AT CROSS PURPOSES? SACRED AND SECULAR FIGURAL ICONOGRAPHIES OF THE HIGH CROSS IN THE NORTHERN DANELAW, *C.* 850-1000

VOLUME 1 OF 2

AMANDA DOVIAK

PH.D.

UNIVERSITY OF YORK
HISTORY OF ART

DECEMBER 2020

ABSTRACT

This thesis examines the sacred and secular figural iconography of Viking-age stone crosses produced between *c.* 850-1000 in the Northern Danelaw, the area of northern England under Scandinavian economic and political control, in order to address the potential Christian frames of reference of the carvings. This is undertaken in the light of previous iconographic studies, which have focussed primarily on presumed 'pagan' figurations derived from Germanic mythological and heroic subject-matter since the sculptures first came to scholarly attention in the late nineteenth century. Such preoccupations have ignored the nuanced iconographic relationships of the Christian subject-matter preserved on the crosses – the pre-eminent symbol of Christianity – thus preventing any meaningful consideration of contemporary understandings of the monuments' overall iconographic programmes or the various cultural and political contexts within which they were erected. These lacunae will be mitigated here by undertaking a thematic approach to the carvings, which prioritises neither their Christian nor 'pagan' features and addresses the historical contexts of the monuments, including the ongoing phenomena of conversion and Christianisation of the Scandinavian settlers, and the phenomena of tradition and innovation, monumentality, audience encounters and patronage. This enables a thorough engagement with the carefully constructed art-historical and socio-political relationships of the carvings and their iconographic significances, as they might have been understood by contemporary audiences. Close visual analysis of the carvings within their monumental settings is supplemented by consideration of contemporary archaeological and textual sources, including numismatic iconographies, contemporary liturgical rites, vernacular poetry and coeval and regionally-accessible biblical exegesis and homiletic texts, rather than the twelfth- and thirteenth-century Icelandic texts concerning 'pagan' myth and legend usually invoked. Overall, by uncovering such aspects, this thesis provides new insight into the cultural complexities of Christianity in the Northern Danelaw as preserved in the figural carvings, and how these were perceived by contemporary audiences.

LIST OF CONTENTS

VOLUME 1

Abstract 2

List of Contents 3

List of Illustrations 9

Acknowledgements 29

Author's Declaration 31

Introduction 32

1. Problematising the 'Pagan' 33

2. Defining the 'Danelaw' and 'Northern Danelaw' 36

3. Conversion and Christianisation 42

3a. Meaning and Motives 42

3b. The Evidence 47

3c. Ecclesiastical Infrastructure in the Northern Danelaw 60

4. Materiality and Audience Engagement 70

5. Christianising the Landscape 77

6. Taking Thematic Approaches to the Sculpture 81

6a. Moving Forward: Methodological Approach 81

6b. Moving Forward: Overview of Study 86

Chapter 1: Creating a Binary Scholarship: Approaches to the Figural Carvings on Anglo-Scandinavian Stone Crosses 89

1.1 Introduction 89

1.2 The Nineteenth Century 89

1.3 The Early Twentieth Century: W.G. Collingwood 92

1.4 The Early to Mid-Twentieth Century 96

1.5 Moving the Discipline Forward 98

1.6 Iconographic Studies 101

1.7 Re-assessing Anglo-Scandinavian Figural Iconographies 113

Chapter 2: Survival, Sea Change and the Second Coming 116

2.1 Introduction 116

2.2 The Ilkley Crosses 117

2.3 The Leeds Cross: An Introduction 126

2.3a Weland the smith: *Deor* and *Vǫlundarkviða* 126
2.3b The Franks Casket 128
2.3c The Leeds Cross: The Iconographic Programme 130
2.4 The Whalley Cross 139
2.5 Summary 144

Chapter 3: Monumentality 146
3.1 Introduction 146
3.2 Dacre 148
3.3 Middleton 1 158
3.4 The Alnmouth Cross 165
3.5 Summary 175

Chapter 4: Audience Encounters 178
4.1 Introduction 178
4.2 Collingham 180
4.3 Nunburnholme 190
4.4 Gosforth 209
4.5 Summary 222

Chapter 5: Patronage and Purpose 226
5.1 Introduction 226
5.2 Middleton 2 227
5.3 Halton 237
5.4 Summary 254

Conclusion 256
1. Overview 256
2. Monumentality 257
3. Transmission of Visual Languages 260
4. Patronage, Anticipated Audiences and Revelation 263
5. Liturgical Concerns 266
6. Summary 269

VOLUME 2 **271**

Appendix I: Catalogue of Figural Carving Preserved on Viking-age Stone Crosses in the Northern Danelaw 272

I.1 Addingham 1 273

I.2 Alnmouth 1 274

I.3 Aycliffe 1 276

I.4 Aycliffe 3 278

I.5 Aycliffe 7 279

I.6 Aycliffe 9 280

I.7 Baldersby 1 281

I.8 Barwick-in-Elmet 2 283

I.9 Bilton in Ainsty 1 285

I.10 Bilton in Ainsty 2 286

I.11 Bilton in Ainsty 3 288

I.12 Bothal 2 289

I.13 Bramham 1 290

I.14 Brigham 5 291

I.15 Brompton 3 293

I.16 Brompton 4 295

I.17 Brompton 5 296

I.18 Brompton 14 298

I.19 Burton in Kendal 1 299

I.20 Burton in Kendal 2 300

I.21 Chester-le-Street 1 302

I.22 Chester-le-Street 11 304

I.23 Collingham 1 306

I.24 Coniscliffe 6 308

I.25 Crathorne 1 309

I.26 Coverham 1 311

I.27 Dacre 2 312

I.28 Dearham 2 314

I.29 Finghall 4 316

I.30 Forcett 2 317

I.31 Forcett 4 318

I.32 Gainford 1 nt 319
I.33 Gainford 3 321
I.34 Gainford 4 323
I.35 Gainford 5 325
I.36 Gosforth 1 327
I.37 Great Clifton 1 330
I.38 Great Stainton 1 332
I.39 Halton 1 333
I.40 Halton 2 335
I.41 Hawsker 1 337
I.42 Holme upon Spalding Moor 1 339
I.43 Ilkley 1 340
I.44 Ilkley 3 343
I.45 Ilkley 5 345
I.46 Kildwick 1 347
I.47 Kildwick 2 349
I.48 Kippax 1 350
I.49 Kirby Hill 2 352
I.50 Kirby Hill 7 353
I.51 Kirkburton 1 354
I.52 Kirkbymoorside 1 356
I.53 Kirkbymoorside 3 358
I.54 Kirkby Stephen 1 360
I.55 Kirkby Wharfe 1 362
I.56 Kirkdale 1 364
I.57 Kirklevington 1 365
I.58 Kirklevington 2 366
I.59 Kirklevington 4 367
I.60 Kirklevington 6 368
I.61 Kirklevington 15 370
I.62 Lancaster, St Mary 5 372
I.63 Lancaster, St Mary 7 373
I.64 Leeds 1 375
I.65 Lindisfarne 3 377

