 1969, pls. 54-70.

9. None of the 3 certain structures are aligned east-west; but the doubtful one in the centre would have east-west orientation.

10. See Bailey, 1960, and 1974, 11, 9, for a full description.

11. But Thomas (1971, 124-5) does not include the Addingham stone on his map of primary grave-slabs and markers, which he believes to be a rough index of missionary activities associable with the northward spread of Irish-based monasticism, mainly in the seventh and eighth centuries.

12. As proposed by Thomas (1968, 97-100)

13. Thomas has suggested (1968, 108) that there were regional divergences and that dug-graves were commoner in South-West Scotland and the Carlisle area; but the concentration of lintel or long-cist graves in the east is much more marked than the number of dug-graves in the west, and there is certainly no concentration of the latter - at least in the form of abandoned sites - around Carlisle.
I am grateful to Miss Clare Fell for confirmation of this.

Bouch (1951a) states that only three are known in Westmorland. Exact figures are not available for other areas, but the writer has encountered a comparably small number in the course of fieldwork and research.

As yet unpublished; illustrated with the finds in the National Museum of Antiquities in Edinburgh.

Most sites have some burials which have been disturbed by later graves, but this usually represents an insignificant percentage of the total.

i.e. those which represent the most recent Ordnance Survey revisions now available in the Department of Archaeology at Durham, which range in date from 1956-1973

This site is therefore not included in the Appendices

These usually have areas of 0.80 ha. or more, as noted above

These are St. Helena's spring at Botcherby (McIntire, 1944, 5), St. Helen's well at Newton, Gosforth (Graham and Collingwood, 1925, 22), Holy Trinity well, Millom (McIntire, 1944, 12) and St. Cuthbert's spring, Wetherall (McIntire, 1944, 15)

Generally, associations may be understood as being within 0.5 km. This is admittedly a fairly generous estimate, but as many wells cannot be located precisely, it seems best to allow some latitude. Most wells associated with churches and chapels are within a couple of hundred yards.

The site of the chapel itself is obliterated so this cannot be made certain except by excavation. Nicolson and Burn (1777, i, 555) state that the well sprang up within the chapel, but Nicholson (1914, 2-3) implies that it was adjacent to, rather than within the structure.
CHAPTER 7

The Evidence of Anglo-Saxon Sculpture

The fragmentary remains of Anglo-Saxon sculpture in Cumbria constitute perhaps the most tangible archaeological evidence of the Anglo-Saxon settlement. Unfortunately it is hardly the most all-embracing kind of evidence: but it is not as devoid of possibilities for a variety of archaeological purposes as might at first seem. Although it is limited chronologically - for even the earliest may postdate the initial settlement by nearly a century, and much of it is later than this - and in distribution - for the number of sites with sculpture must represent only a small percentage of the total number of Anglo-Saxon sites, and a biased sector even within this; and also by its very nature; nonetheless, its shortcomings, for general archaeological purposes, are not as severe as is sometimes thought.

A complete corpus of all the pre-Conquest sculpture - i.e. both Viking and Anglo-Saxon - has already been assembled, and this forms the basis of the present research (Bailey, 1974). The artistic motifs and relationships of the carvings have been the subject of recent study (i.e.
Bailey 1974, Cramp 1974, Cramp 1978 and Cramp, forthcoming). Attention will therefore be concentrated here on other aspects of the sculpture, in order to complement rather than reproduce other work. Detailed analysis of the art of the monuments is obviously the most important key to an understanding of the sculpture itself, and throws much light on relationships between the carvings within Cumbria and elsewhere; but sometimes the sculptures are seen in a pure vacuum. It must not be forgotten that they are field monuments, as well as the raw material for studies of iconography, interlace, vinescroll etc.

It seems advisable to demonstrate the validity of this proposition first, as this has been doubted (Clack and Gosling, 1976, 38). Carvings are known from a total of eighteen sites in Cumbria. The exact findspots of some of the stones are unclear, and the real total may be less than eighteen, but there are at least sixteen sites. Only three of the monuments - the cross-shafts from Beckermet and Bewcastle, and the complete cross at Irton - have any claim to being actually in their original positions, but the writer finds it difficult to doubt seriously that in most other cases the stones did stand originally in the immediate vicinity of their findspots: generally, these have come to light in the course of rebuilding or grave-digging on churches or in churchyards, in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, often reused as building stone or consolidation material.

It comes, therefore, as no surprise that the stones
which were not found in churchyards are the ones with the doubtful provenances. These consist of the now lost Knells slab, and the two carved stones in Tullie House known as the Bow stone and the Dalston trough.

Unfortunately nothing is known of the finding of the slab; the only first-hand description of it (Proceedings, 1911, 482) simply states that it was 'at' Knells, a farmhouse about six km. north-east of Carlisle. It has been suggested (Collingwood, 1923, 230) that it originally came from Carlisle: there seems to be no actual evidence for this, apart from the fact that Carlisle is the nearest place where Anglo-Saxon sculpture has been found, and because there is no church or church site known at Knells itself or any other Anglo-Saxon material. It is still possible that the stone did come originally from, say, an Anglo-Saxon cemetery that later fell into disuse at or near Knells, but the suggestion that its original home was elsewhere, is perfectly reasonable, and if so, Carlisle is the obvious candidate. In default of further evidence from Knells itself, its provenance must remain doubtful.

The Bow stone and the Dalston trough closely resemble each other; indeed the ornament, in both cases on one side only, is identical - a double scroll carved in relief. Each medallion contains a grape bunch and leaf, and the layout of these motifs clearly indicates that both stones were set horizontally. There can be little doubt, as Bailey has pointed out (1974, 29-30) that they
must come from the same site, although both were put to
different uses in more recent times. The Dalston trough
was - self-evidently- hollowed out. The Bow stone was
re-used at least once as a medieval gravestone: one side
has a long sword engraved on it, and a small incised
cross on the opposite side to the vinescroll. The trough
was first noted in Tullie House circa 1874, as being from
'near Carlisle', and described as a 'stone coffin, Roman'
(Bailey, 1974, 11, 100). Collingwood (W.G., 1905, 201)
was able to show, more precisely, that it came from a
farm at Green Lane, Dalston (NY 369,505). The Bow stone
was first observed acting as a gatepost at Bow, a hamlet
(NY 336,561) but it is recorded that it originally came
from Kirksteads (Ferguson, 1879, 178-9), two km. to the
east. This site is perhaps the most probable provenance
for both of these stones. Its nature is problematical:
this will be returned to later (see below, pp. 295-98).
Various suggestions as to the function of the stones have
been proposed, but the one which finds most acceptance
is that they form part of a frieze, perhaps on either
side of a chancel arch (Bailey, 1974, 1, 30).

Apart from these few instances, Anglo-Saxon sculpture
is found only at or near churches or sites of churches.
All the well provenanced material has been found within
the churchyards of what are now or once were parish
churches.¹ Common sense would suggest in any case that
large stone monuments are hardly easily portable;
although one or two stones may have been moved about,
there is really no reason to doubt that the crosses can be considered genuine field monuments, and legitimately studied as such.

**Distribution and Location**

The small number of sites involved renders any interpretation of their distribution dubious; but this in any case presents few surprises (Map XIII). It reflects a more or less even spread over the more habitable areas of Cumbria. The river valleys of the Eamont and Eden account for nearly 50% of the total; there are two sites on the Derwent, and the confluence of rivers which flows into the sea at Ravenglass accounts for a further three. The remainder are thinly spread around the coast, with a couple of sites in the vicinity of Carlisle, and Bewcastle an outlier in the north-east. Minor 'concentrations' around Penrith, Carlisle, and the area south of St. Bees may have little or no significance in view of the numbers involved, although the possibility of local 'groupings' of real significance should not be dismissed. Areas avoided are usually explicable in terms of undesirable terrain - the Lake District, for instance, and the Pennines. The absence of sites in the Carlisle Plain is a little more surprising - Brigham is the only example, and that is on the fringe. The usual explanation - that the heavy clay soils of the area were beyond the agricultural capacity of the inhabitants to exploit, and that
it therefore remained in forest until medieval or post-medieval times - supported by the inclusion of most of this area in the medieval forests of Inglewood and Allerdale (Hogg, 1972, 16), must now be revised in view of recent field work (see above, p.148). Still, the discovery of one or two new sites in this area would considerably alter the distribution, and it must be remembered that at least as many sculptures have been discovered or recognised comparatively recently.2

Bailey (1974, 1, 24) has compared the distribution of Anglo-Saxon sculpture with that of the habitational early English place-names;3 he notes the concentrations of these in certain areas, and observes the overall correlations between them and the sculpture - for instance the tendency for English names to cluster on the Kent, with Kendal and Heversham, rather than further east, on the Lune. He concludes that "the vast majority of the Anglian sculpture comes from areas where there is evidence of early, and to some extent, concentrated settlement". It can be further remarked that specific coincidence between names on map VI (i.e. those that are probably the earliest) and the sites of Anglo-Saxon sculpture occurs in at least three, possibly four cases (Addingham, Brigham, Heversham, Workington). The number of early names is admittedly even fewer than the number of sites of Anglo-Saxon sculpture, but this very fact reinforces the impression that this concurrence is not coincidental. It can be tentatively suggested that the initial settlements
remained the most important into the eighth and ninth centuries - if the idea that a church with sculpture was of a more important centre than one without - is acceptable. Alternatively, a case could perhaps be made out for a small number of sites generally in the seventh, eighth and ninth centuries, though the comparative abundance of English names less closely dateable, such as tun names, points against this. At any rate, there is no evidence that the ecclesiastical bias of the sculpture implies that it was in any way geographically removed from the areas of secular settlement.

Having stated the norm, Bailey observes the exceptions to it - Carlisle, for instance, has no early place-names in the immediate vicinity; and Waberthwaite is also slightly isolated. Neither of these sites cause real problems, however, as there is in any case historical evidence for a civil community at Carlisle in the time of Cuthbert (see Ch. 3), so the place-name evidence is here superfluous; and Waberthwaite is proximate to the cluster of tun names around Irton. Bewcastle, however, is undoubtedly an anomaly; and it is difficult to find an obvious reason for this, other than the fact that it is unusual in so many ways.

Form and Function

The actual number of sites known, though small, is not exceptionally so, and agrees proportionally - i.e. area for area - with the known totals for Durham and
Northumberland; but there is no way of knowing how many sites are lost in any area. Likewise, the number of carvings from any one site is small. There are fragments of at least twenty, at most twenty-two, crosses and one complete cross from fifteen sites, but ten sites have only one cross. In addition to the crosses, there is a grave marker from Bewcastle, and a grave marker or architectural fragment from Workington, as well as the grave slab from Knells and the architectural panels from Dalston and Kirksteads; there is also place-name evidence for another cross at Lowther.

Though the crosses certainly form the bulk, it is clear that in fact Cumbrian sculpture assumed a variety of forms, and therefore fulfilled a variety of functions. Grave markers and slabs are more rarely met with than in the north-east, but the collections of grave-markers from Lindisfarne and Hartlepool are largely responsible for the greater totals for Northumberland and Durham respectively - i.e. slabs occurring in much larger numbers at single sites rather than much larger numbers of slabs distributed throughout these regions. The architectural pieces from Dalston and Kirksteads demonstrate how sculpture was incorporated into the fabric for a purely decorative purpose; and, significantly, attest the existence of at least one stone church in Cumbria at this time - a fact not clearly evident from any of the surviving church fabrics (Taylor and Taylor, 1965; Fisher, 1962). The curiously shaped 'Osithgid' stone from Workington (Mason
& Valentine, 1928, pls. facing 60, 62) is perhaps also most convincingly explained as an architectural fragment - it is difficult to be certain on this point, but it bears fairly close comparison with a stone from Jarrow, of similar size and shape, which has the name HELMGYT carved on the tooled face. This stone was found among the collapsed rubble of a ninth century structure (Building D) where it had apparently been used as a building stone (Cramp, 1976, 74).

The simple inscription on the Workington stone - i.e. just a single personal name - is evidently commemorative, and inscriptions on the other carvings can also be generally interpreted in this light, where these are legible. The Knells slab had a brief inscription at the top, above the two carved birds, read by Okasha (1971, 88-9) as .. MVN .. / from Hope's photograph. Collingwood himself read the stone as - MVNDI at the time of its discovery (Proceedings, 1911). It is therefore probable that the inscription consisted, as on the Workington stone, of a personal name (Okasha, 1971, 88-9).

The fragments of two crosses from Carlisle also have commemorative inscriptions, although neither is complete. On the upper arm of a crosshead found in St. Cuthberts Lane, Carlisle, is an inscription which reads - BA/ D... /- (Okasha, 1971, 61-2). It is clearly fragmentary, and would presumably have been continued round the other arms of the crosshead. A personal name is again indicated for the surviving piece, reconstructed by Collingwood
(W.G., 1916, 280) as BADVVLFE, but the text may have been longer.

The transverse is the only part of the second inscribed Carlisle crosshead to survive. It has letters on both sides, which can be reconstructed to form separate parts of the same inscription, carved clockwise on all arms of the crosshead. Some of the letters on the upper and lower arms are partially discernable, on one side only. The inscription has been read as:

(Front) SIG/ ...... /TTEDIS/ ......... /
(Reverse) AEF/ ...S. /ITBE/ RH ....

by Okasha (1971, 61) who has interpreted this, by comparison with formulae, as:

SIG ...SE TTE DIS ... AEF TERS.
- ITBE RH ...

i.e. Sig .... set this in memory of S.itbe rh..

A similar, though slightly longer, inscription is found on the cross-shaft fragment from Urswick, in runes, crudely spaced in a panel above a carved figural scene. The ill-planned inscription extends onto the latter; the last six runes are tucked into the spaces between the figures. It reads tunwinisetae/sefter tor oz/tredaebeku/naefterhisb/aeurnae gebidaespe/re au/lae (Page, 1973, 155) the runes /y/ pi/s w · are actually carved onto the figures themselves (Bailey, 1974, ii, 248). This means: 'Tunwini set up a monument for Torthred his son; pray
for his soul' (Page, 1973, 145) and on the figures 'this was Lyl' (Collingwood, W.G., 1911, 467). In spite of the ugly carving, however, all artistry was not lost. Page has pointed out that the formula itself

\[
\text{Tunwini setae aefter Torhtredae} \\
\text{becun aefter his baeurnae; ge biddaes per saulae}
\]

is in fact alliterative verse (Page, 1973, 153-4).

The inscriptions at Irton and Beckermet have never been successfully read - indeed the existence of an inscription on the Irton cross is open to doubt. The space on the western side of the shaft between two panels of interlace might have been left blank for an inscription which it never received, or for some other reason. In any event, there is no clear, visible trace of an inscription there now, nor was any trace of one visible in 1899 (Calverley, 1899, 206-7), although there are lines dividing the space into three horizontal panels. Haigh and Stephens read ' Gebidaeth Forae' in runes in 1863 (Stephens, 1866-1901, ii, 469). This reading may be treated with some scepticism - partly because the readings of Haigh and Stephens are notoriously open to criticism, but also because there is no trace of an inscription visible on the fine illustration of the Irton cross in Lysons' work of half a century before (Lysons, 1816, pl. facing CCI).

Nineteenth century readings abound for the long inscription (five lines surviving) on the Anglo-Saxon
cross at Beckermet St. Bridget, but so various that all must be considered doubtful. It is usually considered non-runic, but suggestions as to its language range from Manx Gaelic through Pictish to Old English (summarised by Calverley (1899, 28-32)). The most recent considerations of the monument (Okasha, 1971, 52; Bailey, 1974, 11, 26) deem it illegible, but probably in either uncial (Bailey) or insular miniscule (Okasha) characters.

The runic inscriptions on the Bewcastle Cross have received even more attention than the inscription on the Beckermet stone. For a long time it was thought that a satisfactory interpretation, at least for most of the main text, had been arrived at, and it was generally accepted that Alcfrith, son of Oswiu, and Cyneburh his wife, daughter of King Penda of Mercia, were commemorated, the former in the longish text on the west face, and the latter on the north face. Detailed examination of the cross in the field and a full study of the history of the monument and its various readings by R. I. Page (1960) however, has made it clear that, firstly, the commemoration of Alcfrith son of Oswiu in the long inscription can no longer be maintained; and, secondly, that this inscription appears to have suffered too much damage at the hands of nineteenth century antiquarians and would-be interpreters, who had few scruples about 'clarifying' their readings manually with tools, for any reliance to be placed on their results. This really means that no hope can be held out for the future - bar
the development of new techniques - for more accurate readings.

Although the name Kyneburg is still quite legible on the north face, the fact that the Alcfrith commemoration is no longer acceptable means that there are really no grounds for maintaining that this Kyneburg was Alcfrith's queen. The Bewcastle cross can therefore no longer be held to be a monument set up by or commemorating Northumbrian royalty of the late seventh century. Increasingly, art historians have considered this date to be in any case too early (i.e. Cramp 1965). It remains quite possible that the inscription does commemorate important individuals of a slightly later date. The cross is sufficiently exceptional to the general order of Cumbrian sculpture for it to have fulfilled an important function at the time of its erection. It is interesting that it is the only Anglo-Saxon stone carving in Cumbria to have Latin texts, both in runes, and admittedly very brief, and easily understood: + Gessus Kristtus on the west face above the figure of Christ (Page, 1960, 38) and - ssus (another form of Jesus) on the north face at the very top of the shaft (Page 1960, 40). These two inscriptions are clearly explanatory of features on the cross, the latter evidently referring to some feature on the last crosshead. The absence of this kind of inscription elsewhere in Cumbria clearly goes hand in hand with the general lack of figure sculpture on the monuments requiring to be thus explained.
None of the other Cumbrian carvings have inscriptions, but evidence for the former existence of an inscribed runic cross is preserved in the place-name Runcrosbanc, Lowther, occurring in a document of the late thirteenth century (Smith, 1967, 11, 187). Bailey has suggested (1974, 1, 24) that this most probably refers to an Anglo-Saxon rather than a later, Viking sculpture, as a runic inscription (presumably of sufficient length to merit its giving its name to the cross) would fit better in the earlier context.

The importance of the commemorative function can be assessed to a certain degree by the extent to which other ornament is present. Some sculpture was obviously designed more or less purely for this purpose. The Workington 'Osithgid' stone has no other decoration, although it is set within a frame. The transverse inscribed crosshead from Carlisle has decoration of a very simple kind: there is a rosette on one face, in the centre, and on the reverse side, in the same position, there is a circular boss. The two ends of the arms have simple knots set within the arris moulding, and the inscription is framed similarly with a single incised line. Bailey (1974, 1, 27) has suggested that this cross was probably otherwise undecorated, and cites parallels for this type of memorial from Whitby, Hexham and elsewhere.

It is impossible to be certain if in fact any of the crosses were entirely without inscriptions; all
apart from Irton, are fragments of larger monuments which could have born inscriptions on other, non-surviving parts - but by analogy with elsewhere it is very likely that at least some of the Cumbrian crosses were uninscribed. Apart from the examples discussed above, however, decorative carving plays a role of prime importance. Too little survives of the simple cross-inscribed stone from Bewcastle to be certain whether or not it too had a name or formula carved on it, but there can be little doubt that it was a grave marker. The Knells slab, though clearly also a grave slab, has reasonably elaborate decoration, and all the sculpture, apart from the Osithgid stone, the Dalston trough, and the Bow stone, incorporates the Christian symbol in one way or another, either, as with the crosses, in the actual form of the monument, or, in the case of the slabs, as an applied motif. It has been suggested that the crosses might have been used as objects for contemplation (Bailey, 1974, 1, 20) or as preaching crosses, although the absence of iconographic scenes from all but the Bewcastle and Urswick crosses indicates that this can never have been a major function in Cumbria.

Although some commemorative function for the crosses is certain, there is no evidence that they were, strictly speaking, set up like modern tombstones to mark the grave of the person commemorated. Indeed, it is often suggested that they were not, but this is really impossible to assert or deny, largely because so little
of the sculpture has been found in situ. Even in the case of those which may still be in their original positions there is little hope of establishing the point, as later burials will in any case have disturbed the ground around the cross; the possibility of being able to associate a cross with any particular burial is fairly remote, even if the association were genuine. It is interesting, however, that those three crosses which have a claim to being in situ (i.e. Beckermet St. Bridget, Bewcastle and Irton) all occupy broadly similar positions with regard to their respective churches: they are all on the south side, within a comparatively short distance of the standing church. This also appears to be true of at least some crosses outside Cumbria such as Masham and Eyam. None of these churches have any pretensions to an antiquity comparable with the crosses, but it is not unlikely that successive churches were built on the same site over long periods; in any case the alignment would not differ significantly, even if earlier churches had different dimensions. This position is also fairly consistently occupied by churchyard crosses of later date, where these may also be considered in situ, and is not, perhaps, very surprising, as the north side is traditionally considered 'unlucky' and was often unused for burials until quite recent times, but it is a little striking that none of the Cumbrian crosses are sited east of the chancel, or at the west end. The two standing cross shafts at Beckermet St. Bridget (the second being
of Viking date) are beside each other, rather than at either ends of the church. On the whole, it would seem that there was a 'proper place' for a cross; and if this is so, then it can be suggested that crosses may always have had a special function over and above a commemorative one.

It is interesting to compare this situation with the well-known plan in the Book of Mulling of a monastic enclosure - presumably an idealized one - of St. Mullins Monastery, in which several crosses are shown, at virtually all points of the compass, both within and without the enclosure (Henry 1965, 135). There are twelve crosses on the plan, eight without, three within, and one on the enclosure wall. The layout of the three crosses within the enclosure does not seem to follow a strict pattern. Outside it would seem that the crosses were placed at, and halfway between, the main points of the compass; in any event there is no indication, from the plan, that they were sited with respect to standing churches or other structures. The picture is further complicated, however, by the fact that many of the Irish monastic sites had more than one church, so a cross sited east of one church could be south of another. Some of the English monastic sites had more than one church too, although it is difficult to be sure how common the phenomenon was - where plans are known multiple churches seem to share the same axis. Many of the Irish churches are later in date than the nearby crosses, but it is
likely that here, as in England, they were built on the sites of their predecessors. It is possible that the 'proper place' for a cross varied from one region to another. But there is some evidence that they were not usually set up at random. It is often assumed that crosses are by their very nature outdoor monuments; and it is true that the evidence points to this being the norm. However, the original siting of the Ruthwell cross, within the kirk in the early seventeenth century, is well attested, and it is sometimes observed that, although the Bewcastle cross is considerably more weathered, it could not have survived in its present form if it had been exposed to the elements for over a millennium. As it appears to be in its original socket stone, it may be that it was originally within an earlier church south of the present one. Some of the other carving appears surprisingly fresh, e.g. Dacre, but in most cases an outdoor position is consistent with the state of the carving and the stone used. The evidence from Bewcastle is admittedly uncertain; weathering depends considerably on aspect and atmospheric conditions as well as length of exposure. While the Bewcastle cross may have been sited originally within a structure, it is surely at least as likely that it was not.

Not all commemoration is for the dead; and many of the Irish crosses, at least, commemorated the living, the person or persons who had caused the cross to be set up - for instance, the inscription in Irish on the Bealin cross - Oroit do Tuathgall las Dernath in Chriossa -
"Pray for Tuathgall, who had this cross made." An element of this can be seen on the Urswick shaft, where the names of both the erector and the carver appear, as well as the person in honour of whom the cross was set up. Crosses were certainly set up by both laymen and clerics in Ireland; sometimes by both together, such as the Cross of the Scriptures at Clonmacnoise. The erection of a large sculptured cross must have been a fairly expensive business, undertaken only by the important and affluent, and probably only then in special circumstances. There is a clear hint of politics in the Clonmacnoise inscription, and it was perhaps in similar circumstances that crosses such as Bewcastle, with elaborate iconographic scenes and long inscriptions, were set up. The same might apply to Beckermet St. Bridget, and, to a lesser extent (in view of the poor quality of the carving) to Urswick.