I.66 Lindisfarne 8 379
I.67 Masham 3 380
I.68 Middleton 1 382
I.69 Middleton 2 384
I.70 Middleton 5 386
I.71 Neston 1 387
I.72 Neston 2 388
I.73 Neston 3 389
I.74 North Otterington 3 391
I.75 Nunburnholme 1 393
I.76 Otley 6 396
I.77 Ovingham 1 397
I.78 Pickhill 1 399
I.79 Prestbury 1 400
I.80 Royston 1 402
I.81 Sherburn 1 404
I.82 Sinnington 11 405
I.83 Slaidburn 1 406
I.84 Sockburn 3 407
I.85 Sockburn 5 409
I.86 Sockburn 6 410
I.87 Sockburn 7 412
I.88 Spennithorne 1 414
I.89 Stanwick 1 415
I.90 Stanwick 3 417
I.91 Stanwick 7 418
I.92 Staveley 1 419
I.93 Stonegrave 1 421
I.94 Sutton-upon-Derwent 1 423
I.95 Thornton le Moors 1 425
I.96 Thornton Steward 5 427
I.97 Thornton Watlass 1 428
I.98 Tynemouth 2 429
I.99 Wath 1 431

I.100 Weston 1 432
I.101 Whalley 1 434
I.102 Winwick 1 436
I.103 Wycliffe 1 439
I.104 York, York Minster 2 440
I.105 York, York Minster 9 442
I.106 York, Newgate 1 443
I.107 York, St Mary Bishophill Senior 1 445

List of Abbreviations 447
Bibliography 448
Illustrations 479

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

Introduction

Fig. 1: Map of the 'Northern Danelaw', corresponding to the modern counties of Yorkshire, Lincolnshire, Leicestershire, Nottinghamshire, Derbyshire and Rutland. Photograph from: Hadley, *Northern Danelaw* (2000), 3.

Fig. 2a-b: **(a)** Coin of Sigeferth. Silver coin, *c.* 894-898. Obverse: Crosslet. Reverse: Small cross. British Museum, London, acc. no. 1838,0710.1256. © Trustees of the British Museum. https://www.britishmuseum.org/collection/object/C_1838-0710-1256. **(b)** Coin of Cnut. Silver coin, *c.* 900. Obverse: Inscription 'CNVT REX' and depiction of cross. Reverse (not shown): Inscription: '+ CVN NET TI'. British Museum, London, acc. no. 1838, 0710.1295. © Trustees of the British Museum. https://www.britishmuseum.org/collection/object/C_1838-0710-1295.

Fig. 3: 'St Peter's coinage'. Silver coin, *c.* 915. Obverse: Inscription 'SCIPE TRIIO' and depictions of a sword and 'Thor's hammer' in lower register of the inscription. British Museum, London, acc. no. 1915,0507.772. © Trustees of the British Museum. https://www.britishmuseum.org/collection/object/C_1915-0507-772.

Fig. 4a-b: Coin of Rægnald. Silver coin, *c.* 919-920/1. **(a)** Reverse: Inscription '+RABIOCIT' and depiction of bow and arrow. **(b)**: Obverse: Inscription 'R ACIIOI T' and depiction of Thor's hammer/Tau cross. British Museum, London, acc. no. E.5091. © Trustees of the British Museum. https://www.britishmuseum.org/collection/object/C_E-5091.

Fig. 5a-b: **(a)** Ruthwell cross, East face. Eighth century. Cummertrees, Mouswald and Ruthwell Church, Ruthwell, Dumfriesshire. Photograph: Amanda Doviak.
(b) Lärbro Tängelgårda I picture-stone. Group C picture-stone, ninth to eleventh century. Statens Historiska Museum, Stockholm, acc. no. SHM 4373. Photograph: Amanda Doviak.

Fig. 6: Cross-shaft Fragment, Fishergate, York, displaying traces of red and white paint over white gesso. Tenth century. York Archaeological Trust, York. Photograph from: Beekman and Bailey (2017), 2, fig. 1.

Fig. 7: Lichfield Angel, fragments 1-3. Lichfield Cathedral, Lichfield, Staffordshire. Eighth to ninth century. Photograph from: Rodwell, et al. (2008), 61, fig. 7.

Fig. 8a-b: (a) Reculver 1e, cross-shaft fragment: Figure with drilled eyes for inset material(s). Early ninth century. Canterbury Cathedral, Canterbury, Kent. Photograph: © CASSS, Durham University / Courtauld Institute. (b) Sandbach 1 (North Cross), Face C, detail: hole between Calvary and Annunciation schemes for inset material(s). *c.* 800. Market Square, Sandbach, Cheshire. Photograph: Amanda Doviak.

Chapter 2

Fig. 2.1: Ilkley 1, Faces A-D. Mid-late ninth century. All Saints, Ilkley, West Yorkshire. Photographs: © CASSS, Durham University, T. Middlemass.

Fig. 2.2: Map of Ilkley, Addingham and Otley. Photograph: Amanda Doviak.

Fig. 2.3: Ilkley 1, Face A, detail: *Majestas* figure. Mid-late ninth century. All Saints, Ilkley, West Yorkshire. Photograph: Amanda Doviak.

Fig. 2.4: Ilkley 1, Face C: Evangelist portraits. Mid-late ninth century. All Saints, Ilkley, West Yorkshire. Photograph: © CASSS, Durham University, K.P. Jukes and D.J. Craig.

Fig. 2.5: Halton 2, Faces A-D: Evangelist portraits. Ninth century. St Wilfrid's, Halton, Lancashire. Photographs: © CASSS, Durham University, R.M.C. Trench-Jellicoe.

Fig. 2.6: Halton 2, Face D, detail: Evangelist portrait. Ninth century. St Wilfrid's, Halton, Lancashire. Photograph: © CASSS, Durham University, R.M.C. Trench-Jellicoe.

Fig. 2.7: Leeds Cross, Faces A-D. Tenth century. Leeds Minster, Leeds, West Yorkshire. Photographs: Amanda Doviak.

Fig. 2.8: Franks Casket, front panel: Weland scene and Adoration of the Magi. Early eighth century. British Museum, London, acc. no. 1867,0120.1. Photograph: © Trustees of the British Museum.

Fig. 2.9: Leeds Cross, Face A, detail: lowermost figure. Tenth century. Leeds Minster, Leeds, West Yorkshire. Photograph: Amanda Doviak.

Fig. 2.10: Leeds Cross, Face A, detail: symbol accompanying lowermost figure. Tenth Century. Leeds Minster, Leeds, West Yorkshire. Photograph: Amanda Doviak.

Fig. 2.11: Lärbro Tängelgårda I picture-stone. Group C picture-stone, ninth to eleventh century. Statens Historiska Museum, Stockholm, acc. no. SHM 4373. Photograph: Amanda Doviak.

Fig. 2.12: Leeds Cross, Face A, detail: upper figure. Tenth century. Leeds Minster, Leeds, West Yorkshire. Photograph: Amanda Doviak.

Fig. 2.13: Leeds Cross, Face C, detail: Weland scheme. Tenth century. Leeds Minster, Leeds, West Yorkshire. Photograph: Amanda Doviak.

Fig. 2.14: Leeds Cross, Face C, detail: female figure in Weland scheme. Tenth century. Leeds Minster, Leeds, West Yorkshire. Photograph: Amanda Doviak.

Fig. 2.15: Leeds Cross, Face C, detail: central figure. Tenth century. Leeds Minster, Leeds, West Yorkshire. Photograph: Amanda Doviak.

Fig. 2.16: Leeds Cross, Face C, detail: uppermost figure. Tenth century. Leeds Minster, Leeds, West Yorkshire. Photograph: Amanda Doviak.

Fig. 2.17: Franks Casket, Front Panel, detail: Weland scene. Early eighth century. British Museum, London, acc. no. 1867,0120.1. Photograph: © Trustees of the British Museum.

Fig. 2.18: Ardre VIII picture-stone. Group D picture-stone, ninth to eleventh century. Statens Historiska Museum, Stockholm, acc. no. SHM 11118:8. Photograph: Amanda Doviak.

Fig. 2.19: Ardre VIII picture-stone, detail: Weland scene. Group D picture-stone, ninth to eleventh century. Statens Historiska Museum, Stockholm, acc. no. SHM 11118:8. Photograph: Amanda Doviak.

Fig. 2.20: Mount, depicting figure in flying contrivance. Gilded copper-alloy. Late tenth century. Uppåkra, Sweden. Lund University Historical Museum, Lund, Sweden, acc. no. LUHM 32146:13360. Photograph: Amanda Doviak.

Fig. 2.21: Pendant, Tissø, Denmark. Gilded copper-alloy. Tenth century. National Museet, Copenhagen, Denmark, acc. no. FB-0247. Photograph: Amanda Doviak.

Fig. 2.22: Sword scabbard chape, Birka, Sweden. Mid-tenth century. Statens Historiska Museum, Stockholm, Sweden. Photograph from: Helmbrecht (2012), 174.

Fig. 2.23: Ilkley 3, Face A, detail: Figure with curling nimbus. Mid- to late ninth century. All Saints, Ilkley, West Yorkshire. Photograph: Amanda Doviak.

Fig. 2.24: Map of Roman Roads, detail: Roads 712, 72 and 729. Photograph from: Margary (1955), 90, fig. 3.

Fig. 2.25: Whalley Cross, Faces A-D. Tenth Century. St Mary's, Whalley, Lancashire. Photographs: © CASSS, Durham University, R.M.C. Trench-Jellicoe.

Fig. 2.26: Whalley Cross, Face A, detail: nimbed *orans* figure flanked by serpents. Tenth century. St Mary's, Whalley, Lancashire. Photograph: Amanda Doviak.

Fig. 2.27a-b: **(a)** Whalley Cross, Face B, detail: *orans* figure. Tenth century. St Mary's, Whalley, Lancashire. **(b)** Whalley Cross, Face D, detail: *orans* figure. Tenth century. St Mary's, Whalley, Lancashire. Photographs: © CASSS, Durham University, R.M.C. Trench-Jellicoe.

Fig. 2.28: Whalley Cross, Face C, detail: nimbed *orans* figure. Photograph: © CASSS, Durham University, R.M.C. Trench-Jellicoe.

Fig. 2.29: Ruthwell Cross, West Face, detail: Christ in Majesty over the Beasts. Eighth century. Eighth century. Cummertrees, Mouswald and Ruthwell Church, Ruthwell, Dumfriesshire. Photograph: Amanda Doviak.

Chapter 3

Fig. 3.1: Dacre Cross, Faces A, B, D. Tenth to eleventh century. St Andrew's, Dacre, Cumbria. Photographs: Amanda Doviak.

Fig. 3.2: Dacre Cross, Face A. Tenth to eleventh century. St Andrew's, Dacre, Cumbria. Photograph: Amanda Doviak.

Fig. 3.3: Oseberg cart, right-hand side-panel, detail: Figure with ponytail hair arrangement in tunic. Wooden cart, *c.* 850. Vikingskipshuset, Oslo, Norway, acc. no. C55000. Photograph: Amanda Doviak.

Fig. 3.4: Dacre Cross, Face A, upper panel, detail: two figures clasping hands over object. Tenth to eleventh century. St Andrew's, Dacre, Cumbria. Photograph: Amanda Doviak.

Fig. 3.5a-b: (a) Franks Casket, lid. Early eighth century. British Museum, London, acc. no. 1867,0120.1. Photograph: © Trustees of the British Museum. (b) Franks Casket, front panel. Early eighth century. British Museum, London, acc. no. 1867,0120.1. Photograph: © Trustees of the British Museum.

Fig. 3.6: Ardre VIII picture-stone, detail: lower panel. Group D picture-stone, ninth to eleventh century. Statens Historiska Museum, Stockholm, acc. no. SHM 11118:8. Photograph: Amanda Doviak.

Fig. 3.7: Wooden casket, right end, detail: the baptism of Christ. Boxwood, copper-alloy, glass, mid-eleventh century. Cleveland Museum of Art, Cleveland, Ohio, acc. no. 1953.362. Photograph: © Cleveland Museum of Art.

Fig. 3.8: Detail, 'Kilian baptising'. Fol. 5r, Passio Kyliani, MS 189. Hanover, Hannover Niedersächsische Landesbibliothek. Photograph from: Hahn (2013), 14, fig. 6.

Fig. 3.9: Stone font, Southeast face. First half of the ninth century. St Mary's, Deerhurst, Gloucester. Photograph: © CASSS, Durham University, J. Crook.

Fig. 3.10: Middleton 1 Cross, Face A: hunt scheme. Tenth century. St Andrew's, Middleton, East Yorkshire. Photograph: Amanda Doviak.

Fig. 3.11: Middleton 1 Cross, Face C: bound creature. Tenth century. St Andrew's, Middleton, East Yorkshire. Photograph: Amanda Doviak.

Fig. 3.12: Stonegrave 7. Fragmentary grave cover. Tenth century. Holy Trinity, Stonegrave, East Yorkshire. Photograph: Amanda Doviak.

Fig. 3.13: Middleton 3, Face B, detail: Traces of red paint. Tenth century. St Andrew's, Middleton, East Yorkshire. Photograph: Amanda Doviak.