The Context of the Sculpture

The - perhaps surprising - abundance of inscriptions poses many interesting questions. It might well be asked, for instance, who would have been in a position to read them. It is now generally accepted that in Anglo-Saxon times literacy was more or less confined, at least in the earlier phases, to the ecclesiastical sector of the population; and it follows from this that inscriptions would generally only be found on sculptures in monastic contexts, where their meaning could be appreciated.
Bailey has in fact suggested a monastic background for "much, if not most" of the Cumbrian sculpture (1974, 1, 24) partly because of the inscriptions but also in view of the literary evidence for monasteries at Carlisle, Dacre and Heversham.

The Bewcastle cross stands apart from the other monuments in this respect, largely because it depicts scriptural scenes which could have been used for the instruction of laymen. Indeed, it is the only Cumbrian cross which may have been, primarily, a preaching cross. Yet the scenes themselves are explained by inscriptions (see above, p.285), and it is probable that the audience consisted of both literate clerics and illiterate laymen. In any case it is certain that, whatever type of site formed the setting for the cross, there was at least a cemetery more or less contemporary with it, within the Roman fort. This is attested by the small grave marker. The great cross was not erected in isolation.

Virtually nothing is known of the Cumbrian monasteries, apart from the meagre historical notices (see above, pp.72-73) although in two cases, at Dacre and Heversham, chance discoveries have indicated the general whereabouts of the monastic buildings. At Dacre, a stone-built drain was discovered in the churchyard in 1932 and examined in a small excavation (Huddleston, 1932)(Fig. 7.1). The glimpse given of the site is tantalising, but not, alas, very informative. The drain was constructed of massive stones, 12"-14" (30.5-35.6 cm.) wide, 31"-34" (78.7-86.4 cm.)
long, and 18"-20" (45.7-50.8 cm.) deep. Many of the stones were tooled, as can be seen from the plan, some on upper and lower surfaces, apparently in two different ways. The drain was Y shaped, and ran downhill, the line of stones ending at the churchyard wall. The feature continued beyond this, however, as a ditch, running down to the stream. The side stones were capped by large slabs laid across them at two points. It was suggested at the time of discovery that proper drainage would have been impeded if the drain had been fully covered, but this explanation may simply have been offered to explain the absence of a complete covering. Other capstones could have been removed in earlier diggings, or, perhaps, when the monastery fell into disuse.

Massively built drains like this are known from other Anglo-Saxon monastic sites, for example, at Jarrow and Whitby (Cramp, 1974a, 121; plan facing 112). The tooling on the stones is a fairly clear indication of the presence of contemporary stone buildings - i.e. that the monastic buildings themselves, or an earlier church, or both, must have been built of stone. There is also an arch stone of an Anglo-Saxon type window light, re-used as a building stone near the east end of the south wall of the chancel. The brief mention of the site by Bede (H.E. IV : 32) states that the monastery was "in the course of construction" and this surely signifies a prolonged programme of building, and therefore stone structures: the drain was found on the south side of the
church, between the modern and the former churchyard boundaries, leaving, apparently, plenty of space below the church for monastic buildings (Huddleston, 1932, 77).

At Heversham there is even less material evidence. In 1925, again in the course of grave digging, the stone foundations of a building were found, "on the east side of the footpath, a little to the north-east end of the church" (Curwen, 1925, 30) (Fig. 7.2). The discovery was never followed up, so nothing more can really be said as to the nature of the building thus uncovered, but its position could indicate either a domestic structure or perhaps an earlier church building.

It is unfortunate that archaeological evidence for stone structures should be confined to those sites for which there is already documentary evidence for monasteries. Excavation elsewhere has so far produced entirely negative results. At Bewcastle three planned excavation programmes have failed to reveal any trace of Anglo-Saxon features (Fig. 7.3). The first series of excavations concentrated on the area north of the church (Richmond, Hodgson, and St. Joseph, 1938); the second series (unpublished, by J. Gillam in 1956) were east of the church, the third (unpublished, by P. Austen, 1976) were to the north. Although no Anglo-Saxon levels or features were found in 1956, the grave-marker (see above, p. 292) was discovered, re-used in a medieval context. Recent excavations at Penrith in the vicinity of the church have also proved negative, in terms of pre-Conquest evidence; but it is
possible to hold out some hope for the future, if substantial structures ever did exist. Later monasteries and post-medieval settlement failed to eliminate the substantial foundations of several Anglo-Saxon stone buildings at both Monkwearmouth and Jarrow. Against this must be set the fact that many early buildings would have been of wood, and therefore far less easily detectable in complex urban situations or much disturbed churchyards.

Kirksteads (NY 353,566) is best considered here. Although, as we have seen, uncertainty surrounds the original provenance of both the Bow stone and the Dalston trough, this site would seem to have the strongest claim. It was visited by Collingwood circa 1905, in connection with his study of these carvings, and his account remains the fullest published description.

The place-name 'Kirksteads' does refer to the site rather than to any adjacent settlement, but as many 'Kirk' names like this denote nothing more than a ruin or heap of stones - or occasionally even a prehistoric monument, e.g. Towtop Kirk, Bampton - it by no means follows from this that the site is that of a church. The name does not appear on the O.S. maps, but the place can be identified with that marked on the 6" O.S. as 'Roman Remains found here', about 5.5 km. more or less due west of Carlisle, along the road to Moorhouse, immediately adjacent to Cobble Hall, and is not to be confused with either of the two 'Roman Camps' marked on the 1" O.S. in
adjacent fields to the north-west. It is about one km. east-north-east of the original position of the Bow stone, and about 4 km. north-north-west of Dalston.

The site must once have been fairly substantial, or at least noticeable, for it clearly attracted its measure of comment, and depredation at the hands of the curious. The Rev. J. Maughan (1876, 148-50) identified it with 'Glannibanta' (i.e. Glannaventa) and was certain that it was a true stone-walled fort, of about two acres (.8 ha.) of which he could see the north and east sides clearly. He noticed a spread of dressed freestone in three adjacent fields. Collingwood (W.G. 1905) describes and illustrates a quantity of Roman material from it at Kirkandrews, but not the precise circumstances of their discovery. There is no reason to doubt the Roman nature of the Kirkandrews material; but the site has been more or less ignored by Romanists since Collingwood's day, and the identification with Glannaventa is clearly wrong. It is perhaps possible that there is some general confusion between the 'Roman camps' and Kirksteads, but as both Maughan, Ferguson (1880) and Whellan specify Kirksteads, this is not a very convincing explanation; the latter (1860, 171) records the discovery of bones at the site.

Collingwood, in his field investigation, observed "the possible foundations of a building" although part of the site was covered by a shed; and also, several blocks of building stone, incised with a line along the
edge, of 'Norman type' and he also reports a 'tradition' of a church here, although this might mean no more than what could be implied from the name.

Nothing of a clearly definable nature is visible at the site now; and there is no obvious way of augmenting the meagre data without excavation. One other feature should perhaps be mentioned in connection with it, however, although it is impossible to link this directly with the site, let alone the stones. This consists of a trackway - not marked by the O.S. - past the site, connecting it with Grinsdale on the Wall, about 3 km. to the north-east, and continuing on to the south-west in the direction of Little Orton (Collingwood, W.G., 1923, 235). Ferguson thought this trackway Roman (1880, 323) but there seems to be no evidence for this. Even if it is no more than a medieval drove way, however, it does give the place a little greater significance, at least in terms of communications, in former times.

Positive conclusions about the site are, in view of the dearth of information, impossible, but it is clear that a site of genuine if undetermined antiquity is involved. Unfortunately the miscellaneous 'facts' known about it tell little more than could be already deduced from inspection of the stones themselves, apart from the 'Roman connection'. It is reasonable to conclude that there was a stone structure there; and it is probable that this was within a cemetery, but both of these things are evident already, for, as has been shown, the
sculpture must have formed, by its very nature, part of a stone building; and the long sword on the Bow stone indicates its use as a medieval tombstone. Whatever the explanation for the propinquity of Roman stones and sites - and it is possible, for instance, that the site was selected for a stone church simply because pre-worked stones were easily available - it is probable that the true sequence of events at Kirksteads will only be clarified by a careful excavation.

A connection between Roman sites and those of Anglo-Saxon sculpture fairly certainly exists. This is perhaps no more than one would expect; but there are certainly problems in explaining the chronological gap - in most instances, probably of at least four centuries - between the 'official' end of Roman Britain, and the setting up of the earliest Anglo-Saxon monuments, in terms of continuity, as has already been explained (see above, Ch. 4).

A cursory comparison between map II and map XIII shows that many Anglo-Saxon sites coincide with, or are within a short distance of, sites occupied in the Roman period. In the former category must be included - apart from the Kirksteads site discussed above - Carlisle and Bewcastle, both actually within the physical confines of the Roman town and fort respectively. In the latter category are Waberthwaite, just across the river from the fort at Ravenglass (Glannaventa); Kendal, about 3 km. from Watercrook (Alauna); Workington, about 2 km. north-east
of the fort at Burrow Walls, on the other side of the Derwent; and Brigham, upstream from Workington, about 3.5 km. from Derventio, or Papcastle, on the same side of the river. Other sites, though not adjacent to Roman forts, are reasonably near Roman roads - Penrith, Irton, and perhaps, Dacre. Addingham, down by the river, is well east of the Roman road through the valley and Heversham is by the Kent estuary, away from the Roman road, Kirkby Stephen is south and east of Roman routes; but none of these sites is at a distance of more than 10 km. from a Roman site or fort, and Kirby Stephen is less than this distance south of the road and the extremely strategic fort at Brough-under-Stainmore. Against this must be set Urswick, which is in an area where no Roman fort or site had ever been established; Beckermet St. Bridget\textsuperscript{10} and Lowther. The siting of these three can really lay no claim to having a positive relationship to Roman roads and sites.

All this seems quite impressive; but closer inspection throws doubt on many of the supposedly close relationships thus revealed. For a start, the point made in the introduction is well remembered here - few of the areas in Cumbria that are desirable in terms of human settlement are very far from Roman roads or sites; these follow natural routes, and practically anything can be superficially so connected to them in an apparently meaningful way.
The concurrence of specific sites undoubtedly carries more weight. It is perhaps no more than one would expect at Carlisle, but is very striking in view of the minor nature of some of the other sites; but even here it is possible to show that any thesis which proposes any kind of continuous occupation rests on very thin ice. In many cases there is no evidence for late fourth century occupation at the Roman forts associated with the Anglo-Saxon sculpture. As already noted above (p.120) forts north of the wall were probably abandoned circa A.D. 369, so any such may be ruled out at Bewcastle - where in any case there is no evidence for a vicus; neither is there any indication of late fourth century occupation at Burrow Walls or Watercrook. If any kind of case for direct continuity is to hold conviction, the absence of sculpture at those sites most likely to have remained occupied into the fifth century - i.e. important sites with large vici and abundant late fourth century material, such as Brough-under-Stainmore, and Ambleside, must be somehow explained.

On the positive side, however, it is possible to think of a few reasons why abandoned Roman forts should have been nonetheless attractive to the Anglo-Saxon builders. One has, in fact, already been suggested - the availability there of ready tooled building stone. There is abundant evidence from all over the country that the Anglo-Saxons did frequently use such stone for church buildings and as we have seen there is evidence for stone churches and other buildings contemporary with the crosses
in Cumbria, although none of these have survived; there
is therefore no reason why this motive might not have
been a factor here. Nonetheless, it is clearly
unsatisfactory in terms of a full explanation. It is
odd, for instance, that the prospective church builders
opted for moving their building stones distances of a
mile or more instead of building the church in situ.
They may have had other reasons for building the church
elsewhere, but if so, one might logically ask what was
the attraction of the Roman fort.

There can be little doubt that, long after the
Roman army withdrew from Cumbria, their forts remained
conspicuous features of the landscape, doubtless giving
rise to local folklore and legend. The long-deserted
fort at Bewcastle may, for some such reason, have been
considered a suitable place to erect an important mono­
ment, in an area without a prominent centre or local
focus. It would be a mistake to think of this cross as
being, as it were, 'set up in the wilderness'. On the
contrary, the site is on the fringes of the moorland.
The contrast between the 'bad land' to the north and
east, rising to the Bewcastle Fells, and the 'good land'
to the south, on which the site itself is found, is
clearly visible from the fort itself. It is on a low
knoll, above the junction of two streams with a clear
view of the surrounding countryside in most directions.
It is easy to see why it had attractions for the builders
of fort, cross and castle alike, although it is not
strongly defensive.
Bewcastle stands apart however. None of the other sites are as strikingly chosen, although certain features are consistently present. They are always near a water supply, within areas of agricultural land; they are all to be found in areas suitable for settlement. Caution must be always closely exercised in drawing apparently obvious conclusions from distributions without considering the whole area in terms of suitability for settlement. Perhaps the most reasonable explanation of the concurrence of forts and sites is simply that both were in the areas which supported the Roman and later post-Roman population, and centres of importance in Roman times remained of significance later.

It can be suggested, over and above this, that Roman roads did, in at least one or two areas, open up new routes. The most striking example of this is at Bewcastle where both fort and site are on the very limit of the Roman communication network through the north-west. Many of the Roman roads must have continued in use, well into post-Roman times. Much of the most important road of all - that over Stainmore, and up through the Eden valley - is still in use today, and it is not unique; the Roman surface of the road from Carlisle to Papcastle was clearly visible, and still in use, as far as Thursby in 1302 (Parker, 1905, 39). In the case of Bewcastle, however, while there is no specific evidence as to when the Maiden Way fell into disuse, no modern road follows the line north from Birdoswald, so it must have been
abandoned at a fairly early stage. The selection of the Bewcastle fort for the site of the great Anglo-Saxon cross, however, does strongly suggest that this was not before the eighth century. The post-Roman importance of Birdoswald itself has already been considered (see above, p.77).

At least one cross-site is reasonably close (1 km.) to the 'native' settlement already discussed, that of Urswick Stone Walls (see above, p.141). There is nothing which really connects the two in any way, but an attempt has been made to see various sites in the Urswick area, i.e. the hillfort on Skelmore Heads, the Stone Walls settlement, and the village itself, as the successive dwelling places of the Iron-Age, Romano-British, and Anglo-Saxon and medieval communities respectively (Milward & Robinson, 1972, 192-200). One way or another, this is probably an oversimplification and none of these sites can really be considered securely dated to the periods to which they are assigned by Millward.

Connections and Some Implications

There may be no clear (or at any rate, specific) relationship with sites of other periods, but, in spite of the large area of the county, only Urswick and Bewcastle are in physical isolation from their cross-sites. Kirkby Stephen, though distant from other sites, is at the upper end of the Eden, the main route through
the region, and thus linked with sites such as Addingham and Carlisle, and the 'cluster' of Dacre, Penrith, and Lowther, to the west. The significance of this is, as already stated, doubtful. It does not appear to indicate any particular local groups of sculpture, or the work of individual schools, for instance; at any rate there is little evidence in pre-Viking times for close artistic connections between sculptures from nearby sites.

The general harmony to be found between much of the Cumbrian sculpture and that east of the Pennines (Bailey, 1974, i, 32) suggests, along with the documentary evidence, that links between the two areas were close. Connections between individual sites are in many cases difficult to prove on present evidence, however, although it has been possible to identify links with some of the Northumbrian schools. The impulse of Hexham was clearly felt strongly at Lowther for instance (Cramp, 1974, 134) and Collingwood (W.G., 1927, 36-7, 107-8) pointed to a group of monuments - Heversham, Kendal, Urswick and Waberthwaite, as well as Halton and Heysham in Lancashire, which came within the orbit of Lancaster, where he postulates an important monastery, and a centre for the dispersal of influences first from Hexham, later from Ripon. He also suggests that the 'lorgnette' motif, as found on the uninscribed cross-head fragments at Carlisle, was characteristic of the latter centre (Bailey, 1974, 107).

Cumbrian sculpture does appear to have had one or two
characteristic features of its own. A particular type of vinescroll, in which the offshoot stems from the base, and not the top, of each volute, has been identified by Bailey (1974, 1, 34-6) as characteristic of the north-west. It is found at Lowther and Heversham, and also at Lancaster, Heysham and Hoddom, and devolved forms at Kendal and Waberthwaite. It is clear that there were also links with Mercian work; indeed the whole trend of recent work seems to emphasise links with the south and Yorkshire, rather than with the north-east. Bailey has noted the general scarcity of influences from the orbit of Lindisfarne, all the more surprising in view of the prestige which that see seems to have had in the north-west in the later Anglo-Saxon period; the undoubted connections between Carlisle, Dacre and St. Cuthbert in the late seventh century, and the fact that at least the northern area may have formed part of the see itself (see above, p.55).

Decorative motifs - panels of interlace, scrollwork and to a lesser extent other patterns, form the bulk of the artistic repertoire of the Cumbrian sculptors. The almost total absence of figural scenes has already been mentioned. Apart from the Bewcastle cross, only one such survives, below the panel with the inscription at Urswick. This shows two figures on either side of a cross. Various interpretations of the scene are possible (Bailey, 1974, 1, 43-4). It has been suggested that this is a crucifixion scene, for instance, but as it does not
conform to the conventions usual in the depiction of crucifixions, this is perhaps unlikely. The cross clearly indicates a religious rather than secular motif, so the figures depicted are presumably Biblical figures, saints or clerics of some sort. Bailey suggests the Harrowing of Hell as a possible source of inspiration for the scene, or alternatively, that the figures are just saints.

Sculptors must have been, in some measure, itinerant. Otherwise one would surely be able to see more abundant evidence for individual craftsmen at any one site. Whether it constituted a 'full-time' or 'part-time' profession is a moot point. The professionalism of the Bewcastle, Lowther and Dacre shafts can be contrasted with the disorganised work at Urswick; and again, if there were several full-time sculptors, one would naturally expect more carvings. It is possible that carving took its place, along with manuscript illumination, glass-working, and perhaps fine metalworking, in the monastic day; a skill for specialist workers, some good, some bad, who were also monks, or secular workers who were attached to groups of monasteries rather than individual sites.

While none of the sculpture can be considered closely dated it is clear that collectively it spans several generations. The date of the Bewcastle cross has been the subject of much controversy, but an eighth century date is now fairly certain, and it may be reasonably
considered as among the earliest of Northumbrian monumental carving (Cramp, 1965, 6-7). Some of the other sculpture may be almost contemporary with the Viking settlement. Indeed Bailey has noted a parallel for the Waberthwaite vinescroll at Glencairn, Dumfrieshire, on a carving of the Viking period, and it is possible that crosses as yet uninfluenced by Viking styles were still being set up in Cumbrian into the tenth century. The rest of the sculpture can be placed within these limits. Eighth century work is represented at Lowther (R.C.H.M., 1936, 160; Cramp, 1974, 138) and possibly at Kirksteads (Collingwood, W. G., 1905, 202-7) and work of the late eighth or early ninth century at Addingham (Collingwood, 1913, 164-66), Brigham (Bailey, 1960a, 42-5), Dacre (Collingwood, W. G., 1927, 46-7), Carlisle (Collingwood, W. G., 1901, 292-94; 1916a, 279-80; 1927, 58-9), Kendal (Cramp, pers. comm.), Knells (Proceedings, 1911, 482) and Heversham (Cramp, pers. comm.). The Irton Cross has been dated by Collingwood to the mid-ninth century (W.G., 1927, 119) and later work of the mid-ninth to early tenth century is found at Workington (Mason and Valentine, 1928, 60-1). Collingwood suggested a date of circa A.D. 900, or at any rate late ninth century for the Urswick shaft (W.G., 1911, 468; 1927, 53) but linguistic evidence indicates a somewhat earlier date of circa A.D. 750-850 (Bailey, 1974, 1, 43). The Beckermet St. Bridget shaft was considered Anglo-Norse by Collingwood (W.G., 1927, 6, 147) but Bailey considers it pre-Viking on the basis of the
long inscription; it has been accepted as Anglo-Saxon here.

As has already been generally indicated, the quantity of sculpture at any one site is small. Even simple grave markers are rare. The majority of sites have only one cross. More than one is only certainly known at Carlisle (3), Kirkby Stephen (2), Lowther (3-4) and Workington (2). To this might be added Heversham, as it is at least possible that the head and shaft fragments are not from the same cross12 and, more doubtfully, Bewcastle.

A cross-head with a runic inscription from Bewcastle was in the possession of the (then) owner of Naworth Castle in 1618, when it was shown to the antiquaries Camden and Spelman, and later sent to Sir Robert Cotton (V.C.H., 1901, 255; Brown, G. B., 1921, 113-120). It is usually assumed that this lost head belonged to the shaft in the churchyard, but it is at least conceivable that it came from another cross. It is also possible that another cross was planned for Bewcastle, but never erected. On the Long Bar, about 7 km. north-east of the church, is a massive block of sandstone, first commented on by Baldwin Brown (1921, 107) which may be the roughout for a cross. Grooves on the surface of the stone could be the marks of mason's wedges, used to split it from the natural rock; and it has approximately the correct proportions for a large cross-shaft of the Bewcastle
type, assuming that the cross-head would have been cut from another block of stone. Whether this stone was intended as a roughout for the Bewcastle cross, or for another which was never carved, can only be conjectured. It may have been abandoned because it did not fracture as desired, or left where it was simply because a suitable stone was found nearer the church. There is also the slight possibility that it was intended for another place - two monuments such as that now standing in the churchyard would make it a somewhat remarkable site - though not unique.

Where there is evidence for more than one cross in Cumbria there is nothing to indicate monuments conceived in the Bewcastle style, although there is some fine carving. This underlines the rarity and value which Anglo-Saxon sculpture must have had for those who caused it to be made. It may be, therefore, that sites with a quantity of sculpture must have been, as a general rule, of greater importance than those with single monuments, and the latter presumably of greater significance than those without any, as already indicated. Conversely, the erection of really important monuments at sites where there is no other evidence for a wealthy community with a taste for fine sculpture, does suggest that crosses such as that at Ruthwell and Bewcastle are the 'imposed' or donated products of a wealthier sector elsewhere, erected for some special reason.
The Significance of Some Other Sites with Viking Period Sculpture

It remains now to consider sites where the sculptural evidence is pre-Conquest rather than pre-Viking, but where there is nonetheless reason to suspect an Anglo-Saxon origin. There is a certain amount of evidence for this being a realistic proposition. Viking sculpture is considerably more abundant than that of the earlier period. The number of sites is more than doubled - a total of thirty seven or thirty eight\(^\text{13}\) - and the actual quantity of sculpture is increased fivefold (Bailey, 1974, 1, 20). There is no reason to assume that all of these are newly selected Viking sites; on the contrary there are indications of a considerable measure of continuity between the Anglo-Saxon and Viking periods. Firstly, a high proportion - over seventy-five per cent - of sites with Anglo-Saxon sculpture also possess later Viking carvings. Secondly many of those sites which do not have Anglo-Saxon, as well as Viking sculpture have nonetheless pre-Viking place-names. Not all of these are habitational, but there are seven instances of tūn and one hām name (i.e. Arlechdon, Burton, Clifton, Distington, Harnington, Hutton, Walton; Dearham). The impression of continuity is reinforced when it is remembered that even some of the pre-Viking sites have Viking names (Beckermet St. Bridget, Bewcastle, Kirkby Stephen, Lowther, Waberthwaite). Unfortunately it is difficult to point to particular sites where a pre-Viking origin may
be clearly demonstrated. In two cases, however, there is some evidence which can be seen as an indication of this.

The legend of St. Bega has already been discussed (see above, p.68). As we have seen, there is really no way of knowing if this is simply a product of the medieval imagination, or whether it incorporates an element of truth, even if only a testament to the actual existence of the saint. One way or another, however, quite a large quantity of Viking sculpture - the remains of five cross-shafts - are to be found in the vicinity or incorporated in the walling of the priory church. Some of this appears to have been incorporated into the original Norman fabric (Bailey, 1974, 11, 229-235). In 1951 and 1952, excavations were carried out by pupils of the nearby school 'to discover if any of the foundations of the old priory buildings still exist' (Last, 1952a, 192). A wall was found, deemed at the time to be 'either the west wall of the Chapter House or of its vestibule', and an entrance, presumably through the wall. This measured 3'9" (1.14 m.). There were bases for two columns on either side. No illustration of this doorway was made at the time, nor are there any plans of the excavation; but it was observed that the doorway had been 'built up' to cover the bases. The proposition that a later, wider doorway was built on top circa 1200 A.D. was put forward, but there seems to have been no actual evidence to support this. Alterations in monastic plans,
even at an early stage in the construction, are by no means unknown, and it is possible that the explanation offered at the time is the correct one; but one feature does suggest wider possibilities. It was observed during the excavations that the wall was not 'at a right angle to the church, as we would have expected the cloister to be'. This, combined with the narrow width of the doorway, might be an indication of an earlier, pre-conquest building, south of the priory church. The priory was founded c. 1125. It is clear, however, on the evidence of the Viking sculpture, that there was a church on the site before this. The wall and doorway may have formed part of an earlier church, but there is also the more intriguing possibility - not unlikely, in view of their positions and the shift in alignment - that they belong, not to the church itself, but rather to stone buildings associated with it. In this case a monastery is clearly indicated, and it is more likely, as we have already argued (see above, p.71), that such a monastery would have been founded in pre-Viking times than that it was a product of the tenth or early eleventh century. The case for an Anglo-Saxon monastery here is somewhat tendentious, it is true, but it must be remembered that there undoubtedly were many more such sites, which cannot now be identified. If the search for these is to start anywhere, St. Bees is surely at least a good place to begin.

Another site which may perhaps be pre-Viking in origin is St. John's Beckermet, although here the evidence is
very slight. It consists simply of the fact that the parish shares a name with nearby Beckermet St. Bridget. The usual interpretation of this is that here we are dealing with what was originally one parish later divided into two. Such divisions are common enough in modern times, but it is clear that in this case the division must be of some antiquity, as pre-Conquest sculpture is to be found at both parish churches. Analogies for this exist elsewhere; the two Anglo-Saxon churches of Bywell St. Andrew and Bywell St. Peter in Northumberland, for instance, one of which at least appears to incorporate seventh or eighth century work, bear close comparison, as they too are physically separated by only a short distance. It seems unlikely that two churches would have been necessary for the spiritual needs of the population in such a small area, and it is more probable that one at least was monastic - a proposal reinforced by the presence of an inscription on the Beckermet cross. Which such a subdivision could conceivably have taken place in Viking times, it seems more likely that this would have happened in the Anglo-Saxon period.
An attempt has been made in this chapter to assess what light Anglo-Saxon sculpture throws on the history of Cumbria, in the broadest sense. Thus its distribution, function, and associations have been discussed, rather than its iconography or ornament. The latter aspects have only really been dealt with in so far as they reveal more about the former. It has been shown that the almost total dearth of known secular settlement sites can be to a certain extent compensated for by a number of ecclesiastical sites which appear to share the same settlement pattern, and may themselves have formed foci for settlement. As yet much too little of a specific nature is known about these sites. There are good reasons for thinking that many were monasteries; but apart from the obvious point that present numbers are probably incomplete, we cannot really attempt to answer the most basic questions about them. There is no clue as to their size, or what population they supported; what their role in the community was, although generalizations from the historical evidence, or archaeological evidence elsewhere, can be made - it is clear, for example, that at Carlisle there was a Royal monastery, but we cannot be certain if the cross-fragments from Carlisle were produced from that particular monastery, although this seems extremely probable. Little enough can be suggested about economic life or means of subsistence, but there must have been a sufficient surplus to enable the payment or reward, or at the very least, the leisure-time, of skilled craftsmen.
Again, the physical appearance of the sites is largely a mystery, but there is evidence for contemporary stone churches, and, at one site, evidence for organized drainage or even a sanitation scheme. The sites were inhabited and used by people who could read and write, at least in the vernacular; and the crosses were sometimes set up by those who wished others to be aware of the fact.

The distribution of sites attests the widespread practice of Christianity in the eighth and ninth centuries, but this does not preclude the continuing practice of pagan rite. This must have been peripheral to the main areas of settlement, however. It must be remembered that even the earliest crosses probably postdate Cuthbert's activities in the west by a couple of generations. With the possible exception of Bewcastle, it is unlikely that any of the Cumbrian carvings are the products of a missionary church. They are, rather, the products of a settled and perhaps only moderately affluent community, churchyard crosses rather than testaments to pioneering zeal. Even the Dacre shaft cannot have been carved for nearly a century after the miracle of St. Cuthbert's relics there.

There is no evidence, in the sculptures themselves, for contact with an indigenous British Christian tradition. If any such was still present in the eighth century, there is no evidence that it ever produced any monumental carving of any kind. The general shortage of
datable, pre-Anglo-Saxon evidence of Christianity has already been observed - although it has been possible to draw attention to certain types of site which could be associated with some such system (Ch. 6). There is at least one point of contact, however, at Addingham; and although the early cross-slab here does not necessarily pre-date the Anglo-Saxon period in Cumbria, it does provide some evidence of the existence of such a tradition.

As we have seen, the documentary evidence for the Viking settlement in the north-west is negligible (see above, p. 75) but the place-name evidence confirms that it took place. On the archaeological side, although there is a fairly clear-cut division between the two styles, many new motifs and ideas being introduced, while earlier ones went out of fashion, none the less, it is clear that many Anglo-Saxon church sites continued in use. Although these may have ceased to function as monasteries, they continued in use as centres of Christian devotion, or were occasionally put to a pagan or semi-pagan use.

There is some chance that investigation of the ecclesiastical sites will lead to information about the elusive secular community. The possibilities for excavation are hard to assess, but there is a good chance, at least at some sites, that something will survive. Even if the area within the churchyard should prove too hopelessly disturbed by burials - and it is very
unfortunate that none of the sculpture is associated with a long deserted church\textsuperscript{14} - the area immediately adjacent may reveal traces of a secular community.

The amount of information to be gleaned from these sites at the moment is certainly meagre; but it can be said that valuable pointers to future work are apparent. A fuller picture must await the accumulation of a much larger body of data.
1. Carlisle Cathedral was originally an abbey. The re-selection of this site in the immediate post-Conquest period strongly suggests that the original site of the Anglo-Saxon church was still known precisely, even if not standing at this date (c.1123). This is not, of course, unusual — many medieval monasteries were sited on or near earlier predecessors — but in many cases there was at least a surviving church structure to indicate the place. No trace of such an early church has ever been noted at Carlisle; and, as we have already observed (see above, p.227), it is usually thought that the town was severely depopulated, if not actually deserted, between the late tenth and eleventh centuries.

2. The cross-fragment from Penrith was discovered in 1969; it remains unpublished. The fragment from Brigham was found in 1959 (Bailey 1960a).

3. The place-names mapped by Bailey are -ham, -ingham, -tun (selected), -ingtun and wic, but not boX, ceaster or burh (see above, p.102).

4. This information is based on the lists of pre-Conquest sculpture maintained in the Department of Archaeology, University of Durham, in connection with the forthcoming publication of a corpus of Anglo-Saxon sculpture from Durham and Northumberland.

5. There are no internal structures marked on this plan however.

6. e.g. Jarrow, Hexham, St. Augustine's, Canterbury.

7. The inscription on this cross is weathered and much of it is illegible; but what can be discerned is consistent with Petrie's reading of 'Colman Dorrioni in Chriessa or in Big Flaind' — 'Colman erected this cross for King Flann.' (Henry, 1964, 18)

8. That is, as the crow flies; but to travel by road from Dalston to Kirksteads by present routes would involve a journey of about 10 km.

9. The site of Knells, being doubtful, is omitted from the following discussion.
10. Beckermet St. Bridget may have been en route for a doubtful road, only a small part of the course of which is established, running south-west from Papcastle to Ravenglass - but there is no known evidence for this route for several miles in the vicinity of Beckermet St. Bridget church (O.S. 1956).

11. It is sometimes stated that the road continued on past the fort. Collingwood (W.G., 1924, 110-11) denied this but drew attention to an old road which passed the fort about 1 km. to the east, going north-west, which he thought to be medieval.


13. Rey Cross is now in Yorkshire (see Morris, 1977)

CHAPTER 8

The Evidence of Stray Finds

Although most archaeologists, with some justification, attach little significance to chance finds of material (i.e. objects without a proper archaeological context) the dearth of dateable material of the Early Christian period in Cumbria is such that any relevant discoveries should not be totally ignored. It is true that a study of chance finds is of limited value. In some instances it is possible that the material made its way to Cumbria in later times, and it is at least likely that some of it is Viking loot, brought from further afield, or else deposited or hoarded as a result of the Viking settlement, and therefore, strictly speaking, outside the scope of this study. The issue should not be prejudged, however; exotic objects may have been imported into Cumbria in pre-Viking times, and it must be borne in mind that Viking raids may have been frequent throughout the ninth century well before the settlement itself took place. Many of the Cumbrian finds are of intrinsic interest, while in other cases the find-place of the object is already potentially a post-Roman or Anglian site, and the chance find may be seen as corroborative evidence. For these reasons, all inadequately
contexted objects which may reasonably be assigned a date in the fifth to ninth centuries, and which were certainly or probably found in Cumbria, are briefly considered here. They are described, with references, in Appendix 10. The finds are divided into two groups, numismatic and non-numismatic, which will be dealt with separately.

The Numismatic Evidence

The coin evidence is, perhaps surprisingly, rather meagre. The standard inventory of early medieval coin hoards is Thompson 1956. For Cumbria, this summarises the evidence for the Kirkoswald hoard only. Many of the smaller or more obscurely published hoards escaped Thompson's notice and Metcalf has produced a valuable supplement (Metcalf 1960), which contains two further styca hoards from Cumbria, and two single finds. In addition, the writer has been able to find one or two other references to discoveries of Anglo-Saxon coins in Cumbria, and recent excavations in Carlisle have produced two sceattas, unfortunately both in unstratified, later medieval contexts (McCarthy 1978). Thus there is only one large hoard, although it is possible that some of the other finds are remnants of larger deposits.

The Kirkoswald hoard contained a total of 542 styca coins, as well as the silver ornament discussed below (p.330). The circumstances of the discovery are fairly precisely recorded (see Appendix 10a). The total comprised 99 coins
of Eanred, 350 of Aethelred, 14 of Redwulf, 15 of Osberht (all Northumbrian kings) and one of Eanbald, 58 of Wigmund, and 5 of Wulfhere (all Archbishops of York). Thompson dated the deposition to circa A.D.865 (1956, 81), Wilson, (D. M. 1964, 7,140) offers a date of c. A.D.855, presumably following Lyon (1956) who proposed that stycas were not minted in Northumbria after that date. Pagan, however, (1969) has revised this view, and holds that Osberht did not ascend the throne until circa A.D.862, and that his coinage spans the years A.D.862-5. This would mean moving the date of deposition of our hoard forward by about 10 years, to that originally proposed by Thompson.

Only six coins survive. These were donated to the Society of Antiquaries of Newcastle-upon-Tyne in 1814 (Donations, 1822,3) and are now in the University Museum. In the original register, these are referred to as being all of Eanred or Aethelred; in fact, one at least appears to be of Wigmund, and another is illegible. Two are of Eanred (Moneyers Gadveteis and Monne) and two of Aethelred (Moneyer Fordred or Eordred). All six are used, but none appears badly worn, with the possible exception of the Wigmund coin; this could be due to corrosion. The illegibility is due to corrosion or bad mutilation, or, in the case of the unreadable coin, to bad striking. However, the Eanred and Wigmund coins appear to be mutilated, with little bits chipped off the sides. This may also be true of the unreadable coin, but the Aethelred coins are whole.
There are three other hoards. That from Castle Head, or Atterpyle Castle, Grange-over-Sands (SD 422,798) is accepted by Metcalf (1960, 93-4) as of genuine antiquity, but for reasons to be given below, the present writer is more sceptical. The site is doubtfully that of a hillfort or defended or enclosed settlement of unknown date. The case for this seems to rest largely on the motley collection of finds from the spot allegedly found during the construction of the house of one John Wilkinson, circa 1830-40 - but something may also be implied by the place-name. Lists of finds from the site are quoted by various local historians, and as these differ considerably it is hard to know which is the most reliable; one may be borrowing or misquoting from another. Baines (1888-93, IV, 717-8) quotes among these finds a figure of ninety-five stycas of Northumbrian kings. Stockdale (1872, 223) only mentions five. The latter lived locally and is writing closer to the event, so his figure is probably more realistic. He even states that he had one of the coins in his possession, and that it read HAFDNE REX; MONNE. The king is certainly otherwise unknown as a minter of stycas, but the moneyer's name is quite plausible; it features on coins of kings Eanred, Aethelred II, Redwulf and Osberht. It may be, however, that we are not dealing with a Northumbrian styca at all, but with a Viking coin, perhaps similar to those found in the Cuerdale hoard (Blunt; 1961, 7; 8-10). Apart from this styca, all the finds apparently passed to a Liverpool dealer, and
have since disappeared (Stockdale, 1822, 223).

It is the other finds from the site which suggest that it may not be what it purports to be. Lengthy lists are given by both Stockdale and Baines, and such items as "teeth of Buffaloes" and "pieces of limestone resembling hens eggs", "75 Roman coins" and "imitations of muscles" (Baines) or "mussels" (Stockdale), spoons, forks and keys, moulds, and something "supposed by Mr. Wedgewood to be pottery or bone" can only raise the doubt that we are dealing with a typical Victorian antiquarian collection of odds and ends, of varying date and diverse origin, rather than with a site of unique longevity and multiple function. It may well be that there was an original collection of antiquities from Castlehead, but we have no guarantee that the stycas formed part of it. On the other hand, the next site to be dealt with is, as Metcalf has pointed out, only a couple of km. away, so the appearance of the stycas themselves in this part of the world is not in itself very odd.

The neighbouring site is Merlewood Cave, Grange-over-Sands (SD 411, 788). Seven stycas were found in a deposit of loose soil with stones, which also contained much animal and some human bone, in the course of "excavation" at the mouth of the Cave in 1892. Other finds included "several fragments of red and black pottery, apparently Roman", some bits of glass which fitted together, charcoal, and some rusted iron objects "which may be parts of rusted fibulae" (Swainson Cowper 1893a, 278). The present
whereabouts of any of these finds is unknown. Two of
the coins were illegible, and one of these was broken.
Of the remainder (see Appendix 10a for readings) one was
of Archbishop Wigmund - Moneyer Coenred - and one of
Eanred - Moneyer - Gadvteis. Three were coins of
Aethelred - moneyers Eardwulf, Fordred and Leofdegn - the
last named was apparently much blundered. Metcalf dates
the coins by this factor to the mid-ninth century. Yet
again we would appear to have an amalgam of finds of
different dates and implications, assuming that the
information about the pottery can be relied on, but
perhaps this is rather less extraordinary in a cave. There
are no obvious grounds for challenging the authenticity of
the deposit - it is difficult to imagine anyone deliberately
'salting' the site.

The last 'hoard' is not mentioned by Metcalf or
Thompson, and is very dubious. The only notice of it is
contained in Hutchinson's History of Cumberland (1794, i,
571) where it is observed that "broken battle axes of flint,
arrowheads, and coins of different people have been found,
many of them Roman, and some Saxon" at Walls Castle, which
is the bath house of the Roman fort at Ravenglass (SD 088,
958), a conspicuous site which stands even today to a
height of up to 4.00 m. This statement is the kind of general
summary of "ancient antiquities" that one would expect to
find in a work like this, and the apparent association of
flint axeheads makes one additionally suspicious; none­
theless, the distinction is firmly drawn between the Roman
and Saxon coins, so it is at least possible that some were found on the site, or in its general vicinity.

In addition to the hoards, there are also isolated single finds, all from Carlisle or its immediate vicinity. The most exotic of these is a Beneventan tremissis of Arachis II (Proceedings, 1892, 185), said to have been found 'near Carlisle' circa 1871-2. It was in the possession of Chancellor Ferguson in 1892, but its present whereabouts is, again, unknown. It is not in Tullie House. Metcalf (1960, 107) has suggested that another single find may have been actually found with this, but there seems to be no evidence for this. This coin is doubtful in the eyes of the present writer, without a proper record of its discovery. Whatever the chances of contact between Cumbria and Italy in the late eighth century, it is surely at least as likely that the coin represents a collected item, of much later deposition. Indeed, it is nowhere stated that it was actually found in the ground.

The other coin is an uninscribed sceatta, and therefore of eighth century date (Brooke Class 30) which was also found 'near Carlisle'. It is now in a private collection; and Gosling (1976, 172) has drawn attention to another uninscribed coin, also presumably a sceatta, attributed to Ecgberht, Archbishop of York (A.D. 735-766) found 'at Carlisle'. There are also the two sceattas found in the Blackfriars Street excavations of 1977, already noted.

This, then, is the sum total of the Anglo-Saxon coinage
of pre-Viking date in Cumbria. The Kirkoswald hoard is obviously the most important, and is also the easiest to interpret. There seem to be no reasons for doubting that it and other large hoards with a similar date of deposition reflect a quest for a safe hiding place for valuables during increasing Viking activity in the second half of the ninth century. The other hoards and finds are too doubtful or too small to provide the same kind of evidence, but it is noteworthy that the Merlewood coins, if they do represent a single group, cannot have been deposited before circa A.D. 850. This suggests, either that Viking activity was unimportant in the area before this date, and that there was therefore no need to hoard, or that the absence of coins reflects a genuine rarity.

On the other hand, it must be remembered that the Northumbrian coinage starts fairly late - circa A.D. 750, with the silver sceatta series. This continues until circa A.D. 790, when there is an apparent gap (Lyon, 1956, 230) until circa A.D. 820-30, when the stycas starts. The coinage from Eanred onwards is well represented, proportionately in the two Cumbrian finds for which we have full identifications. The total absence of the earlier, silver, coinage outside the Carlisle area is striking but perhaps not significant. These coins may have had a much more restricted circulation than the copper stycas, at least in the north west.
Non-Numismatic Evidence

Apart from the coins, most of the other finds are of ornamental metalwork. Some of the items are now lost, and without illustrations or adequate descriptions, it is impossible to be certain if these are really of Anglo-Saxon or post-Roman date but all the possibilities are included here. Where possible, illustrations are provided (pls. 8.1-8.14).

To start with the lost examples: The Brougham horn or cup mount (see above, p. 210) is at least sufficiently well known for a fairly positive identification, but other lost items are very dubious. Collingwood's reference (VCH 1901, 283) to "Saxon beads of glass and other ornaments, which may be seen at the Rectory" of Kirkbride is misleading. There is no evidence that he ever inspected the material himself, and it is most doubtful if his source (Whellan 1860, 248) can be trusted. Whellan seems to be the only authority for the 'Saxon' nature of the beads. Kirkbride is clearly a Roman site; several recent excavations (Birley, 1963; Bellhouse and Richardson, 1975) though admittedly of limited scale and purpose, have revealed pottery, and occupation and industrial levels of the first and early second centuries; a very small quantity of Roman sherds of a slightly later date; and sherds representing three medieval green-glazed vessels, from a disturbed part of the site. Roman glass - including beads
of the first or second century has been found and it is likely that this is the probable date of the so-called 'Saxon' material.

It is also doubtful if the pennanular ring from 'near Carlisle' confusingly cited later as a brooch (VCH, 1901, 282) really merits inclusion either. This was sent to the temporary museum set up in Carlisle in 1859 by the Rev. Tullie Cornthwaite, and is thus described in the Catalogue (Catalogue, 1859, 14):

"Massive ring, pennanular, formerly in possession of the Rev. Dr. John Waugh, and supposed to have been found near Carlisle. It appears to have been of copper or some other base metal, thickly plated with gold ... Diameter about \( \frac{3}{4} \) inch."

It is classed in the catalogue with "miscellaneous antiquities of early character, anterior to Medieval times". There is nothing that warrants an Anglo-Saxon date in the actual description, and indeed some of the other items considered Anglo-Saxon in VCH are certainly nothing of the kind. The brooch with Saxo-Gothic inscription, for instance (see below, p.423) and the so-called runic armlet from Aspatria (VCH, 1901, 283) which is clearly a find of prehistoric gold.

Another lost find may well be Viking; the main reason for including it here is simply because as it is now lost, it is impossible to be sure about this. It is described as a "good specimen of the Anglo-Saxon or Danish Battle Axe" (Addenda Antiquaria 1902, 418; 1904, 351).

The provenances of many of the items are very imprecisely known; this is especially irritating in cases
where this is of particular interest. The two objects from Moresby, for instance, might have come from the Roman fort; they could even have come from the vicinity of the ?Early Christian cemetery; but nothing is known of the circumstances of their finding. They were acquired by the British Museum from different people, at separate dates. The pin came with the Greenwell collection, in 1898; the spindle-whorl was donated in 1891 by Sir A. W. Franks. Both gentlemen were collectors on a grand scale, and could have obtained the items from dealers.

Three of the most interesting items - the sword handle with gold filigree panels and gold and garnet cloisonne, and the Crosthwaite mounts - are barely provenanced at all. The sword handle was acquired by the British Museum in 1876, from a dealer in Carlisle. The only record of its provenance is a pencilled note in the Museum Register, which reads "Found in Cumberland". The discs went to the Museum in 1870, when the Crosthwaite Museum collection was sold. Most (but not, apparently, all) of the material in that museum was local; but we cannot be sure if the mounts themselves are from Cumbria, though it seems unlikely that a small museum like this would have acquired such objects if they were exotic to the area. The decorative head from "near Furness" is also only vaguely provenanced.

One of the few objects whose find circumstances indicate a positively archaeological context is the Kirkoswald ornament. This was found with the large coin hoard discussed above, and the finding of the latter is
comparatively well described, although we cannot now locate the findspot precisely. It is occasionally thought that the Ormside bowl was loot in a Viking grave, but there is no real evidence for this. All we know is that it was found in Ormside churchyard ante 1823 when it was presented to the Yorkshire Philosophical Society. The fact that there is at least one documented Viking burial from the same churchyard (Ferguson, 1899) has coloured interpretations of the find, but it is at least possible that the bowl was one of the church treasures, buried to prevent it falling into Viking hands. There is no doubt that the object has undergone crude repair; but as it is no longer thought to be of Northumbrian manufacture anyway (see below, p.339) this would not have to have been at Viking hands, although this is perhaps the most plausible explanation.

The glass beads found in the Dog Holes cave, Haverbrack, came to light in the course of archaeological excavation (Benson and Bland, 1963) but the stratigraphy of the cave - as of all caves - was difficult to establish. The excavators did not detect the presence of occupation layers, although they did establish three 'Zones'. Unfortunately the finds themselves do not appear to have been related to the stratigraphy during the excavation. These were quite abundant; they consisted of the remains of at least twenty-three humans, as well as a large quantity of animal bone. In addition, there were several bracelets and a couple of finger rings, and some jet beads. The metalwork and stone beads were dated by
Elizabeth Fowler to a period from the first century BC to the third century AD, and are all of Roman type. The dating of all of the glass beads (but none of the other material) to the fifth to ninth centuries is therefore a little surprising; the present writer is not in a position to suggest a total revision of this dating but the date of these beads will receive further consideration below (p.337). The excavators did note that one of the glass beads was found with the Romano-British bracelets. However, a few sherds of unstratified medieval pottery were found in the cave fill, so it may be that the cave remained in use into later times. In any event, it seems clear that the finds span a fairly long period. The interpretation offered by the excavators was, that during the time when the beads were deposited the cave was probably a dog's den. They were of the opinion that all the human bone and artifacts had accumulated in the cave as a result of hillwash. The writer finds this rather hard to believe, but cannot suggest a viable alternative explanation, not having seen the cave in the course of excavation.