Fig. 3.14: Middleton 2, Face C: bound creature. Tenth century. St Andrew's, Middleton, East Yorkshire. Photograph: Amanda Doviak.

Fig. 3.15: Hunt scheme with hart and two hounds. Fol. 24v, Utrecht Psalter, MS Bibl. Rhenotraiectinae I Nr 32. Universiteitsbibliotheek, Utrecht. Ninth century. Photograph: http://psalter.library.uu.nl/page?p=55&res=2&x=0&y=126.

Fig. 3.16: Alnmouth Cross, Face A: Crucifixion scheme. Late ninth to early tenth century. Great North Museum, Newcastle, Northumberland, acc. no. 1958.8 N. Photograph: Amanda Doviak.

Fig. 3.17: Alnmouth Cross, Face C: interlace panels and inscriptions. Late ninth to early tenth century. Great North Museum, Newcastle, Northumberland, acc. no. 1958.8 N. Photograph: Amanda Doviak.

Fig. 3.18: Romsey 2, crucifixion panel. Ninth century. Abbey, St Mary, Romsey, Hampshire. Photograph: © CASSS, Durham University, RCHME: Batsford.

Fig. 3.19: Ivory plaque showing Crucifixion scheme. *c.* 1000. Musée de la Cour D'or, Metz Metropole, Metz, acc. no. 3550. Photograph: http://musee.metzmetropole.fr/en/mediaeval-collections/medieval-binding-testimony-of-the-work-on-ivory-in-metz_-r.html#.X67J-Mj7RPY.

Chapter 4

Fig. 4.1: Collingham 2 Cross, Faces A-D. Late ninth century. St Oswald's, Collingham, West Yorkshire. Photographs: Amanda Doviak.

Fig. 4.2: Collingham 1 Cross, Faces A-D. Late ninth century. St Oswald's, Collingham, West Yorkshire. Photographs: Amanda Doviak.

Fig. 4.3: Collingham 1 Cross, Face A. Late ninth century. St Oswald's, Collingham, West Yorkshire. Photograph: Amanda Doviak.

Fig. 4.4: Collingham 1 Cross, Face B. Late ninth century. St Oswald's. Collingham, West Yorkshire. Photograph: Amanda Doviak.

Fig. 4.5: Collingham 1 Cross, Face C. Late ninth century. St Oswald's, Collingham, West Yorkshire. Photograph: Amanda Doviak.

Fig. 4.6: Hackness 1, Face A. Fragmentary cross-shaft, late seventh to early ninth century. St Peter's, Hackness, East Yorkshire. Photograph: © CASSS, Durham University, T. Middlemass.

Fig. 4.7: Collingham 1 Cross, Face D. Late ninth century. St Oswald's, Collingham, West Yorkshire. Photograph: © CASSS, Durham University, K.P. Jukes and D.J. Craig.

Fig. 4.8: Collingham 1 Cross, Face B, detail: damage to bottom of shaft. Late ninth century. St Oswald's, Collingham, West Yorkshire. Photograph: Amanda Doviak.

Fig. 4.9: Gulval 1, Face A: chamfered arris (mounted upside down). Fragmentary cross-shaft, tenth to eleventh century. St Gulval's, Gulval, Cornwall. Photograph: © CASSS, Durham University, A. Preston-Jones and A. Langdon.

Fig. 4.10: Penrith 4, Face C: 'collar' marking transition between rectangular cross-shaft and cylindrical base. Tenth century. St Andrew's, Penrith, Cumbria. Photograph: Amanda Doviak.

Fig. 4.11: Otley 1, Face A. Late eighth century. All Saints, Otley, West Yorkshire. Photograph: © CASSS, Durham University, K.P. Jukes and D.J. Craig.

Fig. **4.12**: Drawing of Cuthbert coffin, left side-panel. Late seventh century. Durham Cathedral, Durham, County Durham. Photograph from: Battiscombe (1956), Plate VIII.

Fig. 4.13: Sandbach 1 (North Cross), Face A, detail: *traditio legis cum clavis* scene. *c.* 800. Market Square, Sandbach, Cheshire. Photograph: Amanda Doviak.

Fig. 4.14a-c: **(a)** Collingham 1 Cross, Face A, detail: lowermost figure with head turned to the left (viewer's right). Late ninth century. St Oswald's, Collingham, West Yorkshire. Photograph: Amanda Doviak. **(b)** Collingham 1 Cross, Face A, detail: lowermost figure with head turned to the left (viewer's right). Late ninth century. St Oswald's, Collingham, West Yorkshire. Photograph: Amanda Doviak. **(c)** Diagram: Potential paths of movement based on the viewer's approach and observation of the turned heads of the lowermost figures on Collingham 1, Faces A and C. Photograph: Amanda Doviak.

Fig. 4.15: Collingham 2 Cross, Face C. Late ninth century. St Oswald's, Collingham, West Yorkshire. Photograph: Amanda Doviak.

Fig. 4.16: Collingham 2 Cross, Faces A and C. Late ninth century. St Oswald's, Collingham, West Yorkshire. Photographs: Amanda Doviak.

Fig. 4.17: Collingham 2 Cross, Face D. Late ninth century. St Oswald's, Collingham, West Yorkshire. Photograph: Amanda Doviak.

Fig. 4.18: Nunburnholme Cross, Faces A-D. Late ninth to early tenth century. St James', Nunburnholme, East Yorkshire. Photographs: Amanda Doviak

Fig. 4.19: Nunburnholme Cross, Faces A-D: Correct orientation. Late ninth to early tenth century. St James', Nunburnholme, East Yorkshire. Photographs: Amanda Doviak.

Fig. 4.20: Nunburnholme Cross, Face D, detail: lower panel showing figure holding chalice, with pair of superimposed confronting figures. Late ninth to early tenth century. St James', Nunburnholme, East Yorkshire. Photograph: Amanda Doviak.

Fig. 4.21: Nunburnholme Cross, Face A (correct orientation), detail: upper panel. Late ninth to early tenth century. St James', Nunburnholme, East Yorkshire. Photograph: Amanda Doviak.

Fig. 4.22: Nunburnholme Cross, Face A (correct orientation), detail: lower panel. Late ninth to early tenth century. St James', Nunburnholme, East Yorkshire. Photograph: Amanda Doviak.

Fig. 4.23: Derby St Alkmund's 3, Face A: Seated figure with harp and sword. Late tenth century. Derby Museum and Art Gallery, Derby, Derbyshire. Photograph: Jane Hawkes.

Fig. 4.24: Nunburnholme Cross, Face B (correct orientation). Late ninth to early tenth century. St James', Nunburnholme, East Yorkshire. Photograph: Amanda Doviak.

Fig. 4.25: Stonegrave 1 Cross, Face A, detail: figure wearing book satchel or reliquary. Tenth century. Holy Trinity, Stonegrave, East Yorkshire. Photograph: Amanda Doviak.

Fig. 4.26: Bewcastle Cross, Face A, detail: Christ wearing a *rational*. First half of eighth century. St Cuthbert's, Bewcastle, Cumbria. Photograph: Amanda Doviak.

Fig. 4.27: Ezra Portrait. Fol. 5v, Codex Amiatinus, MS Amiatino 1. Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana. Before 716. Photograph: Public Domain.

Fig. 4.28: Nunburnholme Cross, Face C (correct orientation), upper panel. Late ninth to early tenth century. St James', Nunburnholme, East Yorkshire. Photograph: Amanda Doviak.

Fig. 4.29a-b: **(a)** Sutton-upon-Derwent 1 Cross, Face A, detail: Virgin and Child. Late tenth to mid-eleventh century. St Michael's, Sutton-upon-Derwent, East Yorkshire. Photograph: Amanda Doviak. **(b)** Shelford 1 Cross, Face A, detail: Virgin and Child. Early tenth century. St Peter and St Paul's, Shelford, Nottinghamshire. Photograph: © CASSS, Durham University, P. Everson and D.A. Stocker.

Fig. 4.30: Nunburnholme Cross, Face C (correct orientation), lower panel. Late ninth to early tenth century. St James', Nunburnholme, East Yorkshire. Photograph: Amanda Doviak.

Fig. 4.31a-b: **(a)** Barwick-in-Elmet 2, Face A: blessing scheme. Fragmentary cross-shaft, tenth century. All Saints, Barwick-in-Elmet, West Yorkshire. Photograph: Amanda Doviak. **(b)** York Minster 2, Face A: blessing scheme. Fragmentary cross-shaft, late ninth to early tenth century. St Peter's, York, North Yorkshire. Photograph: © CASSS, Durham University, T. Middlemass.

Fig. 4.32a-b: **(a)** South Cross, Kells, East Face, detail: Crucifixion scheme. Tenth century. St Columba, Kells, Co. Meath. Photograph: Jane Hawkes. **(b)** Cross of the Scriptures, Clonmacnoise, West Face, cross-head detail: Crucifixion scheme. Early tenth century. Clonmacnoise, Co. Offaly. Photograph from: Harbison (1992).

Fig. 4.33: Nunburnholme Cross, Face D (correct orientation), upper panel. Late ninth to early tenth century. St James', Nunburnholme, East Yorkshire. Photograph: Amanda Doviak.

Fig. 4.34: Nunburnholme Cross, Face D (correct orientation), lower panel. Late ninth to early tenth century. St James', Nunburnholme, East Yorkshire. Photograph: Amanda Doviak.

Fig. 4.35: Nunburnholme Cross, Face D (correct orientation), lower panel, detail: pair of overcarved, confronting figures. Late ninth to early tenth century. St James', Nunburnholme, East Yorkshire. Photograph: Amanda Doviak.

Fig. 4.36a-b: **(a)** Halton 1, Face C: Sigurd scheme. Tenth Century. St Wilfrid's, Halton, Lancashire. Photograph: © CASSS, Durham University, R.M.C. Trench-Jellicoe. **(b)** Ramsund runestone. Eleventh century. Ramsund, Eskilstuna, Södermanland, Sweden. Photograph: Public Domain.

Fig. 4.37: Ruthwell Cross, West Face, detail: Paul and Anthony panel. Eighth century. Cummertrees, Mouswald and Ruthwell Church, Ruthwell, Dumfriesshire. Photograph: Amanda Doviak.

Fig. 4.38a-b: **(a)** St Vigeans 007, Face A, detail: Paul and Anthony scheme. Late eighth to early ninth century. St Vigeans Museum, St Vigeans, Angus. Photograph from: Geddes (2017), Vol. 2, 235. **(b)** Armagh Cross, North Face, detail: Paul and Anthony scheme. Early ninth century. Armagh Church of Ireland Cathedral, Armagh, Co. Armagh. Photograph from: Harbison (1992).

Fig. 4.39a-c: **(a)** South Cross, Kells, East Face, cross-head (north arm) detail: Paul and Anthony scheme. Tenth century. St Columba Kells, Co. Meath. Photograph from: Harbison (1992), Vol. 3, fig. 951. **(b)** Tall Cross, Monasterboice, East Face, detail: Paul and Anthony scheme. Early tenth century. Monasterboice, Co. Louth. Photograph: Jane Hawkes. **(c)** Nigg Cross-slab, Face A, detail: Paul and Anthony scheme. Late eighth century. Nigg Old Church, Nigg, Ross and Cromarty. Photograph: Amanda Doviak.

Fig. 4.40: Nigg Cross-slab, Face A. Late eighth century. Nigg Old Church, Nigg, Ross and Cromarty. Photograph: Amanda Doviak.

Fig. 4.41a-d: **(a)** Nunburnholme Cross, Face A (correct orientation), upper panel, detail: Angel frieze. Late ninth to early tenth century. St James',

Nunburnholme, East Yorkshire. Photograph: Amanda Doviak. **(b)** Nunburnholme Cross, Face B (correct orientation), upper panel, detail: Angel frieze. Late ninth to early tenth century. St James', Nunburnholme, East Yorkshire. Photograph: Amanda Doviak. **(c)** Nunburnholme Cross, Face D (correct orientation), upper panel, detail: Angel frieze. Late ninth to early tenth century. St James', Nunburnholme, East Yorkshire. Photograph: Amanda Doviak **(d)** Nunburnholme Cross, Faces A and D (correct orientation), upper panel, detail: Angel frieze. Late ninth to early tenth century. St James', Nunburnholme, East Yorkshire. Photograph: Amanda Doviak.

Fig. 4.42: Newgate 1 Cross-shaft (fragmentary), Faces A-D, details: Angel frieze. Mid-tenth century. Yorkshire Museum, York, North Yorkshire, acc. no. YORYM: 1993.714. Photographs: © CASSS, Durham University, T. Middlemass.

Fig. 4.43: Fol. 7v, Book of Kells. *c.* 800. TCD MS 58. Trinity College Library, Dublin. Photograph from: https://digitalcollections.tcd.ie/concern/folios/v692t643n?locale=en#?c=0&m=0&s=0&cv=0&xywh=-3904%2C-164%2C10172%2C3499.

Fig. 4.44a-d: Eyam Cross-head. (a) North Face: Man. (b) South Face: Angel. (c) East Face: Angels carrying rods. (d) West Face: Angels carrying trumpets. Early ninth century. St Lawrence, Eyam, Derbyshire. Photographs: Jane Hawkes.

Fig. 4.45: Tempation of Christ, fol. 202v, Book of Kells. *c.* 800. TCD MS 58. Trinity College Library, Dublin. Photograph: https://digitalcollections.tcd.ie/concern/parent/hm50tr726/folios/k643b140q#?c=0&m=0&s=0&cv=0&xywh=-3355%2C0%2C9155%2C3149.