The Brougham mount has already been discussed (see above, p.210) with regard to Ninekirks. As has been shown, this does come from a context of a sort, but it is difficult to be sure if this is primary; it is included in Appendix 10b for the sake of completeness.

There is little point in attaching great significance to the distribution of finds when so many of the findspots
are unknown or uncertain, quite apart from the already arbitrary factors of survival or discovery. Nonetheless, it seems relevant here to expand slightly on the interest of the objects themselves, their dating, and one or two general points which deserve comment. The first is the presence of a few objects which are stylistically linked with the British, rather than the Anglo-Saxon world. The Meolsgate brooch, Moresby pin, Furness head and enamelled disc from the Crosthwaite Museum, are not products of English metalworkers, although this is not to say that they were of necessity made by Celts in Cumbria, or were not the property of Anglo-Saxons, for objects made under 'Celtic' influence are by no means unknown in Anglo-Saxon contexts elsewhere in England. It is not possible to date the finds with great precision but they are not all necessarily assignable to the period before the Anglo-Saxon settlement in the north-west.

The pin and brooch are evolved forms of late Roman types. The latter is classed by Fowler (1964, 138) as type Fl, and therefore made in Britain "during the primary settlement of the Anglo-Saxons" (Fowler, 104). Associated examples from elsewhere are found in late fourth to sixth century contexts; they have a fairly wide distribution in Britain and Ireland but there are fewer in the south and east. Hand pins proper have a fairly similar distribution and are often thought of as a characteristically Irish type, but Fowler has pointed out (1964, 125) that the distribution of proto-hand pins is more confined to northern
Britain, and suggests an origin for the series there, and a date in the late fourth and fifth centuries for their use (1964, 129).

The Furness head has received little attention from students of post-Roman material in Britain. Henry (1965, 113-4) refers to it briefly in a discussion of the human figure in Early Christian Irish metalwork. She considers the Furness head to be of Irish manufacture, and compares the treatment of the hair on the head to the hair on the human heads on the St. Germain plaques, which are normally dated to the late eighth or early ninth century. Close parallels for the head are, however, hard to find; indeed, we do not even know what its original function was; it was presumably part of a larger object. The circular concavity in the crown of the head, and the filling in of the back with lead, point to its use as a weight, although there is no dating evidence for this operation either. It is assumed by Dr. Henry that this use is secondary, but this may not be the case; a small head similarly hollowed, but backed with iron, was among the finds from excavations on Glastonbury Tor (Rahtz 1971, 54-5) which has been dated on stratigraphic grounds to the sixth century.

The gilt-bronze Crosthwaite disc, hitherto unpublished, is perhaps the most problematic of all the finds, and it is particularly unfortunate that its original provenance is uncertain. It is clearly a mount of some kind; it is decorated on one side only. It is slightly concave, which suggests that it may have been an internal mount at the

*It is noted in passing in Fell 1972.
base of a bowl or dish. The layout and decoration are simple: the mount consists of two concentric rings of four strand plait, each strand itself composed of three threads; the whole is very closely knit. All the interlace is plainly non-zoomorphic. This is usually considered 'Celtic' but was certainly in use in Northumbria in the late seventh century, as it is found in the Book of Durrow. There are parallels for this particular type of interlace in the mould fragments from the Mote of Mark (Curle, 1914, 149, Fig. 16, no. 2 for instance). The moulds are very fragmentary but do seem to be far more elaborately laid out pieces than the Crosthwaite disc, so the overall comparison is not necessarily very close. The Mote of Mark finds are usually thought to be late seventh century, and the result of the activities of incoming Northumbrians on the site (Graham-Campbell et al, 1976) but Laing (1975b) has argued for a date before 638, although his views have not found wide acceptance. Similar interlace is also found on the Caenby, Lincolnshire, mount, classed by Haseloff (1959) with a seventh century group, and on a mount from Allington Hill, Cambridgeshire (Meaney and Hawkes, 1970, pl. 71b) which has already invited comparison with the finds from the Mote of Mark (Graham Campbell et al, 1976, 50) and which shows close similarity in layout although here the bands of interlace are zoomorphic, and there are no beaded rings; there are also four interruptions in the external plait, and these appear to be functional. All of these finds have been dated on stylistic considerations to
the seventh century; and we may say that the gilt-bronze disc from Crosthwaite belongs with them. Indeed, it may be possible to recognise a specific group of bronze discs utilizing this dense plait - a similar mount found in Standal, Norway, has been published by Bakka (1964, 53).  

The enamelled disc from Crosthwaite Museum has never been properly published, although Kendrick (1936, 99) refers to it in connection with an escutcheon from Benniworth, Lincs. He places the latter, with the Winchester hanging-bowl, circa A.D. 600, and implies that the Crosthwaite disc, with its 'cold, logical sketches' is a stylistic development from it. Haseloff (1959, 78) quotes Kendrick on this, but appears to group all three items together. Fowler (1968, 308) identifies the piece as type IV - "Durrow spiral patterns and red and yellow enamel" (1968, 297) and assumes it to be from a hanging bowl. She makes no attempt to date it closely. The piece is not included in Longley's more recent list of hanging bowls and their escutcheons (Longley, 1975).

The beads from Haverbrack pose another problem. It would appear that they are relatively undiagnostic, and it would be unwise to attempt to distinguish between Anglo-Saxon and 'Celtic' beads without a full study of the material for the whole country, which is lacking in print at the moment. Beads are very common artifacts on Anglo-Saxon cemeteries; they are understandably less well known from other sites, being presumably prized as ornaments and not left lying about. It is very likely that
both Celtic and Anglo-Saxon craftsmen drew largely on the same source of raw material, i.e. Roman residual or imported glass cullet. Most of the beads from Haverbrack were of blue or blue-green glass, translucent or opaque. However, one bead was very distinctive. It was segmented, of yellow glass, and apparently gilded, with 'striations along the axis which may have been filled with a contrasting colour' (Benson and Bland, 1963, 65). This type of bead has been the subject of a recent study (Boon, 1977). It is frequently found in Roman contexts, but it can also occur on post-Roman sites; there is a typical example from a well-stratified Saxon context at Jarrow, for instance.8

The affinities of the remaining items are all Anglo-Saxon. The axe head was identified as being potentially Anglo-Saxon at the time of its discovery, and as it is now lost, this will have to stand by default. Of the remaining pieces, the sword handle has been dated to the early seventh century because of the use of gold and garnet cloisonné (British Museum, 1923, 23). This technique is a little surprising so far north and west, but the handle may be an import; the combination of gold and garnet decoration with spiral filigree very similar to that on the Cumberland handle is found on objects from White Low, Derbyshire - a cross and a silver-gilt disc (Ozanne, 1964, fig. 11, pl.IV E and D). The technique is known in Northumbria in a slightly later context, however, the pectoral cross of St. Cuthbert, which has been considered to be a local product (Bruce Mitford, 1956, 325).
The Brougham mount has recently been reconsidered by Bailey (1978). He points out that there are close parallels between the mount and the art of the Book of Kells, and observes that the mount is in fact the only piece of metalwork in the Hiberno-Saxon style which has actually been found in Northumbria. He does not necessarily think that it is of Northumbrian manufacture, and rather favours a Pictish origin.

The Kingmoor ring is rather large for a finger (2.7 cm. diam.) although it is possible that it was meant to be worn over a glove. The Bramham Moor ring in the British Museum is slightly larger, however (2.9 cm.) and it is possible that both of these rings, which bear apparently meaningless inscriptions in runes, were never intended to be worn. Prof. Wilson (1959) considers them to have been amulets, and suggests that the formulae are magical. The ring is dated by the use of an early type of niello to the ninth century (Wilson, D.M., 1959, 166; 1964, 139).

As already discussed, the date of deposition of the Kirkoswald ornament is fairly well fixed by the date the associated coin hoard, to circa A.D. 855/865. Prof. Wilson has dated its manufacture to the eighth century (Wilson, D.M., 1964, 17-19). The use of a garnet in the surviving boss - and presumably also in the damaged ones - is apparently unusual at this late date. Wilson maintains that the piece is of 'insular' origin, but leaves its affinities open, because there are too few items which parallel some of the techniques used.
The Ormside bowl is undoubtedly one of the most important pieces of Anglo-Saxon metalwork found in North Britain. For a long time it was considered to be of Northumbrian manufacture (e.g. Kendrick, 1938, 150), but fuller consideration by Bakkø (1964, 17-18) has stressed its connections with Mercian metalwork and it is now generally accepted (e.g. Cramp, 1968) that it is a Mercian piece. The bowl is usually dated to the eighth century and the crude later repairs to the Viking period, as we have already seen.

Of similar date is the pin from Birdoswald. This is clearly part of a set of three pins, linked together; it has a perforation on the right side of the head plate. This is definitely an Anglo-Saxon type; there is one other example from Northumbria - the pin from Roos, in Yorkshire. It has been dated by Cramp to the eighth century (Cramp, 1964).

The Brough buckle was distinguished from the Roman finds in the same collection by the fact that it has a curved tongue. Largely on this basis; Collingwood (R.G., 1931, 83) identified it as Anglo-Saxon, but suggested that it might not actually have come from the Roman fort at Brough, but rather that it had been included with them by mistake. It is true that Anglo-Saxon buckles do generally have curved tongues, but the writer has been unable to find close Anglo-Saxon parallels for the back-plate. In form, the Anglo-Saxon examples of these tend to be square, rectangular or triangular although there is
a wide range of shapes and also of decoration. The buckle's decoration is hardly diagnostic; the ring and dot ornament is common on Roman bronzes but is also found on Anglo-Saxon objects. Its affinities are thus somewhat ambiguous, but it can probably be included, if only provisionally, as an Anglo-Saxon stray-find from Brough-under Stainmore. A date early in the period - or at least ante A.D. 700 - would seem most plausible.

Anglo-Saxon spindle-whorls await systematic study. Most are known from the context of pagan graves, and are frequently made of bone, chalk or stone as well as glass. The Moresby spindle-whorl is apparently a perfectly acceptable example, although the use of three colours renders it more elaborate than most.9

The cursory treatment meted out to stray finds here may seem over-superficial and brief. Many of the items could properly form the subject of a dissertation in themselves. However, the primary aim of this thesis is not to demonstrate the variety, interest, or typological relationships of individual artifacts or ornaments, but rather to collect together data which could illuminate the history of Cumbria in the period. The capacity of stray finds in this respect is not great. A dozen or so objects forming a chance scatter on a map adds little more than we already know - corroborative evidence, perhaps, but no more. Indeed it should come as no surprise to us to find some objects of the period. One might perhaps, more properly,
ask why there is so little rather than so much; but here we must remember the point stressed at the beginning - we are only dealing with a map of the evidence which survives - not a true distribution map.
Notes

1. Although recent work suggests a definite lull, in both Ireland and Britain, between the initial raids at the end of the eighth century and the 840s, or even later. See Morris, 1977a, 82-3; Hughes, 1966, 199.

2. Discussion of the Brougham hoard is omitted in this section, since the notion that this is 'Dark Age' would appear to be no longer tenable. See above, p 210 for discussion.

3. Most of the material (a total of 35 items) obtained by the British Museum is provenanced; and all of the provenanced material comes from Cumbria with the exception of a group of Roman material from Kingsholm, Gloucestershire.

4. Miss Clare Fell, who did see the site in the course of excavation, has suggested to the writer that there may have been actual burials in the cave.

5. I am grateful to Dr. Richard Bailey for drawing my attention to this.

6. Fowler, erroneously gives this disc a 'Westmorland' provenance.

7. A full corpus by Mrs. Margaret Guido is in the press.

8. I am grateful to the excavator, Prof. R. J. Cramp, for this information.

9. I am grateful to Ms. Leslie Webster for this information.
CONCLUSION

Our view of the post-Roman centuries has undergone considerable modification of recent years, and it is at least realized that there were a variety of responses to the changing circumstances of the period. No simple theories will do: we know that we can no longer draw conclusions about East Anglia from our knowledge of what was happening in Kent; that each of the Anglo-Saxon kingdoms was a separative and distinctive entity. Likewise, we can no longer generalise about the fate of "The British Church", "Romano-British survival" or "settlement continuity". Each area must be considered on its own merits, as a separate problem. It would seem fatuous to any normal, intelligent person to draw long term and widespread conclusions on the basis of a single site, a single reference, or a single pollen diagram. Nonetheless, archaeologists have acquired bad habits. We may be aware that each site, field monument or stray find represents a unique set of circumstances, but the poverty of material culture and relevant information, forces us into the logical fallacy of abstracting from the few to the many.

It may seem that the task of reconstructing any kind of valid picture of Early Christian Cumbria on the basis of
the material surveyed in the preceding chapters is a hopeless one. Our knowledge of Roman Cumbria is very far from comprehensive, and as we have shown, most issues still require constant reappraisal in the light of new evidence, but it is at least possible to set the problems within some kind of general framework, for Roman Britain in general. For the immediate post-Roman period the situation elsewhere is almost as poorly documented as that in Cumbria, and although in some areas it is possible to postulate certain lines of development - the use or re-use of certain types of settlement and abandonment of others, and to suggest some kind of political and social framework for the material and documentary evidence, it is difficult to translate this interpretation into Cumbrian terms, where the settlements, material culture and documents may be very different. This is not to say that Cumbria was unique, but rather that we do not know how different it was. Likewise, models used to reconstruct 'Anglo-Saxon England' are not necessarily relevant to the expanded kingdom of Northumbria, both because of the projected nature of the Anglo-Saxon settlement here, and the period at which it took place. At the same time it is impossible to derive a model independently, from Cumbrian evidence alone. We are forced back to the very position from which we try to escape: many major issues are impossible to tackle on a regional basis, simply because we do not have enough data to present proper regional studies. With regard to technology, for instance, generalizations can only be made with regard to what is known from elsewhere.
We are simply not in a position to identify the regional differences which may or may not exist. Again, political and social institutions are still largely a matter of conjecture, not based on internal evidence, but rather on inferences drawn from what are deemed to be parallel situations elsewhere.

The sudden poverty of material culture is itself the most striking and dramatic break with the Roman world. This can be explained to a certain extent by the methods by which it has or has not been recovered, but it is nonetheless striking and is by no means unique to Cumbria. The collapse of the Roman pottery industry and the disappearance of a great range of other material happens everywhere. Although some types of post-Roman metalwork are identifiable, the general impression conveyed is that everyone had much less of everything. We will, perhaps, never fully understand why the alteration in the pattern of material culture was so complete, but at least in Cumbria, it can hardly be explained by the arrival of hoards of incoming Saxons since their appearance was not for another two centuries. Cumbria is usually seen at the end of the Roman system of markets, roads and re-distribution, and it may be that we have seriously underestimated the latter's importance. Alternatively, we may be attaching far too much social significance to the rapid disappearance of Roman material culture; although, other factors - the emergence of local kingdoms, the disappearance of centralised government and a unified church - do suggest that society and economy was organized
on a regional rather than a centralized system; and the disappearance of coinage must have had far-reaching effects. If barter was the only means whereby goods could be exchanged the potential for trade, both internal and external, is severely reduced. There is no indication that supplies of pottery, metal tools, weapons, and personal ornament available in the Roman period were in any sense replaced by imported Anglo-Saxon goods from other parts of Britain. Indeed the total absence of imported Anglo-Saxon artifacts of the fifth and sixth centuries is remarkable, and does suggest that the channels of trade were considerably more physically circumscribed than they had been before; although it can of course be argued that since our knowledge of Anglo-Saxon material culture of this date is still based almost entirely on grave-goods from cemeteries, and since these are in any case absent from Cumbria, the absence could be accounted for in other ways.

There nonetheless remains an interval of time of at least two centuries before the Anglo-Saxons made significant inroads into the north-west. This period is at the moment, as we have demonstrated, an almost total archaeological blank. In terms of dateable artifacts, we are confined to the stray finds from Moresby and Meolsgate, and even these are only potentially, rather than certainly, of post-Roman date. There is also the Addingham slab; but this could belong to a later period. We have suggested that rural settlement probably continued in the same form as before, largely because we can see no convincing evidence of radical
alteration or mass abandonment of sites, and partly simply because the population must have lived somewhere. We have proposed that there were probably a variety of settlement forms in use contemporaneously: some isolated farmsteads, some small nucleated clusters - proto 'villages' like Ewe Close and Severals. In addition to these two forms, we have suggested that there may well have been others - temporary or seasonal dwellings, or unenclosed timber structures - not easy to detect archaeologically; and that perhaps a relatively small percentage of the population occupied, or re-occupied strongly defensible sites, perhaps, again, on a seasonal basis, although the scarcity of this type of site, and its very limited distribution hints that there may well have been other settlement forms which fulfilled the function of central place, court, or administrative centre, in certain areas. In any event, it is clear that the known distribution of native sites should not be taken as reflecting the true spatial pattern of sites for Iron Age, Roman, or post-Roman settlement.

We cannot recover the 'true' settlement pattern of this period. The pattern that we 'observe' is one that we ourselves make, by linking often quite unrelated scraps of information. Even at our most optimistic, we can only hope for a larger collection of fragments which will enable us to make more informed guesses. We make what we hope to be reasonable assumptions about the range of possibilities before us. Thus, it seems reasonable to infer that Roman forts and their associated _vici_ were abandoned, because
they no longer fulfilled any essential function. If Cumbria was almost, or totally, cut off from external markets, then it can be inferred, as a corollary, that the economy was more or less self sufficient. We have seen (above, p.150) that it has been proposed that even in Roman times, the economy of the Frontier Zone was not necessarily dependent on external supplies of foodstuffs, so it may be that this is simply a continuation of a trend already powerful before A.D.410; but there are several factors which, if taken together, allow us to postulate a more forceful view of this development, in spite of the paucity of archaeological data.

We really have no idea of what the population of Britain or its various components was at any stage before Domesday and for Cumbria we must wait until the seventeenth century for anything approaching a capita count of inhabitants. Many assessments using different methods of varying degrees of reliability, have been made, and what is perhaps the most authoritative of recent years (Brothwell, 1972) stresses that we must both stay within reasonable limits of inference, and aim at a range of probability rather than a fixed figure. Frere has estimated the population of Roman Britain at over two million (Frere, 1974, 350). It is assumed that it was densest in the "Lowland Zone" - we have no unitary estimate for Cumbria. In many ways it is more meaningful to argue relatively rather than in terms of actual numbers; and to attempt to observe population expansion or contraction, rather than arrive at a hard statistic.
For example, it is possible to postulate an overpopulation of any particular area when we see that settlements are pushed further and further onto less and less desirable land. It may be that the settlement sites in the Cumbrian uplands are the result of a rapid population expansion rather than a climatic optimum which made cultivation profitable at a higher level than ever before.

One might draw a parallel for the use of poor land in modern times; the gross overpopulation of marginal land in Ireland in the eighty or so years preceding the Irish Potato Famine of 1845-9. In this case, the retreat from the 'badlands' was very rapid once disaster struck; the population of the whole county fell by about 25% in the ensuing ten years, through starvation, disease, and emigration. In the West, it has been declining ever since. The 'archaeological' evidence both for overpopulation and its consequences can be seen in the abandoned and roofless drystone cottages, with their small attached plots, empty since the nineteenth century, which litter the countryside in the west and southwest. Again, a similar process of depopulation of marginal land can be seen in the Highland Clearances, and for a complementary reason, in the conversion of much arable land to sheep pasture in Britain after the Black Death.

Other evidence for population expansion may be seen in widespread clearance phases. As has been clearly shown (see above, Fig. 1.1) we already have evidence for a prolonged clearance spanning the third to sixth centuries in southern Cumbria; and there is also a hint that at least some of our
marginal sites were in use in this period (see p. 147). If we connect all these threads we may reasonably attempt to fill some of the void of the fifth and sixth centuries. We can only speculate as to what may have caused the regrowth of trees visible in the pollen diagrams and the contraction of settlement observable archaeologically. Overpopulation usually carries the seeds of its own destruction for a rural community, but the process may have been aided by war or disease - the sixth century plague should not be forgotten. The Anglo-Saxons may have done their best to decimate the rural population; alternatively, they may have moved into a natural power vacuum.

At the same time, we must not forget the great elements of continuity in the landscape. A chronological framework may be essential but neat chronological compartments are to be avoided. We have already observed that field systems which predate present ones cannot be simply assumed to be prehistoric faute de mieux; even if many field systems have a prehistoric origin this does not prevent their continuing usage. A system will remain in use until it is abandoned or replaced by another. It is only by removing each development in turn that we will ever get back to original forms. If we accept that innovation in land use is most likely to be functional, then it follows that even if the ownership of land changes, the landscape is most likely to remain unaltered until there is some sound economic motive for re-organization. If we must think in terms of chronological brackets, then we can say that the Early Christian landscape
is the successor to the prehistoric and Roman landscape; but in practice it may not have appeared any different. Our knowledge of settlement is divorced from detailed information, and many features of earlier landscapes - systems of unenclosed fields, for instance - are lost irrecoverably once they cease to be used. Only conclusions of the most nebulous kind are possible.

The picture which we have of the Anglo-Saxon settlement of Cumbria is rather different from that elsewhere, but we must consider if this is not simply because the settlement happens later, rather than that it is essentially different in kind. We are not going to find abundant early place-names, and numerous and populous pagan cemeteries full of characteristically Anglo-Saxon artefacts, if at the time Cumbria was settled the Anglo-Saxons were in any case burying their dead in anonymous Christian graves and calling their homesteads by other names - there are plenty of settlement names which could well belong to the late seventh century. Nonetheless, the main obstacle to this proposition is to be found, not so much from the internal evidence in Cumbria, but rather, in the nature of the Anglo-Saxon settlement of Northumbria, or more especially, Bernicia. The frontiers of Northumbria were constantly expanding from the late sixth to the early eighth century. The English population may have been expanding too, but hardly at the kind of rate which would have made this sort of progression imperative. We have no reason to think that they possessed a superior technology or a superior level of social organization, and
we therefore suspect that this expansion was largely territorial aggrandisement, rather than the extinction of one population and its replacement by another. In any case, the relative paucity of Anglo-Saxon material from Bernicia suggests that the inland areas were never intensely settled, even within the pagan period.

If we view the kingdom of Northumbria as an institution which had to a large extent already incorporated a subservient British population, and could in turn happily absorb the Christian Churches of both Aidan and Wilfrid, then the integration of other, non Anglo-Saxon elements should come as no surprise. What we must account for are, as it were, the losses on the other side. The British in Cumbria lost their sense of identity, and their own rulers; their language, and at least some of their institutions.

We have seen that the British and the English were both conscious of their own separateness (above, p. 54). The distinction between them was at least linguistic, but to what extent it was based on a sense of racial identity is a moot point. Ethnic consciousness is frequently determined by current social mores and circumstances rather than strict heredity. Often it is a sense of identity rather than a person's origin which determines to which group they will belong. The hereditary factor should not, however, be underestimated; it is clear that in both societies kinship was of great importance — an essential foundation to the legal system of compensation and protection. We must still consider, however, that the views and attitudes
expressed in the Armes Prydein Vawr on the one hand and Bede on the other may well reflect only the attitudes of the upper echelons of society. The loss of Britain to the English may well have seemed complete in terms of land ownership, but was hardly so in terms of those who farmed it. Land may well have been the source of all wealth; but to those without wealth, the difference between a Saxon and a British overlord may have been unimportant. Both the English and Welsh social systems incorporated a large percentage, perhaps even a predominance, of bondmen and slaves.