Fig. 4.46: Last Judgment, ivory panel. *c.* 800. Victoria and Albert Museum, London, acc. no. 253-1867. Photograph: https://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O90891/the-last-judgement-panel-unknown/.

Fig. 4.47: Gosforth Cross, Faces A-D. First half of tenth century. St Mary's, Gosforth, Cumbria. Photographs: © CASSS, Durham University, T. Middlemass.

Fig. 4.48: Gosforth Cross, Face A, detail: lowermost scene showing Loki and Sigyn. First half of tenth century. St Mary's, Gosforth, Cumbria. Photograph: © CASSS, Durham University, T. Middlemass.

Fig. 4.49: Gosforth Cross, Face A, detail: central scene showing upside dwn horseman. First half of tenth century. St Mary's, Gosforth, Cumbria. Photograph: © CASSS, Durham University, T. Middlemass.

Fig. 4.50: Gosforth Cross, Face A, detail: central scene showing human figure confronting horseman. First half of tenth century. St Mary's, Gosforth, Cumbria. Photograph: © CASSS, Durham University, T. Middlemass.

Fig. 4.51: Gosforth Cross, Face B. First half of tenth century. St Mary's, Gosforth, Cumbria. Photograph: © CASSS, Durham University, T. Middlemass.

Fig. 4.52: Gosforth Cross, Face B, detail: interlace beneath the hound. First half of tenth century. St Mary's, Gosforth, Cumbria. Photograph: © CASSS, Durham University, T. Middlemass.

Fig. 4.53: Alskog, Tjängvide I picture-stone: Odin Riding Sleipnir. Group D picture-stone, ninth to eleventh century. Statens Historiska Museum, Stockholm, acc. no. 4171. Photograph: Amanda Doviak.

Fig. 4.54: Gosforth Cross, Face C. First half of tenth century. St Mary's, Gosforth, Cumbria. Photograph: © CASSS, Durham University, T. Middlemass.

Fig. 4.55: Gosforth Cross, Face C, detail: Crucifixion scheme. First half of tenth century. St Mary's, Gosforth, Cumbria. Photograph: © CASSS, Durham University, T. Middlemass.

Fig. 4.56a-b: (a) Bothal 2 Cross (fragmentary), Face A: Cross-less Crucifixion. Late tenth to early eleventh century. Great North Museum, Newcastle, Northumberland, acc. no. NEWMA 1956.204. Photograph: © CASSS, Durham University, G. Finch, University of Newcastle-Upon-Tyne. (b) Penrith 11 Crucifixion Plaque, Face A: Cross-less Crucifixion. Tenth century. Borough Museum, Kendal, Cumbria. Photograph: © CASSS, Durham University, T. Middlemass.

Fig. 4.57a-b: **(a)** Lärbro Tängelgårda I picture-stone, third register, detail: Odin riding Sleipnir. Group C picture-stone, ninth to eleventh century. Statens Historiska Museum, Stockholm, acc. no. 4373. Photograph: Amanda Doviak. **(b)** Alskog, Tjängvide I picture-stone, detail: Odin Riding Sleipnir. Group D picture-stone, ninth to eleventh century. Statens Historiska Museum, Stockholm, acc. no. 4171. Photograph: Amanda Doviak.

Fig. 4.58a-b: **(a)** Muiredach's Cross, West Face, cross-head, detail: North cross-arm, Denial of Peter. Tenth century. Monasterboice, Co. Louth. Photograph: Jane Hawkes. **(b)** Durrow Cross, West Face, cross-head detail: Denial of Peter. Ninth to tenth century. Durrow, Co. Offaly. Photograph: Jane Hawkes.

Fig. 4.59a-b: **(a)** Gosforth Cross, Face C, detail: Human figure wearing short, flared garment confronting beast. First half of tenth century. St Mary's, Gosforth, Cumbria. Photograph: © CASSS, Durham University, T. Middlemass. **(b)** Gosforth Cross, Face C, detail: Intertwined beasts. First half of tenth century. St Mary's, Gosforth, Cumbria. Photograph: © CASSS, Durham University, T. Middlemass.

Fig. 4.60: Last Judgment, ivory panel. *c.* 800. Victoria and Albert Museum, London, acc. no. 253-1867. Photograph:

https://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O90891/the-last-judgement-panel-unknown/.

Fig. 4.61: Gosforth Cross, Face D, detail: Two horsemen. First half of tenth century. St Mary's, Gosforth, Cumbria. Photograph: © CASSS, Durham University, T. Middlemass.

Fig. 4.62: Gosforth Cross, Face D, detail: Beast. First half of tenth century. St Mary's, Gosforth, Cumbria. Photograph: © CASSS, Durham University, T. Middlemass.

Fig. 4.63: Gosforth Cross, Stepped Cross-base, Face B. First half of tenth century. St Mary's, Gosforth, Cumbria. Photograph: Amanda Doviak.

Chapter 5

Fig. 5.1: Middleton 2 Cross, Faces A-D. Tenth century. St Andrew's, Middleton, East Yorkshire. Photographs: Amanda Doviak.

Fig. 5.2: Middleton 2 Cross, Face A: Figure surrounded by weaponry. Tenth century. St Andrew's, Middleton, East Yorkshire. Photograph: Amanda Doviak.

Fig. 5.3: Repton 1, Face A: Horseman. Early ninth century. Derby Museum and Art Gallery, Derby, Derbyshire. Photograph: © CASSS, Durham University, Jane Hawkes.

Fig. 5.4: Bewcastle 1, Face A, detail: Secular figure with bird of prey. First half of eighth century. St Cuthbert's, Bewcastle, Cumbria. Photograph: Amanda Doviak.

Fig. 5.5: Middleton 2 Cross, Face B: Cross-head and interlace panel. Tenth Century. St Andrew's, Middleton., East Yorkshire. Photograph: Amanda Doviak.

Fig. 5.6: Sanda kyrka IV picture-stone, detail: Incised tree. Fifth to seventh century. Gotlands Fornsal, Visby, Gotland, Sweden, acc. no. GF C10121_1. Photograph: Amanda Doviak.

Fig. 5.7: Middleton 2 Cross, Face C: Bound serpent. Tenth Century. St Andrew's, Middleton, East Yorkshire. Photograph: Amanda Doviak.

Fig. 5.8: Fol. 4v, Dedication to Louis the Pious. *In honorem sanctae* crucis, Cod. Reg. lat. 124, Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vatican City, Rome, Italy. Photograph from Chazelle (2001), 130, fig. 18.

Fig. 5.9: Halton 1, Faces A-D. Tenth Century. St Wilfrid's, Halton, Lancashire. Photograph: (Faces B, C) © CASSS, Durham University, R.M.C. Trench-Jellicoe. / (Faces A, D) Amanda Doviak.

Fig. 5.10a-b: **(a)** Halton 1, Face A. Tenth Century. St Wilfrid's, Halton, Lancashire. Photograph: Amanda Doviak. **(b)** Halton 1, Face A, detail: Lower panel. Tenth Century. St Wilfrid's, Halton, Lancashire. Photograph: Amanda Doviak.

Fig. 5.11: Kirkby Wharfe 1, Face A: Mary and John flanking a Latin cross. Tenth century. St John the Baptist, Kirkby Wharfe, West Yorkshire. Photograph: © CASSS, Durham University, K.P. Jukes and D.J. Craig.

Fig. 5.12: Burton-in-Kendal 1, Face A: Mary and John flanking a Latin cross (upper panel). Tenth to eleventh century. St James, Burton-in-Kendal, Cumbria. Photograph: © CASSS, Durham University, T. Middlemass.

Fig. 5.13: Hope 1, Face C: Pair of figures flanking a Latin cross. Tenth Century. St Peter, Hope, Derbyshire. Photograph: Jane Hawkes.

Fig. 5.14: Lindisifarne 8, Face A: Pair of figures flanking object. Second half of tenth century. Priory Museum, Lindisfarne, Northumberland. Photograph: © CASSS, Durham University, T. Middlemass.

Fig. 5.15a-b: **(a)** Pilgrim Token, Saint Symeon the Younger: saint seated upon a column with flared capitals and flanked by angels. Late sixth to early seventh century. Collection of Dr. Christian Schmidt, CS1313. Photograph from: Pentcheva (2010), 25, fig. 6. **(b)** Pilgrim Token, Saint Symeon the Younger: saint seated upon a column with flared capitals and flanked by angels. Late sixth to early seventh century. Walters Art Museum, Baltimore, Maryland, acc. no. WAM 48.2667. Photograph from: Pentcheva (2010), 38, fig. 13.

Figs. 5.16a-b: (a) Pilgrim Token (fragmentary), Saint Symeon the Younger: saint flanked by angels, and seated on column without flared base. Late sixth to early seventh century. The Menil Collection, Houston, Texas, acc. no. 79-24.198 DJ. From: Pentcheva (2010), 26, fig. 8; (b) Pilgrim Token, Saint Symeon the Younger: saint flanked by angels, and seated on column without flared base. Late sxith to early seventh century. Museo dell'Abbazia di San Colombano, Bobbio, Italy. Photograph from: Pentcheva (2010), 38, fig. 14.

Fig. 5.17: Halton 10, Stepped cross-base. Ninth or early tenth century. St Wilfrid's, Halton, Lancashire. Photograph: Amanda Doviak.

Fig. 5.18: Halton 1, Face A, detail: Upper panel. Tenth Century. St Wilfrid's, Halton, Lancashire. Photograph: Amanda Doviak.

Fig. 5.19a-c: **(a)** Nunburnholme 1, Face C (correct orientation), detail: Crucifixion scheme. Late ninth to early tenth century. St James', Nunburnholme, East Yorkshire. Photograph: Amanda Doviak. **(b)** Barwick-in-Elmet 2, Face A: blessing scheme. Fragmentary cross-shaft, tenth century. All Saints, Barwick-in-Elmet, West Yorkshire. Photograph: Amanda Doviak. **(c)** York Minster 2, Face A: blessing scheme. Fragmentary cross-shaft, late ninth to early tenth century. St Peter's, York, North Yorkshire. Photograph: © CASSS, Durham University, T. Middlemass.

Fig. 5.20: Cross of the Scriptures, Clonmacnoise, East Face, detail: *traditio legis cum clavis.* Early tenth century. Clonmacnoise, Co. Offaly. Photograph from: Harbison (1992).

Fig. 5.21: Tall Cross, Monasterboice, East Face, detail: *traditio legis cum clavis.* Early tenth century. Monasterboice, Co. Louth. Photograph: Jane Hawkes.

Fig. 5.22: Muiredach's Cross, Monasterboice, West Face, detail: *traditio legis cum clavis.* Tenth century. Monasterboice, Co. Louth. Photograph: Jane Hawkes.

Fig. 5.23: Sandbach 1 (North Cross), Face A, detail: *traditio legis cum clavis* scene. *c.* 800. Market Square, Sandbach, Cheshire. Photograph: Amanda Doviak.

Fig. 5.24: Durrow Cross, East Face, lower panel, detail: Raised Christ scheme. Early tenth century. Durrow, Co. Offaly. Photograph from: Harbison (1992), Vol. 3, fig. 922.

Fig. 5.25: Metal Casket: The Raised Christ. Early ninth-century. Vatican Museum, Vatican City, Rome, Italy. Photograph from: Harbison (1992), Vol. 3, fig. 924.

Fig. 5.26: Fol. LI, Seventeenth-century drawing of a (now lost) eleventh-century fresco at Sant'Urbano alla Caffarella, Rome: Christ enthroned, flanked by Peter and Paul. MS Barb. Lat. 4408, Vatican Library, Vatican City, Rome, Italy. Photograph from: Harbison (1992), Vol. 3, fig. 923.

Fig. 5.27: Halton 1, Face C: Sigurd scheme. Tenth Century. St Wilfrid's, Halton, Lancashire. Photograph: © CASSS, Durham University, R.M.C. Trench-Jellicoe.

Fig. 5.28: Halton 1, Face C, lower panel: Figure at forge and two headless bodies surrounded by smiths' tools. Tenth Century. St Wilfrid's, Halton, Lancashire. Photograph: © CASSS, Durham University, R.M.C. Trench-Jellicoe.

Fig. 5.29: Halton 1, Face C, upper panel: Sigurd sucking his thumb and facing the tree. Tenth Century. St Wilfrid's, Halton, Lancashire. Photograph: © CASSS, Durham University, R.M.C. Trench-Jellicoe.

Fig. 5.30: Sandbach 1 (North) Cross, Face C, detail: Road to Calvary. *c.* 800. Market Square, Sandbach, Cheshire. Photograph: Amanda Doviak.

Fig. 5.31a-c: (a) Kirk Andreas cross-slab, detail: Sigurd scheme with figure roasting dragon heart. Tenth century. Kirk Andreas, Isle of Man. Photograph: Jane Hawkes. (b) Jurby cross-slab, detail: Sigurd scheme with dragon slaying. Tenth to eleventh century. Jurby, Isle of Man. Photograph: Jane Hawkes. (c) Malew cross-slab, detail: Sigurd scheme with dragon. Tenth to eleventh century. Malew, Isle of Man. Photograph from:http://wasleys.org.uk/eleanor/man/churchesandcrosses/crosses/cross_malew/index.html.