The most striking and certain change within Cumbria in the period is the replacement of a British language by English as common speech; and the replacement of British rulers by English ones. We cannot be really sure if this replacement was total by the end of the ninth century; an outside limit can only be certainly drawn in the twelfth century; but we must remember that in the tenth and eleventh century Cumbria was apparently repopulated by British speakers from Strathclyde, and that these may well be responsible for its late survival in some areas, rather than the original British population. This apparently rapid loss of language is perhaps the most difficult of all factors to comprehend, without recourse to old theories of genocide. Many recent replacements of one language by another seem to be due to the use of the predominant one in schools and places of work; but this is hardly translatable as an analogy in terms of Early Christian Cumbria. There was obviously some degree of social mobility and
intermarriage, which would have resulted in a degree of bilingualism; but it seems impossible to draw a direct equation between the scale of a conquest, invasion, or settlement, and the speed at which the native language of the area will disappear. It does seem certain, however, that once a language has declined to a certain point, its total elimination is virtually inevitable. Language revivalists are a relatively recent phenomenon, and most people speak in order to be understood. If one's speech is only comprehensible to a small percentage of ones acquaintance one will probably feel the necessity of learning how to talk to everybody else. If we are unwilling to accede to theories of genocide, then we must acknowledge that the loss of the British language remains perhaps the most enigmatic aspect of Cumbrian history.

We have considered what might be termed the British losses. It is opportune now, to inspect the evidence for survival. At the most basic, anthropological level, recent work on blood-groups in the British Isles (Potts, 1976) suggests that the survival of a substantial pre-Saxon population in the north-west was very probable. Commenting on the high occurrence of genotype r in the Lake District, Potts observes that this is probably due to the survival of an indigenous Celtic population, and suggests that "in Durham and the Lakes about three-quarters of the ancestors of the present population must have been here in Roman times" (Potts, 1976, 249). His methodology has been severely criticised however (Sunderland, 1976) and it would
appear that much of the value of the work depends on assumptions about what are 'Celtic' blood group traits. In addition, the samples used may not be representative. If Potts is correct then his evidence is obviously of the greatest relevance, but since we cannot be sure of the former, we must resist the temptation to consider the problem solved, and revert to the material we have studied in the foregoing chapters.

It is clear that from at least the late sixth century the North British were collectively attempting to drive the Anglo-Saxons out of their territory; that they lost the struggle, and that by at least the late seventh century Cumbria was ruled by Northumbrian kings, organised by a Northumbrian church, and settled, at least in the higher ranks of society, by people with English names. We hear nothing more of Britons in Cumbria from the time of Bede onwards, with the exception of the late reference to the Britons of Cartmel (Hinde, 1868, 141) and, of course, the later Britons of the tenth century. There is no indication of a surviving British church.

With regard to onomastic evidence, it would appear that early British place-names had to all intents and purposes disappeared by the time that we get any documentary record of place-names. Those that survive are largely natural features, although it must be noted too that Cumbria has a relatively high percentage of British river names, compared to the rest of England, and that there are a small number of English names which point to British settlements.
The environmental data is pitifully sparse and not subjectable to analysis in terms of Britons and Saxons; but this does indicate a recession of arable and pasture which might coincide with or precede the Anglo-Saxon settlement.

It may be that the estate system of Cumbria as observed in the middle ages, is derived from a basically British system; and that some forms of tenure which go with these estates may also derive from British custom. However, these remain controversial topics of a rather speculative nature.

It is doubtful if the archaeological evidence can be brought to bear on the matter at all. In concrete, material terms it is virtually impossible to identify two sorts of people. There are as yet no identified characteristics of settlement type, no distinctive pottery types, no typologies of artefacts. There are only a few stray finds and fewer grave-goods to which ethnic affinities may be attached, and some of these may well have been traded from elsewhere.

Nonetheless, we can of course theorise and speculate in terms of general probability. We have already discussed the possibility that we might expect the British to continue living in their own sort of settlements, and the incoming Anglo-Saxons to establish the kind of settlements to which they were accustomed in the north-east; but the true situation may have been much more complicated. Even if it were possible to isolate contemporary 'British' and 'Anglo-Saxon' settlement forms - and we are certainly not
in a position to do so in Cumbria at the moment - how can we be sure that either group was incapable of utilizing the settlements of the other? It may be that the British abandoned their own settlements and adopted Anglo-Saxon forms; alternatively English speakers may have lived in British-type settlements. It may be possible to identify 'characteristically' Anglo-Saxon settlements elsewhere - clusters of timber halls with associated grubenheuse, as at Chalton for example; but we have no guarantee that those who had settled in Bernicia and Deira conformed to this pattern. They may have adjusted to a pattern of dispersed settlement; and structural evidence alone is hardly conclusive. 'Timber halls' have a lifetime of four or five millennia in Britain and Ireland.

Increasingly it is clear that we cannot typify ethnic affinities in an archaeological sense. The search for the elusive post-Roman population tends to become increasingly divorced from the realities of human behaviour when we try and define our objectives, in terms of material culture. A recent study (Faull, 1977) has attempted to isolate potentially Romano-British elements in the pagan Saxon cemeteries of Deira. Faull's criticism of the relevance of much archaeological data is very pertinent. She is sceptical, for instance, of the value of isolating certain pottery techniques, and observes that the so-called Romano-British techniques are unknown in the ceramic repertoire of Roman Yorkshire and that it is perhaps best to regard these "simply as variants of normal Anglo-Saxon pottery"
(Faull, 1977, 3). She is also suitably dubious about the ethnic affinities of metalworking techniques and forms of artifact, although there is little relevant material in her area. It is doubtful if the criterion on which she bases her own judgement is really preferable to those which she deems suspect, however.

Holding that "Continuity of ritual provides stronger evidence for survival than continuity of manufacturing technique", she attempts to identify "typical" British ritual burial forms and then proceeds to observe the phenomena which she has defined in several cemeteries which have hitherto been seen as exclusively cemeteries of the intrusive Anglo-Saxon population. She consequently proposes that these cemeteries were used by both British and Anglo-Saxon populations alike; and isolates areas where there are cemeteries which have a relatively high percentage of 'British' interments as regions where Romano-British survival was an important factor.

Firstly, it is doubtful if her initial premise, if correct, is quite as simple to assess archaeologically as she proposes. The aspects of funerary ritual which she selects are, principally, the position and orientation of the body, but there are factors which are at least partly controlled by non ritual considerations. Clarke's discussion of this problem in connection with the problem of identifying intrusive Germanic graves in late Roman cemeteries is relevant here:
"Of the other elements of funerary rite, the means of conveying the body, the position of the body, the grave-pit, and cemetery-organization are more difficult to evaluate, but in some measure at least it is clear that they are connected with the functional side of removing the dead. Thus, the body has to be conveyed to its grave, it has to be laid out, a pit of some kind is usually required to accommodate the body or its burnt remains, and a cemetery has to be organized to prevent the recently buried from being inadvertently disinterred. These aspects will of course also be the product of ritual and tradition, especially as regards matters of detail, but it is difficult to know to what extent and in what manner these details operate, and this makes interpretation difficult."

(Clarke, 1975, 52)

Clarke selects grave furniture as the most hopeful indicator of intrusive social groups. Faull comments on the utility of this, but her own analysis of grave ritual rests heavily on the more doubtful value of orientation.

Secondly, even if we could use alignment as a sure guide, it is doubtful if we could use Ms. Faull's selected alignment of north-south as characteristically British, or her judgement that east-west is characteristically Anglo-Saxon. Again, Clarke has usefully analysed how we should approach the problem of intrusive forms:

"First, the archaeological material in question must have no parallel or antecedent in the context to which it is said to be intrusive. Secondly, it must have many such parallels and antecedents in the area whence the people involved are supposed to have come. Third, the material must have demonstrably become assimilated over time into the context to which it was initially foreign."

(Clarke, 1975, 48)

We must ask ourselves if Ms. Faull's criteria fulfill these requirements.
Firstly, it is clear that east-west orientation, our supposedly diagnostic Anglo-Saxon trait, is frequently found in Romano-British cemeteries. At Lankhills, for instance (the site which Clarke used for his analysis) virtually all of the graves, which appear to date from the early fourth to the early fifth century, were aligned with their heads to the west. Other cemeteries show a wide range in orientation, through all points of the compass. It could be argued that in the Frontier Zone - although Deira can hardly be considered a part of this! - one might expect a rather different picture for the native population in this area, but in practice we have far too little material to make a fruitful analysis. What seems fairly clear, however, is that we do not have an independent tradition of burial in cemeteries for the majority of the population. It is hardly legitimate to use isolated and selected examples of certain types of burial from Roman fort cemeteries when we are supposedly analysing the 'native' tradition. Such graves as there are outside the contexts of forts are extremely rare and isolated phenomena. The notion that the 'normal' ritual associated with native interment in northern Britain involved some rite which is archaeologically undetectable, remains true today. In any case, it is clear that the North British considered themselves Christian in the sixth century (see above, p. 56) and it is even more difficult to account for their willingness to be buried in unhallowed pagan Saxon cemeteries.
Thirdly, even if we were to concede that Ms. Faull's identification of Romano-British traits is correct, we cannot demonstrate that these were outside the run of normal Anglo-Saxon burial. Indeed, her own data shows that this is manifestly not the case. The relatively high instance of north-south orientation in East Yorkshire can surely be accounted for as a variation within the normal Anglo-Saxon population. There is by no means uniformity elsewhere — many regions show 'local' tendencies in burial form; a preference for inhumation or cremation, or for mixed cemeteries for instance. She makes some play on the fact that cist burial is a British form, but stone cists are known in Germanic cemeteries on the continent, and are, if not exactly common, at least by no means unknown elsewhere in Britain.

Ms. Faull's study may be seen as a brave attempt to account for the superficial disappearance of the Romano-British population. It seems most unlikely, however, even if they had survived in large numbers, that we would expect to recover evidence of this in Anglo-Saxon cemeteries. We must look elsewhere.

We find, at the end of this investigation, that we know relatively little about the post-Roman environment; that the documentary evidence is extremely sparse, and often very ambiguous; that the interpretation of place-names is uncertain; and that our ignorance of Roman and Viking Cumbria is hardly less than that of the period in-between.
We may see archaeological, environmental, and perhaps settlement studies as the most hopeful avenue for the future; but it is important that work in these fields should proceed in the right direction, if we are to make real progress. An organised programme with specific objectives is required.

It is expected that the scale of excavation will increase dramatically in both quality and quantity in the next few years. The setting-up of the Department of the Environment Urban Rescue Unit at Carlisle, and, most especially, the current programme of excavation in the Lanes area, will, at a minimum, provide some kind of coherent picture of the archaeological sequence of settlement in the city; and it is not unreasonable to hope for some real clarification of the nature of post-Roman settlement in the town. The Rescue Unit for Lancashire and Cumbria should also augment the meagre amount of data available for consideration; but it is doubtful if these two projects, although they are certainly a vast improvement on the former situation, are themselves enough. The exigencies of rescue excavation will not necessarily permit excavation to be geared towards the tackling of general archaeological problems. We must also select priorities in terms of research excavation.

Initially, we would call for more information about sites of which we know little. Thus, we would seek the extensive excavation of a Roman vicus, and an analysis of the process of abandonment - an opportunity sadly missed at Old
Penrith quite recently; at least one (and hopefully more than one) excavation of a suitable and promising hillfort; and the detailed examination of at least one undoubted church site. The realization of all of these projects is quite feasible, apart from the problem of funding, which is presumably not insuperable.

At a more general level, we would hope for improved techniques of excavation on many 'native' sites, and the total excavation of at least a couple. It is sad to think that the totally destructive nature of much modern development finds no fellow in the determination of archaeologists, who are usually forced to be content with a highly selective sample. We must hope, also, for the correction of other areas of imbalance; for more publication of fieldwork, and more aerial photography, in areas hitherto neglected. Outside archaeology, we should aim at more detailed surveys of the surviving pattern of settlement, and of earlier patterns which survive in sufficient detail to present a coherent picture. The concentration of environmental work in the Lake District should be balanced by a correspondingly close analysis of many other areas. Improvements in methodology in all disciplines should lead to great progress in our ability to draw rational conclusions based on a more rigorous analysis of the bias of our information. We can never hope for a 'true' picture of Early Christian Cumbria; but we can hope for a more solid foundation for the theories of the future.
APPENDIX 1

British habitational names, and other names which indicate British settlements

Names plotted:

British Names

Caer: Parish name: Carlisle; Castle Carrock
Other settlement name: Cardew; Cardunnock; (i.e. not parish or township) Cardullan; Carmalt
Not referring to modern settlement: Cardonneth Pike (peak on Cumnew Fell); Caerthannoc (hillfort)

cil: Parish name: Culgaith: Gilcrux
(i)lan: Parish name: Lamplugh
blaen-dre: Township name: Blennerhasset
buarth: Township name: Burtholme
tref: Other settlement name: Triermain
Other names which indicate British Settlements:

O N names: township name: Birkby (Crosscannonby) 
other settlement name: Birkby Hall, Briscoe 
not referring to modern settlement: Birkby (Muncaster)

O E names: Other settlement name: ?Walton Hall, 
Cummersdale

Lost place names (not plotted)

carer: Caraverick (Hesket in the Forest)
tref: Trerankelborhan (Mansergh)
O N: Britscoghenges (Cliburn)
O E: ? Walton Cote (Dalton)

Not plotted:

Brethstrette: (name of High Street, the Roman road 
from Ambleside to Brougham)
APPENDIX 2

British non-habitational names

Names plotted:

Names in which all elements are probably or certainly British:

Parish name: Arthuret; Cumrew; Dacre; Penrith; Solport

Township name: Blencarn; Blencogo; Blindcrake; Catterlen; Cumdivock; Drumburgh; Parton; Redmain; Tallentire; Talkin

Other settlement name: Birdoswald; Blenket Farm; Cark; Carnetley; Clesketts; Crakeplace; Cumcatch; Cumcrook; Cumrenton; Desoglin; Fletchers; Glenridding; High Cark; Mabbin Hall; Meldon; Newton Arlosh; Lupton; Penruddock; Rinnion Hills; Roose; Spadeadam; Tercrosset; Ternon; Tory Bridge

Natural feature: Barrock Fell; Blencathra; Carrick; Carrock Fell; Glenamara;
Glencoyne; Glendhu; Knorrren Fell; Mabbin Crag; Great & Little Mell Fell; The Pen; Penhurrock; Tarnmonath Fell; (all mountain or hill names apart from Moor Divock and Penhurrock)

?British: Glasson (settlement name)

British names compounded with OE Elements:

Parish name: Cumwhitton; Greystoke; Holm Cultram; Torpenhow; ?Camerton

Township name: Cumwhinton; Watermillock

Other settlement name: Coulderton; Hellpool Bridge

British names compounded with ON Elements:

Township name: Blencow (Great & Little); Cargo; Dundraw; Mallerstang

Other settlement name: Melkinthorpe; Maughanby

Natural feature: Ancrow Brow; ?Moor Divock (plotted as ON, but 1st el could be OE)

British names not plotted:

Lost names:

Names in which all elements are probably or certainly British:

Couwhencatte (Burtholme); Dollerline (Asherton);
Raswraget (Midgeholme); Rossam (Shap Rural); 'Croftam Gospatrici' (Hutton Roof); Pendraven (Upper Denton)
Compound with OE or ON element: Presdall (Milburn)

Compounds with ON elements: Caterlaising (Bothel & Threapland); Karkebucholm (Whicham); Keldowansik (Lowther)

Compound with Olr element: Karcmurdath (Hayton)

Field Names:
All British: Pant (Long Sleddale)
Compounds with OE Elements: Broom Crow (Whinfell); Pen Clarke (Barton)
Compound with ON element(s): Carcowe (Barton)
APPENDIX 3

English Habitational Names, 1

Names Plotted:

-hām: Parish name: Brigham; Brougham; Dearham;
     Heversham; Holm Cultram;
     Sebergham

-hām: Other settlement name: Hames Hall
     (i.e. not parish or township)

?hām: Parish name: Farlam

-ing(?a) + hām:
     Parish name: Addingham; Aldingham; Whicham
     Township name: Hensingham

?inge + tūn: Parish name: Workington
     Township name: Frizington, Helsington

céaster Parish name: Casterton; Aincaster
     Other settlement name: Castrigg
     (All doubtful)

Lost name: (not plotted)
     Eschingham (Strickland-Roger)
APPENDIX 4

English Habitational Names, 2

Names plotted:

*tun*: Parish name: Bampton; Brampton; Camerton; Clifton;
Dalston; Dalton, Denton; Hayton;
Hutton; Irthington; Irton;
Kirkbampton; Kirklinton; Marton (Long);
Newton Reigny; Orton; Pennington;
Santon; Skelton; Stapleton; Ulverston;
Waltan; Wigton

Township name: Brampton; Brayton; Broughton (3);
Casterton; Clifton (2); Colton; Crofton;
Dalton; Egton; Embleton; Farleton;
Fenton; Gleaston; Hayton; Helton;
Hilton; Houghton; Hutton (3); Langton;
Longtown; Lupton; Middleton; Murton;
Oulton; Patton; Preston Patrick;
Preston Richard; Preston Quarter;
Plumpton; Raughton; Ribton; Seaton;
Stainton (2); Stainton; Waverton;
West Linton; West Newton; Wharton;
Winton
Other settlement name: Angerton; Bolton; Crivelton
(now lost, but probably near Newton in Furness); Coulleton; Easton (2);
Helton; Hyton; Itonfield; Lanerton;
Marton; Milton; Morton (2); Newton (3);
Old Town; Plumpton; Randalinton;
Seaton; Shatton; Stainton (2);
Thistleton; Walton; Welton; Wilton

Uncertain or Doubtful: Carlatton (Parish name);
Ackenthalwaite (township)

*ing + tun*: Parish name:
Cumwhitton; Distington; Harrington

Township name:
Killington; Rottington

*wic*: Parish name:
Urswick, Warwick

Township name:
Keswick
Other settlement name:
Butterwick

*?wic*:
Township name:
Sedgewick
Other settlement name:
Cunswick

*burh*:
Other settlement name:
Burbank; Nentsberry; Turnberry
(all doubtful)
Lost place names: (not plotted)

tūn: Hutton (Strickland Ketel)
wīc: Estwyk (Askham); Barewyk (Windermere)
worth: Routhworth (Kendal Ward)

Also not plotted: Grasswick: field name in Killington

The 'doubt' in the case of these names is not as to whether they contain wīc, but as to whether they are early enough to merit inclusion on the map.
APPENDIX 5a

?Anglo-Saxon Burials described by Greenwell and Others

Asby (Great Saylebottom)(?NY 647,119)

Situation: In tumulus, ?on Asby Winderwath Common, just above 1000' OD (305 m.). Dimensions of tumulus and position of burial within it unknown

Type: Either primary or secondary extended inhumation

Age/Sex: Unknown - ?male, from grave-goods

Grave-goods: Iron knife at waist

References: 1. Hodgson, 1820, 152
2. Whellan, 1860, 724
3. Greenwell, 1877, 386
4. Ferguson and Swainson-Cowper, 1893,521
5. Collingwood, W.G., 1926, 6

Crosby Garrett (Bents Hill)(NY 706,067)

Situation: In tumulus, on open moorland, about 1000' (305 m.) OD. Tumulus 34'-36' (10.67-10.97 m.) in diameter, about 4' (1.21 m.) high. Burial was 1' (0.30 m.) below the top of the cairn.

Type: Secondary cremation

Age/Sex: 12-14 years old, either male or female

Grave-goods: Small tanged iron knife, 3/4" (9.5 cm.) long, iron buckle with curved tongue, 1/2" (4.1 cm.) diameter, iron shears with incised decoration on the handle, 5/4" (14.6 cm.) long. Iron bridle-bit - two circular cheek pieces joined by two flat bars, with loops at each end, 10" long (25.4 cm.)
References:  
1. Greenwell, 1877, 386  
2. Ferguson and Swainson Cowper, 1893, 523  
3. Collingwood, W. G., 1926, 7  
4. R.C.H.M., 1936, 78  
5. Nicholson, J. W., 1914, 4

Kirkby Stephen (Wiseber Hill) (NY 770, 066)

Situation: In tumulus, on the common by the Eden, between 600'-700' (183 m.-213 m.) OD, 28' (8.5 m.) diameter and 1\frac{1}{2}' (0.46 m.) high, composed of stones and earth; burial at centre, cut through the natural soil and the primary cremation deposit.

Type: Secondary - ?extended inhumation - no mention of a body, but a wooden coffin, 6' (1.83 m.) long and 2\frac{1}{4}'-1\frac{3}{4}' (0.69-0.53 m.) wide, oriented NW-SE, found in above situation, in a badly decayed condition.

Age/Sex: Unknown - ?adult, from length of coffin?

Grave-goods: At NW end of coffin, a badly corroded small, shallow(? ) thin bronze bowl, with boss (?) in centre: diameter of mouth 5" (12.7 cm.). Just SE of this, a bluish, translucent glass bead, with thick red and yellow splashes, diameter 4\frac{1}{8}" (1.3 cm.).

References:  
1. Greenwell, 1877, 384-5  
2. Ferguson and Swainson Cowper, 1893, 525  
3. Collingwood, W.G., 1926, 3  
4. R.C.H.M., 1936, 143-4

Orton (Near Sunbiggin) (NY 665, 090)

Situation: In tumulus on open moorland, just above 1000' (305 m.) OD, 49'-50' (14.93-15.24 m.) diameter, 4' (1.21 m.) high, but previously disturbed. The burials were on the sides of the cairn, just below the surface.

Type: Three secondary extended inhumations, in shallow graves, roughly oriented with heads to W. or NW.

Age/Sex: A man 'past middle life' an 'aged' woman, and a child. The adult graves had stones set on edge along the sides and behind the heads of the bodies (N.B. previous disturbance of the cairn had displaced three adult inhumations, which could be associated with these.)
Grave-goods: None

References:
1. Greenwell, 1877, 394-5
2. Bulmer, 1885, 258
3. Ferguson and Swainson Cowper, 1893, 528
5. R.C.H.M., 1936, 191

Warcop (Sandford)(NY 733,171)

Situation: In a tumulus, one of a group of three, by the Roman road leading from Brough to Carlisle, within two km. of the Eden, at about 500' (153 m.) OD. The tumulus was 91' (30 m.) in circumference, height unknown. The burial was less than 12' (.46 m.) below the top of the barrow.

Type: Secondary cremation, in urn.

Age/Sex: Unknown - male (?) from grave-goods

Grave-goods: Two pots, one inside the other, the former apparently containing the cremated remains; an iron, double-edged sword, over 2' (0.61 m.) long, and 2\(\frac{1}{2}\)" (6.3 cm.) wide, with a 'curiously carved' hilt, adjacent to the urn, but at a greater depth; either a halberd or a spearhead; and another object. Both of these may have been made of iron, also (Refs. 1 and 2).
Alternatively, the grave may have contained, apart from the pottery and the sword - with a haft 3" (8.3 cm.) long - a shield boss 3\(\frac{3}{4}\)" (9.5 cm.) in diameter, two spearheads, and the remains of a helmet (Ref. 3).

References:
1. Preston, 1776, 273
2. Nicholson and Burn, 1777, 609-10
3. Hodgson, 1820, 156-7
4. Whellan, 1860, 772
5. Greenwell, 1877, 386
6. Bulmer, 1885, 282
7. Ferguson and Swainson Cowper, 1893, 530
8. Collingwood, W.G., 1926, 2
9. R.C.H.M., 1936, 240
Brigg Flat (Near Morland, in Shap parish) (NY 5,2)

Situation: In a tumulus; dimensions unknown; position of burial unknown.
Type: Unknown
Age/Sex: Unknown - male (?) from grave-goods
Grave-goods: Split-socketed iron spearhead; bones of deer, and (?) other animals (?) bronze ferrule

References: Catalogue 1859, 13

* It seems reasonable to infer that the ferrule accompanied the spearhead, although this is not absolutely clear from the original account.
APPENDIX 5b

Burials for which an Anglo-Saxon date has been suggested, but where there is little or no evidence in support of this; or otherwise dubious 'Anglo-Saxon burials'.

Bewcastle (Murchies Cairn) (NY 596,768)

A crouched inhumation, oriented N-S, in a small cairn; the body rested on the natural surface of the ground. There were no grave goods. The orientation N-S is common to prehistoric and Anglo-Saxon burials alike: the identification of the burial as Anglo-Saxon on the basis of this feature is groundless.

References: Maughan, Rev. J., 1874, 320-1
Ferguson and Swainson Cowper, 1893, 495
V.C.H., 1901, 291
Collingwood, W. G., 1923, 210
(The burial is described as Anglo-Saxon in all references except the last.)

*Cartmel (Peter Hill) (SD 3668,7641)

No actual burials appear to have been found here at all, and the description of this site as a "?Saxon tumulus" by the compilers of the Northern Archaeological Survey is inexplicable. The 'site' consists of a large mound: clearly identified as a natural feature in the National Monuments Record, although earlier references describe it as 'tumulus-like'.

References: Barber, H., 1869, 30
Stockdale, J., 1872, 255
N.M.R., SD37NE16 (1958)
N.A.S., Gaz., SD37NE11 (1976)

* Now in Lower Holker Parish
Netherall (Senhouse Collection)

In the Senhouse collection of Antiquities at Netherall is an undecorated Anglo-Saxon cremation urn. Most of the objects in this collection are from the Roman fort at Maryport, but there is no specific record of the provenance of this particular pot. It is more than likely that it does not come from Maryport at all; in the late eighteenth century the Senhouse family also owned property in Northamptonshire, and the Saxon cemetery at Welton was on their land. Several finds of Anglo-Saxon burials are recorded from Welton at this time. It is therefore very probable that the urn was incorporated into the Netherall collection because it belonged to the Senhouse family, and not because it actually came from Maryport.

Reference: Hodgson, K. S., 1956, 70-72 (ill. pl. facing 70)
APPENDIX 6

Evidence for Christianity in Roman Cumbria

1. Brougham (NY 536, 290)

Tombstone, built into the ceiling of an upper passage in the north-east corner of the keep at Brougham Castle; evidently from the fort of Brocavum.

Found ante 1760, in present position

Measurements: 23" x 31" (38.42 x 78.74 cm.)

The inscription reads:

D(is) C M(ANIBUS)
TITTUS M ....
VIXIT ANN IS
PL US MINUS XXXII M ....
FRATER TI T ULM
POSUI T

i.e. "To the spirits of the departed; Tittus M .... lived 32 years more or less. M ... his brother set up this inscription."

4th cent. (Ref. 3)

References
1: Collingwood and Wright, 1965, 265, No. 787 (full bibliography)
2: Wall, 1965, 205-06
3: Thomas, 1968, 97
2. **Brough-under-Stainmore (NY 791, 141)**

A ring with a chi-rho symbol, now lost, found ante 1868; probably, with other Roman finds, in the river bed below the Roman fort.

No description of the ring is known.

References: 1: Simpson, J., 1874, 9
2: Birley, 1961
4: Thomas, 1968, 100

3. **Carlisle (NY 395, 562)**

Tombstone, now in Tullie House Museum, Carlisle.

Found in 1892; re-used as a cover slab for a wooden coffin 8' (2.44 m.) long; the inscription was face down - in the Roman inhumation cemetery on Gallows Hill, Carlisle.

Measurements: 32" x 21" (81.28 x 53.3 cm.)

The inscription reads:

ANTIGON(U)S PAPIAS
CIVIS GRECUS VIXIT ANNOS
PLUS MINUS LX QUEM AD
MODUM ACCOMDTAM
FATIS ANIMAM REVOCAVIT
SEPTIMIA DO . . . .

i.e. "to the spirits of the departed; Flavias Antigonus Papias, a citizen of Greece, lived 60 years, more or less, and gave back to the Fates his soul, lent for that extent of time. Septimia Do ... (set this up).
4. Ireby (NY 234,390)

Lead vat, now in Tullie House Museum, Carlisle.
Found in the course of ploughing, in a field, 400 yds.
(366 m.) west of Ireby village, in March 1943.
The vessel is circular, and constructed of sheet lead,
½" (1.27 cm.) thick. It was built from three main
pieces, one forming the base - 18" (45.72 cm.) internal
diameter - the others forming the two halves of the
vertical sides. The pieces were held together by
molten lead. The external diameter varied from 19½"
- 21" (49.53 - 53.34 cm.) There are two opposing
handles or lugs at the joins, with oval holes. The
rim is decorated with a cable moulding, and there are ten
circles of cables, each 3½" (8.89 cm.) in diameter, on
the sides. One of these is incomplete at the joins.
The vat has a capacity of 10.06 gallons (45.73 litres)

References: 1: Richmond, 1946
2: Toynbee, 1953, 15-16
3: Wall, 1966, 153-56
5. **Maryport** (NY 038,372)

Sculptured fragment, illustrated in Hutchinson's History of Cumberland (1794, pl. V, No. 39) among other objects in the Senhouse collection at Netherhall. Now lost. This collection is comprised almost exclusively of material from the Roman fort at Maryport, but the object is not commented on in the text, so the circumstances of its discovery are not known. The fragment appears to have measured 12" x 6" (30.48 x 15.24 cm.). It may be the top left-hand corner of a panel; the decoration consists of an incised chi-rho monogram below a row of 3 incised, irregularly spaced XXs. circa. 400 A.D. (Ref. 2).

References:  
1: Hutchinson, 1794, pl.V, No. 39  
2: Jarrett, 1954  
3: Frend, 1955, pl. facing 16  
4: Wall, 1965, 213-14  
5: Thomas, 1968, 97
APPENDIX 7

Early Christian Burial Sites in Cumbria

(The interpretation of many of these sites is open to question; dating evidence as such as virtually non existent, but in most cases it is at least reasonable to suppose that the burials are Christian and pre-Conquest.)

1. Early Christian Cemeteries

Carlisle (NY 395,560)

The burials were discovered in the course of excavation for a sewer in a trench 5' (1.52 m.) wide, in May 1959, 8' (2.44 m.) below the modern road surface of Caldergate. They were confined to the middle of the street, but there were indications that the cemetery extended to the south. The remains were immediately overlain by a 2' (.61 m.) layer of dark humus, which in turn underlay 6' (1.83 m.) of road metalling. 40 skeletons were found, "almost all" aligned E-W, heads to the W. No controlled excavation or analysis of the skeletal material was carried out, but the absence of traces of grave-goods, coffins or cists was recorded. The layer containing the burials was "darker than the rest".
Dating Evidence: No direct evidence, but the street is thought to be part of a replanning of Carlisle in the twelfth century, and the burials must therefore predate this. The cemetery is outside the medieval walled town; it was probably also outside the limits of the Roman town, although these are not precisely known. There is no church in the vicinity with which the burials might be connected.

References: 1: Hogg, 1961
2: Gosling, 1976, 173

Tendley Hill, Eaglesfield (NY 088,287)
Several antiquarian topographers record skeletons at this site (Mannix & Whellan, 1847, 527; Whellan, 1860, 297), Dickinson, specifically, 6 skeletons and a sword (1878, 343). Contemporary accounts of these discoveries have now been found (Cowen, 1967). It is clear that a sword and other grave-goods - an axe or spearhead, and a decorated bronze ring-headed pin or brooch - were found with one skeleton in 1814. The other burials were found circa 1841. The number is unspecified - "a great many bones". The graves had a maximum depth of 16" (40.64 cm.) The topsoil was only 8" - 10" (20.32 - 25.40 cm.) deep, so they were partly cut through the natural limestone. It was observed that they were shallower at the head end. Most of the interments were adult - 5' - 6' (1.52 - 1.83 m.) long - but one only 3' (.91 m.) was recorded. They were
spaced "a little distance off one another". The absence of coffins was noted. The orientation was not specifically commented on at the time, but Wilson (1978) has pointed out that E-W can be inferred from the direction of one grave with reference to the siting of the cemetery.

**Dating Evidence:** No direct evidence, but the place-name does indicate an early ecclesiastical site at or near Eaglesfield (see above, p. 88). The sword found in 1814 can be safely equated with one in the Museum of the Society of Antiquaries of Newcastle-upon-Tyne, of Viking date (Cowen, 1948). The other grave-goods appear to have disappeared. These factors suggest a Viking burial in a pre-existing Christian cemetery.

**References:**
1. Mannix & Whellan, 1847, 527
2. Whellan, 1860, 297
3. Dickinson, 1878, 347
4. Cowen, 1948
5. Cowen, 1967
6. Wilson, P.A. 1978

**Hyning, Heversham (SD 492,864)**

The legs of 4 skeletons were found during excavation for a water-pipe in a pasture field at the above location, in the summer of 1911. The rest of the skeletons were exposed in controlled excavation. The graves were at a depth of about 2' (.61 m.). Other bones had previously been found at "several places" in the same field. All were extended, with heads to the W., the distance
between the graves varying between 1'6" (.46 m.) and 4'9" (1.46 m.). In one case, a setting of large slabs and stones was placed around the head, and a small sherd of reddish pottery with criss-cross markings, was found, although it was stated that this "was probably in the soil, and had nothing to do with the interments". Its present whereabouts is unknown. No full analysis of the skeletal material was published, but it was observed that the bones in the grave with the stone setting were "small and thin, some of the teeth much worn"; in another grave the bones were "larger and stronger" than the rest.

Dating Evidence: None, apart from the sherd of pottery just noted. There is no recorded tradition of a church or chapel in the area. The nearest church is at Heversham, 4 km. to the south.

References: 1: McKenny Hughes, 1912
2: Collingwood, W.G., 1926, 53

Doubtful: Roosebeck (SD 257,677)

Tweddell & Richardson record that at Roosebeck in March 1870, "in taking out the foundations for the vinery of A. J. Woodhouse, Esq., the workmen came upon 7 human skeletons, arranged in two rows, the feet of one row to the heads of the other". Nothing else is known of this cemetery.

Dating Evidence: None

References: 1: Tweddell & Richardson, 1880, 11, 17
2: Collingwood, W. G., 1926
2. **Long Cist Cemeteries**

**Moresby (NX 983,210)**

Several skeletons were found before 1842, during alterations to the floor of Moresby Hall, which involved removal of the fireplace. Each skeleton was "enclosed between 4 stones or slates" and "Embedded in the floor". There were no accompanying grave-goods. There is no record of the number, layout, or orientation of the burials, and no analysis of the skeletal material was made. The bones were re-buried in Moresby churchyard.

**Dating evidence:** No direct evidence; Moresby Hall was erected *tempus James I*, but there has been a separate manor of Moresby since the time of William Rufus; the present Hall may therefore be on the site of a much earlier manor house. The parish church of St. Bridget is immediately west of the hall, in the south-east angle of the Roman fort. The Hall itself is outside the fort.

**References:**
1. Jefferson, 1842, 67
2. Whellan, 1860, 420
3. Ferguson and Swainson Cowper, 1893, 511
4. Birley, 1949, 52

**Rampside (SD 239,674)**

Tweddell and Richardson report that at Rampside church "there have been found from time to time in the churchyard, great blocks of granite and other stone, which
have been used, it is supposed, in the construction of the rude vaults which are occasionally found; "and also, the discovery of a large skeleton beneath one of these slabs, in a wooden coffin with iron hinges. Measurements of some of these stones are given by Gaythorpe: one, of 'lava' was 5' x 4' (1.52 x 1.22 m.), and 1' (30.48 cm.) thick. Others were 2'1" - 3' (76.20 - 91.44 cm.) across, and weighed 5-8 cwt. (2514-406.4 kg.). These particular stones rested on "skeletons or bones". Two other dark, coffin-shaped features, and more hinges were noticed beneath the walls of the old chapel, when this was dismantled in 1840.

Dating evidence: No direct evidence, but the Rampside sword, which is Viking and may have come from a burial, was found in this churchyard. It is probable that there was a chapel at Rampside in medieval times, but debateable as to whether this would have had rights of burial - although there is a medieval grave-slab in the churchyard, which may be the slab which covered the coffin noted above.

References: 1: Tweddell & Richardson, 1880, ii, 170
2: Gaythorpe, 1910

3. Single Long-Cist Graves

Beckfoot (NY 086,485)

A long stone cist was first noticed in the cliff face at Beckfoot in 1957, as two courses of dressed sandstone,
set in clay. On excavation, it was found to cut the Roman levels, but not those above. It was at some depth below the modern surface. The cist was oriented east-west. There were no "certain traces" of a body, no grave-goods, and no covering slabs. It measured 5' x 2 1/2' (1.52 x .76 m.). The cist was vandalised after its discovery.

**Dating Evidence:** The grave would seem to be part of the second to fourth century Roman cemetery of Beckfoot Fort. It is the only grave of its type recorded there; its stratigraphical position suggests a late or post-Roman burial.

Reference: 1: Bellhouse and Moffat, 1959, 61-2

**Kirkby Stephen (NY 775,089)**

During the installation of heating pipes in the church, circa 1950, a stone coffin was found in the south transept, 9' (2.74 m.) from the south wall, at a depth of 3' (0.914 m.). The cist was covered with large, flat, unshaped slabs. The sides consisted of long, narrow stones, placed upright in the ground. The bottom was lined with stone at the head and feet, with compacted clay in between. The cist tapered considerably. It was 9" (22.86 cm.) wide at the narrowest end, and 1'10" (55.88 cm.) at the widest part, which was at the shoulder - the stones at this end were stepped in around the head. It was 6 1/2' (1.98 m.) long, and 1' (0.30 m.) deep. The skeleton was male, and at least 6' (1.83 m.)
tall. There were no other finds in the cist, and no other cists found, although more bones were discovered. The orientation is not specifically recorded, but east-west may be fairly safely assumed from the context. **Dating Evidence:** No direct evidence, but the type of cist, and its position in the church are perhaps more consistent with a pre-Conquest rather than a post-Conquest burial. However, the arrangement of stones round the head resembles some post-Conquest burials. Reference: 1: Lowther Bouch, 1951 (illus: pl6.1)

4. **Shifted Cemetery**

**Beetham (SD 496,795)**

Bulmer notes that when Beetham Vicarage was erected, "a large quantity of human bone was disinterred". The vicarage is just south of the church, but the present churchyard is west of it.

Reference: 1: Bulmer, 1885, 386

**Addendum**

**Single Long - Cist Grave**

**Ravenglass (SD 088, 961)**

An isolated long-cist was found in the course of controlled excavation inside the Roman fort of Ravenglass in 1976. It was constructed of undressed limestone slabs, and measured 1.39 X 0.29 m.; it was 0.29m. deep. No human remains were found, but the acidic nature of the soil on site could have been the cause of their absence. The cist was oriented east - west.

**Dating Evidence:** The cist cut the Roman levels of the fort and must therefore be of post - Roman date.


* Information about this site was received too late for incorporation into the main discussion.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Church</th>
<th>National Grid Reference</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Dedication</th>
<th>Alternative Dedication</th>
<th>Earliest part of Church fabric</th>
<th>Holy Wall</th>
<th>Pre-Conquest Sculpture</th>
<th>1957-1973 O.S. 6&quot; Area Acres</th>
<th>Hectares</th>
<th>Figure No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barton</td>
<td>NY 467,263</td>
<td>Parish</td>
<td>St. Michael (18th Century)</td>
<td>All Saints (18th Century)</td>
<td>Early Norman</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.770</td>
<td>0.716</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backworth St. Bridget</td>
<td>NY 015,061</td>
<td>Parish</td>
<td>St. Bridget (1262)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Norman</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0.429</td>
<td>0.173</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clifton</td>
<td>NY 532,270</td>
<td>Parish</td>
<td>St. Cuthbert (18th Century)</td>
<td>St. Nicholas (18th Century)</td>
<td>13th Century</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.411</td>
<td>0.166</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crosshaye</td>
<td>SS 444,911</td>
<td>Chapel of Heversham</td>
<td>St. Mary (1186-1200)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rebuilt, 19th Century</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.300</td>
<td>0.121</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distington</td>
<td>NY 004,236</td>
<td>Parish</td>
<td>No dedication known</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rebuilt, 1886</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.473</td>
<td>0.191</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dufton</td>
<td>NY 685,262</td>
<td>Parish</td>
<td>St. Cuthbert (1355)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rebuilt, 1755</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.784</td>
<td>0.317</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireby Old Church</td>
<td>NY 240,279</td>
<td>Parish</td>
<td>No early dedication known</td>
<td></td>
<td>Norman, site now abandoned</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.607</td>
<td>0.246</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendrew</td>
<td>NY 456,041</td>
<td>Chapel of Kendal</td>
<td>St. Cuthbert (17th Century)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Norman</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.256</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loweswater</td>
<td>NY 141,209</td>
<td>Chapel of St. Bosse</td>
<td>St. Bartholomew (119th Century)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rebuilt 1827 (? on slightly different site?)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.488</td>
<td>0.198</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ormside</td>
<td>NY 701,176</td>
<td>Parish</td>
<td>St. James (18th Century)</td>
<td>St. John Baptist (18th Century)</td>
<td>Saxon - 11th Century</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.598</td>
<td>0.242</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennington</td>
<td>SD 253,774</td>
<td>Parish</td>
<td>St. Leonard (1478)</td>
<td>St. Michael (18th Century)</td>
<td>Rebuilt 1826, but Norman tympanum from old church</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.398</td>
<td>0.161</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skelton</td>
<td>NY 439,354</td>
<td>Parish</td>
<td>St. Michael (18th Century)</td>
<td></td>
<td>15th Century</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.884</td>
<td>0.358</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warwick</td>
<td>NY 465,567</td>
<td>Parish</td>
<td>St. Leonard (1190)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Early Norman</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.775</td>
<td>0.313</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church</td>
<td>National Gold Reference</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Dedication (Earliest Reference)</td>
<td>Alternative Dedication</td>
<td>Earliest part of Church Fabric</td>
<td>Holy Well</td>
<td>Pre-Conquest Sculpture</td>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Hectares</td>
<td>Figure No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appleby Bongate</td>
<td>NY 664,198</td>
<td>Parish</td>
<td>St. Michael (ante 1120)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Anglo-Saxon - 11th Century</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1.113</td>
<td>0.450</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alston</td>
<td>NY 718,465</td>
<td>Parish</td>
<td>St. Augustine (? 1154)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rebuilt 1814, 19th Century</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.604</td>
<td>0.244</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambleside</td>
<td>NY 377,016</td>
<td>Chapel of Grassacre - burial sth. since 1574</td>
<td>St. Anne (1571)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rebuilt 1812</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.331</td>
<td>0.134</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clitheroe</td>
<td>NY 587,218</td>
<td>Parish</td>
<td>St. Cutbert (1445-66)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Early Norman</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0.371</td>
<td>0.150</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crosby-on-Eden</td>
<td>NY 447,595</td>
<td>Parish</td>
<td>St. John (1562) (but Church early 13th Century)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rebuilt 1855</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0.746</td>
<td>0.302</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crook</td>
<td>NY 550,236</td>
<td>Parish</td>
<td>St. Andrew (1559)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Norman</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0.579</td>
<td>0.234</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalston</td>
<td>NY 350,502</td>
<td>Parish</td>
<td>St. Michael (1559)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Late Norman</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0.871</td>
<td>0.357</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dent</td>
<td>SD 705,570</td>
<td>Parish</td>
<td>St. Andrew</td>
<td></td>
<td>Norman</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0.408</td>
<td>0.198</td>
<td>6.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hepton</td>
<td>NY 163,234</td>
<td>Chapel of Brigman</td>
<td>St. Cutbert (1445-66)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rebuilt 1813</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.327</td>
<td>0.152</td>
<td>6.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grisdale</td>
<td>NY 373,580</td>
<td>Parish</td>
<td>St. Kentigern (13th Century)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rebuilt, 1743</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0.499</td>
<td>0.208</td>
<td>6.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrington</td>
<td>JX 592,236</td>
<td>Parish</td>
<td>No dedication in 18th Century</td>
<td></td>
<td>Norman</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0.505</td>
<td>0.205</td>
<td>6.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langleby</td>
<td>JY 608,337</td>
<td>Parish</td>
<td>St. Peter (18th Century)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rebuilt 1718</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0.421</td>
<td>0.170</td>
<td>6.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longtown</td>
<td>JY 155,259</td>
<td>Chapel of Brigman</td>
<td>St. Cutbert (1445-66)</td>
<td>(but Church, 1595)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.462</td>
<td>0.166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stapleton</td>
<td>NY 503,712</td>
<td>Parish</td>
<td>St. Mary (18th Century)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rebuilt 1830</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0.503</td>
<td>0.203</td>
<td>6.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thrusby</td>
<td>JX 324,503</td>
<td>Parish</td>
<td>St. Andrew (1562)</td>
<td>(but Church, 1281-2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0.273</td>
<td>0.110</td>
<td>6.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troutbeck</td>
<td>JX 413,027</td>
<td>Chapel of Windermere</td>
<td>Jesus Chapel (Wolfe, 1562)</td>
<td>(Church c. 1175)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0.621</td>
<td>0.251</td>
<td>6.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usworth</td>
<td>JY 273,443</td>
<td>Parish</td>
<td>St. Hilda</td>
<td></td>
<td>Title of Hermitage of St. Hilda (1215) Rebuilt 19th Century</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1.235</td>
<td>0.508</td>
<td>6.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usworth (2nd Church)</td>
<td>JY 447,241</td>
<td>Chapel of Wylcote</td>
<td>No dedication known, but Church existing 1377</td>
<td></td>
<td>Church abandoned, late 16th Century also only now known</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0.415</td>
<td>0.166</td>
<td>6.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## CHURCHYARDS WHICH ARE DOUBTFULLY PARTIALLY CIRCULAR OR SUB-CIRCULAR ON 1ST ED. 6" O.S.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Church</th>
<th>National Grid Reference</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Dedication</th>
<th>Alternative Dedication</th>
<th>Earliest part of Church Fabric</th>
<th>Holy Well</th>
<th>Pre-Conquest Sculpture</th>
<th>1957</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Figure No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crosby Garrett</td>
<td>NY 730,096</td>
<td>Parish</td>
<td>St. Andrew (18th Century)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Anglo-Saxon (11th Century?)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.869</td>
<td>6.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heversham</td>
<td>SD 494,834</td>
<td>Parish</td>
<td>St. Peter (1360)</td>
<td>St. Mary (18th Century)</td>
<td>Originally Norman 0 now rebuilt</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1.395</td>
<td>6.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkcudbright</td>
<td>NY 534,690</td>
<td>Parish</td>
<td>St. Michael (18th Century)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7 Original church destroyed, late 14th Century - present church, 1885</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.279</td>
<td>6.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirklington</td>
<td>NY 432,670</td>
<td>Parish</td>
<td>St. Cuthbert (1374)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Rebuilt 1815 - predecessor Norman</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.555</td>
<td>6.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matterdale</td>
<td>NY 394,224</td>
<td>Chapel of Greystoke</td>
<td>No early dedication known</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Some 'Pre-Reformation' remains in fabric</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.311</td>
<td>6.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welberby</td>
<td>NY 611,374</td>
<td>Parish</td>
<td>St. John Baptist (1577) - Church existing 1291-2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14th Century</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.917</td>
<td>6.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetherwaite</td>
<td>SD 100,951</td>
<td>Parish</td>
<td>St. James (1392)</td>
<td>St. John (18th Century and present)</td>
<td>Rebuilt 1706 - Font probably Norman</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.308</td>
<td>6.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Holy Wells

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>N.G.R.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Associations</th>
<th>Ritual or Customs</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Church</td>
<td>Chapel</td>
<td>Pre-Conjunct Sculpture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hingham</td>
<td>NY 562,392</td>
<td>St. Michael's</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ascotton</td>
<td>NY 276,534</td>
<td>Fairy Well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slingers</td>
<td>SD 290,720</td>
<td>Bean Well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astley St. Michael</td>
<td>NY 654,207</td>
<td>Lady Well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asby</td>
<td>NY 682,133</td>
<td>St. Helen's</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astria (1)</td>
<td>NY 144,1</td>
<td>Bishop's or Holy Well</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astria (2)</td>
<td>NY 147,4197</td>
<td>St. Patrick's</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churnet</td>
<td>NY 376,677</td>
<td>St. Michael's</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burton</td>
<td>NY 519,181</td>
<td>St. Patrick's</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bremest St. Bridget (1)</td>
<td>NY 058,101</td>
<td>Friar's Well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bremest St. Bridget (2)</td>
<td>NY 015,061</td>
<td>St. Bridget's</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ham</td>
<td>NY 516,240</td>
<td>Lady Well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notable Nunnery</td>
<td>NY 537,433</td>
<td>Chapel Well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ham (1)</td>
<td>SD 45,79</td>
<td>St. Catherine's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgworth</td>
<td>SD 47,80</td>
<td>St. Michael's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Church</td>
<td>Chapel</td>
<td>Guttering</td>
<td>Gate</td>
<td>Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84th &amp; 8</td>
<td>St. Luke's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85th &amp; 8</td>
<td>St. Luke's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86th &amp; 8</td>
<td>St. Luke's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87th &amp; 8</td>
<td>St. Luke's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88th &amp; 8</td>
<td>St. Luke's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89th &amp; 8</td>
<td>St. Luke's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90th &amp; 8</td>
<td>St. Luke's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91st &amp; 8</td>
<td>St. Luke's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92nd &amp; 8</td>
<td>St. Luke's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93rd &amp; 8</td>
<td>St. Luke's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94th &amp; 8</td>
<td>St. Luke's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95th &amp; 8</td>
<td>St. Luke's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96th &amp; 8</td>
<td>St. Luke's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97th &amp; 8</td>
<td>St. Luke's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98th &amp; 8</td>
<td>St. Luke's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99th &amp; 8</td>
<td>St. Luke's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100th &amp; 8</td>
<td>St. Luke's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>N.G.R.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Church</td>
<td>Chapel</td>
<td>Pre-Conquest Sculpture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oswaldside</td>
<td>SD 505,957</td>
<td>St. Oswald's</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penrith</td>
<td>SD 511,769</td>
<td>St. Helen</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reeth</td>
<td>NY 325,398</td>
<td>St. Hubgo's or St. Kentigern's</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ser Abbey</td>
<td>NY 051,064</td>
<td>'Patrick's' or St. Patrick's</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetheral</td>
<td>NY 016,224</td>
<td>St. Helen's</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cirencester</td>
<td>NY 398,561</td>
<td>Armstwell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cirencester</td>
<td>NY 40,95</td>
<td>St. Nicholas'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cirencester</td>
<td>NY 401,509</td>
<td>St. Guthbert's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cirencester</td>
<td>NY 399,558</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cirencester</td>
<td>NY 390,738</td>
<td>Holy Well Spa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stow</td>
<td>NY 390,739</td>
<td>Pin Well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stow</td>
<td>SD 5,7</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teversal</td>
<td>SD 622,781</td>
<td>St. Cloud's or St. Olubula's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warkworth</td>
<td>NY 548,524</td>
<td>Harewell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warkworth</td>
<td>NY 381,350</td>
<td>St. Kentigern's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warkworth</td>
<td>NY 526,258</td>
<td>Clifton Well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*References*:
- McIntyre, 1944, 6;
- Saumarez, 1949, 70.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>N.G.R.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Church</th>
<th>Chapel</th>
<th>Conquest Sculpture</th>
<th>Curv. Com.</th>
<th>Other Site</th>
<th>Gatherings</th>
<th>Cures</th>
<th>Baptisms</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>References</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Birkenshaw</td>
<td>NY 13,31</td>
<td>St. Helen's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>McIntire, 1944, 7</td>
<td>Collingwood &amp; Graham, 1925, 20</td>
<td>McIntire, 1944, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birkenshaw</td>
<td>NY 12,31</td>
<td>St. Anthony's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Williams, 1805, 433; V.G.H., 1914, 384; Collingwood, W.G., 1925, 40</td>
<td>McIntire, 1944, 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birkenshaw</td>
<td>SD 318,860</td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Williams, 1805, 433; V.G.H., 1914, 384; Collingwood, W.G., 1925, 40</td>
<td>McIntire, 1944, 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birkenhead</td>
<td>SD 3,9</td>
<td>Holywath</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Williams, 1805, 433; V.G.H., 1914, 384; Collingwood, W.G., 1925, 40</td>
<td>McIntire, 1944, 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birkenhead</td>
<td>NY 50,50</td>
<td>St. Ann's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Williams, 1805, 433; V.G.H., 1914, 384; Collingwood, W.G., 1925, 40</td>
<td>McIntire, 1944, 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birkenshaw</td>
<td>SD 67,217</td>
<td>Chapel Well</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Williams, 1805, 433; V.G.H., 1914, 384; Collingwood, W.G., 1925, 40</td>
<td>McIntire, 1944, 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birkenshaw</td>
<td>NY 475,532</td>
<td>St. Agans' Well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Williams, 1805, 433; V.G.H., 1914, 384; Collingwood, W.G., 1925, 40</td>
<td>McIntire, 1944, 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birkenhead</td>
<td>NY 651,331</td>
<td>St. Andrew's</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Williams, 1805, 433; V.G.H., 1914, 384; Collingwood, W.G., 1925, 40</td>
<td>McIntire, 1944, 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birkenhead</td>
<td>NY 522,540</td>
<td>Chapel Well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Williams, 1805, 433; V.G.H., 1914, 384; Collingwood, W.G., 1925, 40</td>
<td>McIntire, 1944, 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birkenshaw</td>
<td>NY 45,269</td>
<td>St. Andrew's</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Williams, 1805, 433; V.G.H., 1914, 384; Collingwood, W.G., 1925, 40</td>
<td>McIntire, 1944, 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birkenhead</td>
<td>NY 138,444</td>
<td>Holy Well</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Williams, 1805, 433; V.G.H., 1914, 384; Collingwood, W.G., 1925, 40</td>
<td>McIntire, 1944, 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birkenshaw</td>
<td>TSD 225,738</td>
<td>Church Well</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Williams, 1805, 433; V.G.H., 1914, 384; Collingwood, W.G., 1925, 40</td>
<td>McIntire, 1944, 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birkenhead</td>
<td>TSD 225,738</td>
<td>Mary Bank Well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Williams, 1805, 433; V.G.H., 1914, 384; Collingwood, W.G., 1925, 40</td>
<td>McIntire, 1944, 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birkenshaw</td>
<td>SD 214,752</td>
<td>St. Helen's</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Williams, 1805, 433; V.G.H., 1914, 384; Collingwood, W.G., 1925, 40</td>
<td>McIntire, 1944, 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birkenshaw</td>
<td>TSD 235,742</td>
<td>Yarwell</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Williams, 1805, 433; V.G.H., 1914, 384; Collingwood, W.G., 1925, 40</td>
<td>McIntire, 1944, 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birkenhead</td>
<td>NY 564,321</td>
<td>St. Cuthbert's</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Williams, 1805, 433; V.G.H., 1914, 384; Collingwood, W.G., 1925, 40</td>
<td>McIntire, 1944, 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birkenhead</td>
<td>?NY 561,303</td>
<td>St. Ninian's</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Williams, 1805, 433; V.G.H., 1914, 384; Collingwood, W.G., 1925, 40</td>
<td>McIntire, 1944, 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>N.G.R.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Church</td>
<td>Chapel</td>
<td>Pre-Conquest Sculpture</td>
<td>Curv. Gery.</td>
<td>Other Site</td>
<td>Gatherings</td>
<td>Cures</td>
<td>Baptism</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>References</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kdale</td>
<td>NY 176,004</td>
<td>St. Catherine's or St. Mary's</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hope, 1893, 44; Parker, 1926, 175; Collingwood, 1925, 23; McIntyre, 1944, 10; Fair, 1952, 150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>isby</td>
<td>NY 626,333</td>
<td>Anthony's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O.S. 6&quot;, 1892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oriston</td>
<td>NY 95,66</td>
<td>Animal spring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hutchinson, 1794, 5, 524; McIntyre, 1944, 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lorux</td>
<td>NY 121,383</td>
<td>Tommy Task</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hutchinson, 1794, 5, 524; Lyson, 1816, CXXI; Hope, 1893, 14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>island</td>
<td>NY 636,679</td>
<td>Gilisland Spa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lyson, 1816, CXXI; Hope, 1893, 14; Collingwood, 1925, 23; McIntyre, 1944, 9; Hutchinson, 1794, 1, 53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>easton</td>
<td>SD 257,702</td>
<td>Mikie Well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thedself &amp; Richardson, 1880, 4, 11; Taylor, 1903, 20; V.G.K., 1914, 220; Collingwood, 1925, 52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>esforth (1)</td>
<td>NY 072,041</td>
<td>Chapel Well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>esforth (2)</td>
<td>NY 655,028</td>
<td>St. Helen's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Parker, 1883, 44; Collingwood, 1925, 23; Collingwood, 1925, 23; McIntyre, 1944, 10; Fair, 1952, 150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minstere</td>
<td>NY 534,072</td>
<td>St. Oswald's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nicholson &amp; Burn, 1777, 1, 147; Curwen, J.F., 1914, 312; Collingwood &amp; Graham, 1925, 22; Collingwood, N.G., 1926, 23; O.S.6&quot;, 1935; O.S.8&quot;, 1935</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eystoke</td>
<td>NY 597,550</td>
<td>Teaswell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hope, 1893, 44; Collingwood &amp; Graham, 1925, 11; McIntyre, 1944, 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eystoke</td>
<td>NY 444,305</td>
<td>Tea Eeld</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eystoke</td>
<td>NY 444,303</td>
<td>Teoly Eeld</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>McIntyre, 1944, 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eystoke</td>
<td>NY 450,303</td>
<td>Teoly or the Holy Eeld</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lynette, 1944, 10; O.S.6&quot;, 1957</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eystoke</td>
<td>NY 43,32</td>
<td>'The Fountain in Eyland Road'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>McIntyre, 1944, 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eystoke</td>
<td>NY 43,325</td>
<td>St. Mary's Well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>McIntyre, 1944, 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eystoke</td>
<td>NY 43,50</td>
<td>St. Mary's Well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nicholson &amp; Burn, 1777, 1, 147; Collingwood &amp; Graham, 1925, 22; Collingwood, N.G., 1926, 23; O.S.6&quot;, 1935; O.S.8&quot;, 1935</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eystoke</td>
<td>NY 43,55</td>
<td>St. Mary's Well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>McIntyre, 1944, 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eystoke</td>
<td>NY 45,55</td>
<td>St. Mary's Well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>McIntyre, 1944, 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eystoke</td>
<td>NY 43,50</td>
<td>St. Mary's Well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>McIntyre, 1944, 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eystoke</td>
<td>NY 43,50</td>
<td>St. Mary's Well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>McIntyre, 1944, 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eystoke</td>
<td>NY 43,50</td>
<td>St. Mary's Well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>McIntyre, 1944, 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eystoke</td>
<td>NY 43,50</td>
<td>St. Mary's Well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>McIntyre, 1944, 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eystoke</td>
<td>NY 43,50</td>
<td>St. Mary's Well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>McIntyre, 1944, 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>N.G.R.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Church</td>
<td>Chapel</td>
<td>Pre-Comm. Sculpture</td>
<td>Curr. Comm.</td>
<td>Other Site</td>
<td>Gatherings</td>
<td>Curves</td>
<td>Baptisms</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>References</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leavy</td>
<td>NY 51,375</td>
<td>St. John the Baptist's</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hoare 1944, 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leavy</td>
<td>NY 1,36</td>
<td>Margaret Hardie's</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td>A Stitch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hoare 1944, 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leavy</td>
<td>NY 4,6</td>
<td>Fen Hey Well</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hoare 1944, 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leavy</td>
<td>NY 4,6</td>
<td>Kop-Ob-Well</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hoare 1944, 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leavy</td>
<td>NY 4,6</td>
<td>Ladis's Well</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dressing butter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hoare 1944, 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>llin</td>
<td>SD 170,816</td>
<td>Holy Trinity Well or Deer Leap Well</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hoare 1944, 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>llin</td>
<td>TSO 17,81</td>
<td>Holly Well</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hoare 1944, 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>llin,</td>
<td>SD 18,78</td>
<td>The Holy Well</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hoare 1944, 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ofer</td>
<td>NY 11,24</td>
<td>St. Mary's Well</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hoare 1944, 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oland</td>
<td>NY 596,227</td>
<td>Powwognt Well</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hoare 1944, 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oghisale</td>
<td>NY 363,304</td>
<td>St. Kntigern's Well</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hoare 1944, 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ooligan</td>
<td>NY 708,093</td>
<td>St. Helen's Well</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hoare 1944, 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>olch Forest</td>
<td>NY 456,755</td>
<td>Holy or Holly Well</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hoare 1944, 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>olch Forest</td>
<td>NY 456,768</td>
<td>Priest's Well</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hoare 1944, 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oton</td>
<td>NY 527,068</td>
<td>Lady Well</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hoare 1944, 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ovo</td>
<td>NY 5,3</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hoare 1944, 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oton</td>
<td>NY 981,209</td>
<td>Holy Well</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hoare 1944, 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>N.G.R.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>W.B.S.</td>
<td>Stages</td>
<td>Worship</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Priests</td>
<td>References</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthurside</td>
<td>WA 51,22</td>
<td>St. Patrick's</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nicholson &amp; Burn, 1777, 8, 46, G. H. A., 1839, 10, 14; Hope, 1839, 12, 17; Collingwood, 1928, 17; Smith, 1967, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthurside</td>
<td>WA 51,22</td>
<td>Skirsgill Well</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hope, 1839, 12, 13, 14; McIntire, 1928, 17; Collingwood, 1928, 17; Smith, 1967, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthurside</td>
<td>WA 51,22</td>
<td>Lark Bank Well</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hope, 1839, 12, 13, 14; McIntire, 1928, 17; Collingwood, 1928, 17; Smith, 1967, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Peterkirk</td>
<td>SD 51,3</td>
<td>Gregory Well</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O.S. 6&quot;, 1857; Collingwood, U.G., 1928, 34, 35; Smith, 1957, 1, 13; O.S. 6&quot;, 1857</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockcliffe-on-the-Beaconsfield</td>
<td>RX 51,616</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hutchinson, 1794, 11, 12, 13, 14; McIntire, 1928, 17; Collingwood, 1928, 17; Smith, 1967, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Bega's</td>
<td>RX 51,3</td>
<td>Cold Held</td>
<td>Corpse Road</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Parker, C.A., 1909, 113; Collingwood, U.G., 1928, 2607; McIntire, 1928, 17; Collingwood, U.G., 1928, 17; Smith, 1967, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Bega's</td>
<td>RX 51,3</td>
<td>St. Bega's</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Parker, C.A., 1909, 113; Collingwood, U.G., 1928, 2607; McIntire, 1928, 17; Collingwood, U.G., 1928, 17; Smith, 1967, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salwick</td>
<td>RX 51,3</td>
<td>Cold Held</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>McIntire, 1928, 17; Collingwood, U.G., 1928, 2607; McIntire, 1928, 17; Collingwood, U.G., 1928, 17; Smith, 1967, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwark   (Lanc.)</td>
<td>RX 44,25</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hutchinson, 1794, 1, 12, 13, 14; McIntire, 1928, 17; Collingwood, U.G., 1928, 2607; McIntire, 1928, 17; Collingwood, U.G., 1928, 17; Smith, 1967, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanwick</td>
<td>RD 51,3</td>
<td>Hyssop Holme Well</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Armstrong et al., 1950, 16; O.S. 6&quot;, 1857</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedgefield</td>
<td>RX 51,3</td>
<td>Abbs Well</td>
<td>Abbey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Smith, 1957, 1, 9, 13, 14; McIntire, 1928, 17; Collingwood, U.G., 1928, 2607; McIntire, 1928, 17; Collingwood, U.G., 1928, 17; Smith, 1967, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shipley</td>
<td>TX 51,3</td>
<td>Arnsley Well</td>
<td>Abbey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Smith, 1957, 1, 9, 13, 14; McIntire, 1928, 17; Collingwood, U.G., 1928, 2607; McIntire, 1928, 17; Collingwood, U.G., 1928, 17; Smith, 1967, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stirrable</td>
<td>RX 51,3</td>
<td>Chapel Well</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nicholason &amp; Burn, 1777, 1, 35, 5; Nicholson, A. H., 1914, 12, 13, 14; O.S. 6&quot;, 1857; Collingwood, U.G., 1928, 17; Smith, 1957, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanwick</td>
<td>RX 51,3</td>
<td>Hyssop Holme Well</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>McIntire, 1928, 17; Collingwood, U.G., 1928, 2607; McIntire, 1928, 17; Collingwood, U.G., 1928, 17; Smith, 1967, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stapleton</td>
<td>RX 51,3</td>
<td>Briac's Well</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Collingwood, U.G., 1923, 209; McIntire, 1928, 17; Collingwood, U.G., 1928, 17; Smith, 1967, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorntonsholme: Bothel</td>
<td>RX 51,3</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pymble: Hope, 1931, 1, 2, 13, 14; McIntire, 1928, 17; Collingwood, U.G., 1928, 2607; McIntire, 1928, 17; Smith, 1967, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>N.G.R.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Church</td>
<td>Chapel</td>
<td>Pre-Conquest Sculpture</td>
<td>Curv. Geog.</td>
<td>Other Site</td>
<td>Gatherings</td>
<td>Curves</td>
<td>Baptisms</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisle</td>
<td>NY 258,377</td>
<td>Elfe (or Elfa How)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Native site + cairn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Collingwood, W.G., 1923, 242; McIntire, 1944, 15; O.S. 6&quot;, 1956</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iverston</td>
<td>SD 317,857</td>
<td>Holy Well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Taylor, 1903, 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iverston*</td>
<td>SD 314,822</td>
<td>Sheriff Well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Taylor, 1903, 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skelton</td>
<td>NY 554,583</td>
<td>Holy Well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O.S. 1&quot;, 1971</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skelton</td>
<td>NY 568,518</td>
<td>St. Cuthbert's Spring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In wood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>McIntire, 1944, 15; O.S. 6&quot;, 1970</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skelton</td>
<td>NY 27,48</td>
<td>Holy Well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hutchinson, 1794, 1, 479; McIntire, 1944, 15; Lyons, 1816, LXVI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skelton</td>
<td>NY 45,827</td>
<td>Holy Well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nicholson &amp; Burn, 1777, 1, 236; Bulmer, 1885, 396-7; Collingwood, W.G., 1926, 30; O.S. 6&quot;, 1956</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heywood</td>
<td>NY 43,48</td>
<td>St. Wilfrid's Well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>McIntire, 1944, 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x seq:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolton</td>
<td>NY 648,212</td>
<td>Holy Well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O.S. 6&quot;, 1953; N.R., NRSNW2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bramley:</td>
<td>NY 48,57</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>McIntire, 1944, 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bramley:</td>
<td>NY 600,594</td>
<td>St. Ann's Well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O.S. 6&quot;, 1957</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broom</td>
<td>NY 584,572</td>
<td>Chapel Well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O.S. 6&quot;, 1957</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottle Carrock</td>
<td>NY 536,563</td>
<td>St. John's Well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O.S. 6&quot;, 1957</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Site not mapped
+ Anglo-Saxon sculpture
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>M.O.R.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>References</th>
<th>Reason for Rejection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aitken</td>
<td>NY 25,53</td>
<td>The Spa Well</td>
<td>Lyons, 1816, CXT; Collingwood, W.G., 1923, 258; McIntire, 1944, 5</td>
<td>Discovered circa 1775 (Ref. I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspatria</td>
<td>NY 1,4</td>
<td>Dolfin's Well</td>
<td>Wilson, J., 1915, 51; McIntire, 1944, 5</td>
<td>A boundary mark - no evidence for a holy well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrowdale</td>
<td>NY 252,185</td>
<td>Salt Spring</td>
<td>McIntire, 1944, 5</td>
<td>This is the same as the Saline Spa, Lancashire - see below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brampton, Cotteshill</td>
<td>NY 534, 624</td>
<td>Chalybeate Well</td>
<td>Hutchinson, 1794, 1, 128; McIntire, 1944, 5-6</td>
<td>No evidence that this is or was a holy well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broughton-in-Furness</td>
<td>SD 21,93</td>
<td>The White Well</td>
<td>Taylor, 1903, 13</td>
<td>No evidence that this is or was a holy well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle Carrock</td>
<td>NY 5,5</td>
<td>Ouse Well</td>
<td>Graham, 1919, 104; Collingwood, W.G., 1923, 217; McIntire, 1944, 7</td>
<td>Probably just an ordinary well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle Carrock</td>
<td>NY 535,562</td>
<td>Green Well</td>
<td>Graham, 1919, 104; Collingwood, W.G., 1923, 217; McIntire, 1944, 7; Armstrong et al, 1950, 75</td>
<td>Probably just an ordinary well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crosby-on-Eden</td>
<td>TNT 305,565</td>
<td>Yeoddle Well</td>
<td>McIntire, 1944, 7</td>
<td>This is the same as the Yeoddle Well, Kirkhampton; see above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crosthwaite, Keswick</td>
<td>NY 257,242</td>
<td>St. Kentigern's Well</td>
<td>McIntire, 1944, 8</td>
<td>Lees (1883, 336) states &quot;no well known&quot; at Crosthwaite Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devoke Water</td>
<td>SD 15,97</td>
<td>Spa Well</td>
<td>Hutchinson, 1794, 1, 572; McIntire, 1944, 8; Fair, 1952, 190; G.S. 6&quot; 1957</td>
<td>'Tradition' concerning Devoke Water is fictitious, according to Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drigg</td>
<td>SD 656,779</td>
<td>Spa Well</td>
<td>Hutchinson, 1794, 1, 572; McIntire, 1944, 8; Fair, 1952, 190; G.S. 6&quot; 1957</td>
<td>Not a holy well - a 'Spaw Well', according to Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilton</td>
<td>NY 141,172</td>
<td>Stanger Spa</td>
<td>Lyons, 1816, CXT; Collingwood, W.G., 1923, 259; McIntire, 1944, 9; Fair, 1952, 190</td>
<td>Not a holy well - a saline spa according to Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prisington</td>
<td>TNT 027,182</td>
<td>Gringlehall Well</td>
<td>McIntire, 1944, 8; Fair, 1952, 190; G.S. 6&quot; 1971</td>
<td>Not a holy well - a spa well, according to Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grindale</td>
<td>NY 372,580</td>
<td>St. Luno's Well</td>
<td>Lees, 1883, 333; McIntire, 1944, 10</td>
<td>It is clear from Lees' account that the former existence of this well is pure supposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irton</td>
<td>NY 082,002</td>
<td>Virgin Mary Well</td>
<td>Collingwood, W.G., 1923, 164; Collingwood &amp; Graham, 1923, 222; McIntire, 1944, 11; Fair, 1952, 191</td>
<td>The name was apparently invented in the eighteenth century (Fair)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamesey</td>
<td>NY 252,185</td>
<td>Saline Spa</td>
<td>Hutchinson, 1794, 1, 207; Collingwood, W.G., 1923, 253; McIntire, 1944, 11; Kipling, G., 1961; G.S. 6&quot; 1957</td>
<td>Just a saline spring; a spa in the eighteenth century and later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Llinton</td>
<td>SD 168,136</td>
<td>Jenny Ha' Well</td>
<td>McIntire, 1944, 13; Fair, 1952, 191</td>
<td>Not a holy well, according to Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Well Name</td>
<td>Authors</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millom</td>
<td>SD 1,9</td>
<td>Grey Mare's Well</td>
<td>McIntire, 1944, 13; Fair, 1952, 191</td>
<td>Not a holy well, according to Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millom</td>
<td>SD 16,78</td>
<td>Bulfel Well</td>
<td>McIntire, 1944, 13; Fair, 1952, 191</td>
<td>Named after a family called Bulfel, and not a holy well, according to Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nether Denton: Dectongate</td>
<td>NY 587,635</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Hutchinson, 1894, 1, 128; Lysons, 1816, CXVII; McIntire, 1944, 6</td>
<td>Chalybeate spring only?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nether Denton: Nook</td>
<td>NY 586,643</td>
<td>? Mineral Spring</td>
<td>Hutchinson, 1894, 1, 128; Lysons, 1816, CXVII; McIntire, 1944, 6; O.S. 6&quot;, 1957</td>
<td>Chalybeate spring only?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penrith</td>
<td>NY 35,34</td>
<td>Michael Grey's Well</td>
<td>McIntire, 1944, 14</td>
<td>A boundary mark - no evidence for a holy well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selkirk</td>
<td>NY 5,5</td>
<td>? Mineral Spring</td>
<td>Hutchinson, 1794, 1, 268; McIntire, 1944, 14</td>
<td>Chalybeate spring only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedgfield: Parkfield</td>
<td>NY 24,13</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>McIntire, 1944, 14</td>
<td>Saline spa only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shap Wells</td>
<td>NY 577,098</td>
<td>Shap Wells</td>
<td>Bulmer, 1885, 333</td>
<td>Saline spa, discovered in the eighteenth century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanwix</td>
<td>?NY 3,5</td>
<td>Spa Well</td>
<td>McIntire, 1944, 14</td>
<td>Just a spa well?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanwix</td>
<td>?NY 377,581</td>
<td>Spa Well</td>
<td>McIntire, 1944, 14; O.S. 6&quot;, 1957</td>
<td>Just a spa well?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitbeck</td>
<td>SD 101,842</td>
<td>Gutterby Spa</td>
<td>McIntire, 1944, 15; Fair, 1952, 191</td>
<td>Not a holy well, according to Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wigton</td>
<td>NY 27,43</td>
<td>'Spaw Well'</td>
<td>McIntire, 1944</td>
<td>This is the same as 'Hally Well', Wigton - see above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findplace</td>
<td>N.G.R</td>
<td>Findspot and Circumstances of Discovery</td>
<td>Composition</td>
<td>Disposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Near Kirkoswald&quot;</td>
<td>NY 56,42</td>
<td>The hoard came to light when a tree was blown over and brought up, in its roots, a pot containing the hoard and the silver ornament discussed below, possibly in 1900.</td>
<td>542 stycas: Kings of Northumbria: 1) Hareid; 99; Redwulf; 14; Archbishop of York; 15.</td>
<td>6 stycas are in the Museum of Antiquities, Newcastle-Upon-Tyne.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aberwood Cave, Grange-over-Sands</td>
<td>SD 411,786</td>
<td>Found among animal and human bone in loose, stony soil which blocked the entrance to the cave, in the course of 'excavation': circa 1893.</td>
<td>7 stycas: 1) OS: Hareid, Rev, Cebert. 2) OS: Hareid, Rev, Cebert, (all reversed) 3) OS: Hareid, Rev, Cebert. 4) OS: Hareid, Rev, Cebert. 5) OS: Hareid, Rev, Cebert. 6) One stycas</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castlehead, Grange-over-Sands</td>
<td>SD 422,798</td>
<td>Coins allegedly discovered at various intervals after 1765, during the construction of a house.</td>
<td>75 stycas (ref. 1) or 95 (ref. 2) of various Northumbrian Kings.</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravenglass</td>
<td>SD 088,958</td>
<td>Circumstances unknown; at Walls Castle, the bathhouse of the Roman Port of Glannaventa, before 1794.</td>
<td>&quot;Saxon coins&quot;</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRAY EXCAVATIONS:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlisle</td>
<td>NY 400,460</td>
<td>Blackfriars St, excavations - later medieval context.</td>
<td>Silver sceatta - 8th cent.</td>
<td>D.O.E. Carlisle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlisle</td>
<td>NY 400,460</td>
<td>Blackfriars St, excavations - later medieval context.</td>
<td>Silver sceatta - 8th cent.</td>
<td>D.O.E. Carlisle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;near Carlisle&quot;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Uninscribed 8th century sceatta</td>
<td>Private collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;near Carlisle&quot;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Uninscribed 8th century sceatta</td>
<td>Private collection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 10b

Stray Finds

1. Findplace: Birdoswald (circa NY 617,654)
   Object: bronze pin

Findspot and circumstances of discovery:

Found during 'routine clearance' of the
south face of Hadrian's Wall between
Birdoswald and Milecastle 49 (Harrowscar)

Whereabouts: Tullie House Museum, Carlisle

Description: The pin is of tin-plated bronze, with a
large flat disc head, and a tapering pin.
The head-plate and pin are cast separately,
and joined by a rivet. Decoration is con­
fined to the (almost) circular plate. The
field is divided into quadrants by a central
cross, and in each sector thus formed there
is a chip-carved triquetræ knot. There are
two raised ridges around the circumference.
The outer one is partly damaged. The head-
plate is pierced on the right-hand side,
asymmetrically, clearly indicating that the
pin is the left hand part of a linked set of
three.
Dimensions:  
Maximum length: 7.40 cm.  
Maximum length of plate: 3.1 cm.  
Maximum width of plate: 2.4 cm.

Suggested date: Eighth century

Bibliography: 1. Cramp, 1964, 90-93, illus. Pl.I; see above, p. 339, pl. 8.1, a,b,c

2. Findplace: Brough-under-Stainmore (NY 792,140)
Object: bronze buckle

Findspot and circumstance of discovery:  
Not precisely known. The object is part of a collection of items from Brough-under-Stainmore deposited in the Craven Museum, Skipton, ante 1931

Whereabouts: The Craven Museum, Skipton

Description: The buckle is flat, and cast in one piece. It has a curved tongue and a narrow catchplate with a backward projection; the plate is pierced by a hole for the back of the tongue. The upper surface is decorated with ring and dot ornament. There are slight traces of red enamel on the upper surface

Dimensions:  
Length: 3.4 cm.  
Width of buckle: 2.7 cm.  
Maximum width of place: 1.5 cm.

Suggested date: Uncertain. ref. 1 suggests Anglo-Saxon, sixth-seventh century by implication

Bibliography: 1. Collingwood, R.G., 1931, 83, photo facing p.81; see above, pp 339-40; pl. 8.2, a,b,c
3. Findplace: 'Cumberland'
   Object: Sword handle

Findspot and circumstances of discovery:

Unknown. Acquired by the British Museum through a dealer in Carlisle from a Mr. Archibald Dodds in 1876

Whereabouts: The British Museum

Description: The handle is of wood, decorated with gold filigree mounts, and a single gold and garnet setting. It has a straight guard, and is shaped for gripping. The pommel is slightly domed. Originally, it would have had a total of fourteen mounts. Two are now missing. The layout is symmetrical. Two paired mounts are placed on each of the three grip ridges, while the base of the handle above the guard has one at each side and face, and one in the middle. The guard had a complete border of gold filigree, in two strips, but only one of these survives. Each plaque has a sheet gold backing, with gold filigree superimposed, and is attached with small gold pins. The plaques are decorated with small coiled gold spirals, sometimes opposing, sometimes paired. The garnet cells are grouped into a triangle and surmounted with a circular cell. Two garnets are missing.
Dimensions: Height: 12.5 cm.
Width of hilt: 8.4 cm.
Width of pommel: 6.0 cm.

Suggested date: early seventh century (refs. 2,3)

Bibliography:
1. V.C.H., 1901, 284
2. British Museum, 1923, 92-3, illus. pl. VII, facing p. 94
3. Wilson, 1971, 110
   see above, p. 330, 337; p. 8.3
   not mapped

4. Findplace: 'Furness'

Object: Gilt-bronze head, filled with lead.

Findspot and circumstances of discovery:
Unknown. Acquired by the British Museum in 1870, donated by a Mr. R. Hinde

Description: The head is really a moulded face-mask with projecting ears. The back was originally hollow and presumably undecorated, but is now filled with lead. In the top of the head there is a central, circular hollow, which may be functional. The hair is formed of gilded, wavy lines, slightly worn. The head-band consists of a row of (originally) twelve tightly coiled, cast, spirals, running into each other. Gilding fills the lines between the coils. The almond-shaped eyes are finely cut, with prominent,
feathered eyebrows. The left eye is more or less intact, although the gilding is imperfect. The right is damaged. The sockets are now hollow, but may have originally held a setting. The cheeks are pouches, and the bearded chin is slightly pointed.

Dimensions: Width at head band: 3.0 cm.
Length: 3.8 cm.

Weight: 127 grammes
Suggested date: 8th century
Bibliography: Henry, 1965, 113-4, pl.66
see above, p.334; pl.8.4. not mapped

5. Findplace: Haverback (SE 482,802)
Object(s): 30 complete and seven fragmentary glass beads

Findspot and circumstances of discovery:
Found in a possibly unstratified context in the course of excavation in the Dog Holes cave.

Whereabouts: Lancaster Museum
Description: The beads were of three types. Type a) of which there were nineteen complete and six fragmentary examples, were of opaque blue glass, and had been made by a core-wound process; type b) represented by ten and a half beads, were of translucent
blue-green glass of varying shades. There was only one example of type c) a segmented yellow glass bead with longitudinal striations. It appears to have been originally gilded

Dimensions:
Type a) average diameters 0.3-0.5 cm.
Type b) " " 0.15-0.25 cm.
Type c) length: 0.9 cm.

Suggested date: Fifth to ninth century (ref. 1)

Bibliography:
2. Boon, 1977, 199 see above, pp. 331-2; pp.336-7; pl.8.5, a,b,c

6. Findplace: Kingmoor (NY 392,596)
Object: Gold ring

Findspot and circumstances of discovery:
Found on Greymoor Hill (above N.G.R.) in 1817, by a young man employed in levelling a fence (ref. 1, 166)

Whereabouts: In the British Museum
Description: The ring has a runic inscription, inlaid with niello. The inscription reads:

\[
\text{þe}r\text{a}k\text{ri}u\text{fl}k\text{r}i\text{r}i\text{r}i\text{u}\text{r}\text{i}\text{o}ng\text{læ}\text{sta}\text{e}p\text{o}n\text{ t}o\text{l}
\]

The last three staves are on the inside hoop.
Trans. aerkriufktkriuri onglæestaepon tol This is apparently meaningless, and is therefore probably magical
Dimensions: External diameter: 2.7 cm.
width of band: 0.6 cm.

Weight: 22.25 grammes

Suggested date: Ninth century (ref. 2)

Bibliography:
1. Wilson, D. M., 1969
3. Page, 1973, 164,113
(ref. 2 supplies a very full description and complete bibliography to 1964)
see above, p.338 ; pl. 8.6

Findplace: 'near' Kirkoswald (NY 56,42)

Object: Silver trefoil ornament

Findspot and circumstances of discovery:
The precise findspot is unknown. The ornament was discovered when a large hoard of coins (see above, pp.321-2) in a pot when a large tree was blown over, before 1814 and possibly in 1814. The finds came up in the roots of the tree.

Whereabouts: The British Museum

Description: The object is a flat trilobate plate, with applied filigree and niello decoration, on one side only. The back carries no trace of an attachment. There is a central boss, pushed through from the back. There was originally a boss on the ends of each arm, but the remains of only one of these now survive. There is a border of twisted silver wires.
Dimensions: Lenth: 9.0 cm.
Weight: 82.25 grammes
Suggested date: Eighth century (ref. 2)
Bibliography: 1. Donations ... 1822, 3 (circumstances of discovery)
2. Wilson, D. M. 1964, 17-19, 139-40, pl. XIX, 28. This provides a very full description and bibliography 
   see above, pp. 330,338; pl.8.7

8. Findplace: near Meolsgate (NY 21,42)
Object: Small bronze pennannular brooch
Findspot and circumstances of discovery:
Found at a depth of 1-2 feet, south-west of the filter works at Meolsgate, about 60 yards from the river Ellen, in April, 1953.

Whereabouts: Tullie House Museum, Carlisle, donated by a Mr. J. Bryson, Fletcherstown

Description: The brooch ring is cast as a single piece, the pin is made of a strip of sheet metal, rolled over the ring. The ring has triangular hollow, cast terminals, which contain the remains of solder, and must have originally contained glass or enamel mounts; at the apex of the triangular cavities are two bulbous swellings, which are matched at the other corners by smaller swellings. The pin has an expanded shaft. There are pronounced traces of gilding on the pin shaft, and some on the ring. The back is plain.
Dimensions: Width of ring: 3.0 cm.
Length of ring: 2.8 cm.
Length of pin: 5.2 cm.
Maximum width of terminals: 0.7 cm.

Weight: c. 8.0 grammes

Bibliography: Fowler, 1964, 138
see above, p. 333, pl.8.8, a,b,c

9. Findplace: Moresby (NX 983,210)
Object: Glass spindle whorl

Findspot and circumstances of discovery:
Unknown. Acquired by the British Museum in 1891, with the collection of Sir A. W. Franks

Whereabouts: The British Museum

Description: The spindle-whorl is bun-shaped, with a flat undecorated back. It is made of black glass. The decoration has been superficially applied in grooves in the surface, and is coming off in places. It consists of swirls of red and yellow glass, which radiate from the central hole. The ornament is not quite regular, but a definite scheme has been followed. The inner whirls are of smooth, red glass; the outer, of rather pitted, yellow glass. It is clear that the yellow has been applied first
Dimensions: Outer diameter: 4.1 cm.
Diameter of perforation: 0.8 cm.
Height: 1.6 cm.
Weight: 40.5 grammes

Suggested date: ? seventh century

Bibliography:
1. V.C.H. 1901, 284
2. British Museum, 1923, 89
3. N.M.K. NX 92 SE 14
see above, pp.330, 340; pl. 8.9

10. Findplace: Moresby (NX 983,210)

Object: Proto hand-pin

Findspot and circumstances of discovery:
Unknown: acquired by the British Museum in 1898 with the collection of Canon Greenwell

Whereabouts: The British Museum

Description: The pin is of bronze and was apparently cast in one piece. The shank is slightly curved, and the tip is damaged and split. There is no trace of any applied decoration. The head-plate is of the usual form - a semi-circular flat plate which projects above the shank, surmounted by a row of three pellets

Dimensions: Length: 11.6 cm.
Width of plate: 1.6 cm.

Suggested date: late fourth or fifth century (ref. 2, p.159)

Bibliography:
1. Smith, R.A., 1905, 351, illus. fig.8
2. Fowler, 1964, 152
3. N.M.R., NX 92 SE 13
see above, pp.330,333; pl. 8.10
11. Findplace: Ninekirks, Brougham (NY 559,299)

Object: gilt (?bronze) mount

Findspot and circumstances of discovery:

Found adjacent to Norman burials in the parish church of Brougham, in the chancel near the south wall; possibly associated with one particular skeleton, under a blank tombstone (see above, p. 210)

Whereabouts: Now lost

Description: The object is a hollow circlet of "pale coloured mixed metal, strongly gilt" (ref. 1) and is almost certainly a drinking horn mount; but there are no indications of a binding strip or rivet attachments in the original description or illustration. The decoration consists of three angels, interspersed with three panels of interlace. One figure has a mask-like, pointed oval face, attached to the panel of interlace above by his ears and headband. His wings are attached to the shoulders with spiral joints, and he has a narrow, pearshaped, scaled body. His lower limbs entwine to form two of the strands of interlace in the lower panel; his arms and wings meet in a point above the angle formed by the turned top of the other two strands. The join is awkward, and could be due to faulty draughtsmanship; alternatively, it could have resulted from an imperfect cast.
The angel below this has a much wider face, and a cleft, pointed chin, but the treatment of the features is identical. He, too, is attached to the interlaced panel above, at his eyebrows, and perhaps his ears, but it is possible that these pointed features are in fact the animal-headed terminals of the interlace itself. A small swastika nestles between the two points of the chin. The figure is armless, but appears to have two sets of wings; One pair rises from coiled shoulders, to frame the face. The other pair is simply indicated, by fine parallel lines drawn at either side of the feathered body, which narrows at the waist. The lower limbs are again extended, to form two strands of the panel of interlace below. The third figure has a triangular, pointed face. His hands are long and slender, and appear to spring upwards from his lower limbs. His wings, which have a feathery fringe on the inner side, underlie them. His face is framed by the expanded ends of the strands of the interlace panel above.

The panels of interlace are all four strand, and of different types. As drawn,
each strand has a central line which breaks off just before each intersection. That between the first and the third figure consists of two units of RA type 647 (Adcock pattern B) incorporating a twist. That between the second and the third is composed of three units of RA type 647 (Adcock pattern C). The third unit has the diagonal turned back on, instead of across, the pattern.

Dimensions:
- Diameter: 2-3 inches (5.08-7.62 cm.)
- Width: 3/4 inch (1.90 cm.)

Suggested Date: Eighth century (ref. 2)

Bibliography:
2. Bailey, 1978, pl. XV (as Way, 1948)
ref. 2 supplies a full discussion of the date and relationships of the artifact see above, pp.210, 332, 338; pl. 8.11

12. Findplace: Ormside (NY 701,176)

Object: Small silver and gilt-bronze bowl; "The Ormside Bowl"

Findspot and circumstances of discovery:
Found in Ormside churchyard (above NGR) ante 1823. The precise circumstances of the discovery are not known

Whereabouts: The Yorkshire Museum

Description: The bowl is composed of two hemispherical cups joined by bosses and medallions and (originally) a binding strip round the
rim. The outer cup is of silver gilt, and is elaborately decorated with repoussé ornament of inhabited bushvines. The base-plate has undergone rather crude repair. The inner bowl is of gilt-bronze; it is undecorated, apart from the base-plate.

Dimensions: Diameter: 13.8 cm.
Height: 4.6 cm.

Suggested date: Eighth century (ref. 5)

Bibliography: The Ormside Bowl is an important and much discussed piece of Anglo-Saxon metalwork. The following references cover principal and recent publications only:

1. Collingwood, W. G. 1899, illus. pls. xxx, xxxi
2. Brown, G. B. 1921, V, 318-328, pls. xxx, xxxi
3. Bronsted, 1924, 86-88, Figs. 72, 73
4. Kendrick, 1937, 150-1, 157, 182, pl. LX
5. Bakka, 1963, p, 18-25, 57-8
6. Cramp, 1967, 18-20, pl. 38
Ref. 6 provides a very full description of this object see above, pp. 331, 339; pl. 8.12

13. Findplace: Uncertain; known to have been in the Crosthwaite Museum, Keswick, before 1870

Object: Gilt-bronze mount

Findspot and circumstances of discovery: Unknown
Whereabouts: The British Museum

Description: The object is a partly damaged, slightly concave, rather heavily gilt bronze disc. Decoration is confined to the concave surface. On the back is a triangular iron mount, attached by solder; it has three bronze rivets in the angles, but these do not pierce the disc. The central perforation shows itself as a corroded iron rivet on the backplate. There are two small holes in the decorated area. The decoration consists of two cast concentric closely woven four-strand interlace, each strand consisting of three separate threads. The rings are separated from each other by raised, stippled and beaded rings, which also surround the circumference and the central perforation. The outer band of interlace is divided into three segments, separated by three four-strand knots, threaded in the same manner as the interlace strands. These knots are similar, but not identical to, each other, and each is surrounded by a raised stippled ring.

Dimensions: Diameter: 8.7 cm.
Length of back plate: 6.9 cm.
Width of back plate: 6.7 cm.
Weight: 98.0 grammes
Suggested date: Seventh century

Bibliography: Fell, 1972, 82
see above, pp. 330, 334-5; pl. 8.13
not mapped

14. Findplace: Uncertain, known to have been in the
Crosthwaite Museum, Keswick, before 1870

Object: enamelled bronze escutcheon

Findspot and circumstances of discovery:

Unknown

Whereabouts: The British Museum

Description: The disc is flat, and decorated on one
surface only with a pattern of inlaid spirals, filled with red enamel. The
surface is pitted and the enamel is subject to decay/discolouration, but
the background appears to be green. It is accentrically pierced by a single
hole.

The pattern consists of six spirals arranged in a circle, with a central spiral.

Dimensions: Diameter: 4.3 cm.
Thickness: 0.2 cm.
Weight: 22.8 grammes

Suggested date: Seventh century

Bibliography: 1. V.C.H., 1901, 282
2. Kendrick, 1936, 99
3. Haseloff, 1959, 78
4. Fowler, 1968, 308
see above, pp. 330, 336; pl. 8.14
not mapped
15. Findplace: "near Kirkoswald" (NY 56,42)

Object: Iron axe

Findspot and circumstances of discovery:
Found near High Barn (? disused) farmhouse, Kirkoswald, before October 1907

Whereabouts: Unknown

Description: No details available - "a good specimen of the Anglo-Saxon or Danish Battle Axe"

Dimensions: Length: 7" (17.78 cm.)
Width at cutting edge: 2 3/4" (6.35 cm.)
Thickness: 1 3/8" (3.81 cm.)

Suggested date: Anglo-Saxon or Viking

Bibliography: 1. Addenda Antiquaria 1902, 418
2. " 1904, 351
3. Bailey, 1974, 1, 392
see above, p. 337

16. Findplace: "near Carlisle"

Object: Gold-plated pennannular ring

Findspot and circumstances of discovery:
Unknown

Whereabouts: Unknown

Description/ Date:
The object is originally described as a ring (ref. 1). There seems to be no justification for Collingwood's identification of it as a pennannular brooch (ref. 2) or for a specifically post-
Roman or Anglo-Saxon date; it could equally well be of either prehistoric or more recent origin

Dimensions: \( \frac{3}{4} \) in. (1.90 cm.)

Bibliography: Catalogue: 1859, 14
V.C.H. 1901, 282
see above, p. 329 not mapped

17. Findplace: Kirkbride (NY 231,568)

Objects: 'Saxon' glass beads

Findspot and circumstances of discovery:
from Kirkbride; presumably near the church. Found before 1868

Whereabouts: Present whereabouts unknown; in 1868, at Kirkbride Rectory

Description: No details available

Suggested date: These beads are probably Roman; see discussion above

Bibliography: 1. Whellan, 1868, 248
2. Ferguson & Swainson Cowper, 1893, 509
3. V.C.H. 1901, 284
4. Birley, 1963
5. Bellhouse and Richardson, 1975 (ref. 3 and 5 are to site only)
see above, p. 328-9 not mapped

Discounted

Findplace: Carlisle Castle (NY 397,563)

Object: 'Anglo-Saxon' brooch

Findspot and circumstances of discovery:
Not known; found before 1813
Whereabouts: The Black Gate Museum, Newcastle upon Tyne

Description/Date: The object is a small medieval ring brooch of fourteenth century date, with an inscription in Lombardic capitals (ref. 4). The false identification of the piece as Anglo-Saxon in the literature is doubtless due to the confusing initial description (ref. 1) "An ancient Buckle or Brooch ... bearing a worn inscription in Saxo-Gothic characters"

Bibliography:
1. Donations ... 1822, 5
2. Ferguson and Swainson Cowper, 1893, 501
3. V.C.H. 1901, 1, 282
4. Cowen, 1936, 203-6
5. Gosling, 1976, 172
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