Fig. 5.32a-c: (a) Kirby Hill 2, Face A: Sigurd sucking his thumb, with decapitated body. First half of tenth century. All Saints, Kirby Hill, North Yorkshire. Photograph: © CASSS, Durham University, D.J. Craig. (b) Gök runestone: Sigurd scheme. Eleventh century. Gök, Näsbyholm, Södermanland, Sweden. Photograph: Public Domain. (c) Ramsund runestone. Eleventh century. Ramsund, Eskilstuna, Södermanland, Sweden. Photograph: Public Domain.

Fig. 5.33: Kirby Hill 2, Face A: Sigurd sucking his thumb, with decapitated body. First half of tenth century. All Saints, Kirby Hill, North Yorkshire. Photograph: © CASSS, Durham University, D.J. Craig.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank all who have offered me their generous support over the past four years, but I would like to first offer my sincerest gratitude to my supervisor, Professor Jane Hawkes, for her encouragement to pursue this project and her willingness to invest time into its development. Her extensive support, guidance, expertise and enthusiasm along the way have been invaluable, and without this I would not have seen this project to completion.

Thanks are due also to a number of institutions, without whom it would not have been possible to complete this thesis to an acceptable standard. I would like to thank the International Center for Medieval Art for their generous travel funding and conference assistance, which provided me with opportunities to expand this project in ways I would not have thought possible. I would further like to extend my thanks to the British Archaeological Association for their generous funding, which has enabled me to complete this project. Personal thanks are especially due to Anna Malinowski and Olle Andersson at the Lund University Historical Museum, and Annelie Adolfsson at the Bungemuseet, for graciously allowing me to access objects in their museums that were critical to the development of this project, despite institutional closures. Finally, the History of Art department at York has provided a collegiate environment for the pursuit of this research, as well as generous conference assistance, which has contributed to its development.

It has truly been a privilege to undertake this research while surrounded by so many generous and encouraging colleagues, who have provided me with the challenging environment necessary for the formation of this project. I would particularly like to thank Dr. Heidi Stoner, Dr. Liz Alexander, Dr. Meg Boulton and Megan Henvey for sharing your research and lending your support and encouragement.

Finally, none of this would have been possible without my family and friends; I am eternally grateful for your kindness, encouragement and support. To this end, I would like to thank Dr. Melissa Gustin for formative academic conversations about rocks, reading a thousand drafts and her incredible enthusiasm for adventures of all kinds. I look forward to our next moor stomp. Special thanks are also due to Rebecca Mellor for her incredible generosity, companionship and many chats over pints of Old

Rosie. I would like to thank Neil for being a supportive partner, enduring lectures about rocks and Vikings and of course, encouraging me in my academic pursuits. Without the unfailing support of my parents, this would never have been possible: thank you for encouraging me to pursue my ambitions, accompanying me to museums, enduring several trans-Atlantic moves and always supporting my choices, however far-fetched they may seem.

AUTHOR'S DECLARATION

I declare that this thesis is a presentation of original work and I am the sole author. This work has not previously been presented for award at this, or any other, University. All sources are acknowledged as References.

INTRODUCTION

This study re-assesses the figural iconographies of the Anglo-Scandinavian stone crosses produced in the Northern Danelaw *c.* 850-1000, without prioritising either Christian or 'pagan' perceptions of the carvings. This will demonstrate that the iconographic programmes reflect nuanced contemporary understandings of Christianity in the region, using varied and complex arrangements of figural imagery.

The monuments were first brought to scholarly attention in late nineteenth-century publications by George Forrest Browne and William Calverley.[1] Both addressed Anglo-Scandinavian figural carvings, focussing on those apparently derived from Scandinavian myth and secular legend. They considered these exceptional survivals from the period, with the result that the carvings were understood to be 'pagan', despite many being preserved on crosses – *the* pre-eminent symbol of Christianity. This approach established a precedent for later, twentieth-century scholarly discussions, although formalist approaches emphasising typological and stylistic aspects took precedence, thus establishing monumental chronologies and regional distributions of motifs, and defining the social identities of those who produced the sculptures.[2] Thus, since Browne and Calverley, only two studies have addressed the monuments' figural iconography: the first, Richard Bailey's 1980 monograph,[3] while departing significantly from the existing scholarship, nonetheless prioritised those monuments apparently depicting 'Germanic' mythological and heroic subject-matter. In 2012, Lilla Kopár set out to follow Bailey's approach, but returned instead to twentieth-century formalist interests.[4]

By emphasising 'pagan' figural iconography these publications have ignored the implications of the carvings' preservation on crosses, preventing any meaningful consideration of their overall iconographic programmes. Moreover, this perspective has neglected the nuanced iconographic relationships with Christian subject-matter preserved on the same monuments. This study aims to address these lacunae and

[1] George Forrest Browne, "The Ancient Sculptured Shaft in the Parish Church at Leeds," *JBAA* ser. 1, 41, no. 2 (1885): 131-43; W.S. Calverley, *Notes on the Early Sculptured Crosses, Shrines and Monuments in the Present Diocese of Carlisle*, ed. W.G. Collingwood (Kendal: T. Wilson, 1899).
[2] For further analysis, see Ch.1, 89-116.
[3] Richard N. Bailey, *Viking Age Sculpture in the North of England* (London: Collins, 1980).
[4] Lilla Kopár, *Gods and Settlers: The Iconography of Norse Mythology in Anglo-Scandinavian Sculpture* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2012).

establish the monuments' potential Christian frames of reference by considering the interplay of sacred and secular figural iconographies on the free-standing stone crosses produced between *c.* 850 and 1000 in the Northern Danelaw, the area of northern England under Scandinavian political and economic control.

1. Problematising the 'Pagan'

In considering this topic certain issues will be raised that are essential to pursuing a more nuanced approach to the material; primary among these is the 'pagan'-Christian binary. The meanings and validity of the term 'pagan' must therefore be reconsidered to identify the apparent religious background of those responsible for producing the sculpture and recovering the meanings inherent in the carvings. The current fixation on so-called 'pagan', Scandinavian elements originated in nineteenth-century studies of religion that were themselves rooted within the fields of philology and linguistics. Here, the methodology of using late medieval Icelandic texts to reconstruct and explain the religious practises of peoples living in early medieval Scandinavia was developed.[5] For instance, Annette Lassen has observed that Jacob Grimm omitted texts containing definitively Christian characteristics, because they contaminated the "'pure' antiquity of the North",[6] a practise that now permeates art-historical discussions of the figural iconography of Viking-age sculpture. Nevertheless, the problems in employing later Icelandic texts were already recognised by scholars in other fields, not least because the texts were compiled by writers working under Christian influence.[7] Thus, a more nuanced approach to these terms has emerged in recent historical and literary scholarship, which recognises the distinction between legendary and mythological figures, and the function(s) of the latter in relation to traditional beliefs.[8] The Christian-pagan binary, however, remains prevalent in art-historical and archaeological scholarship, where its application to Anglo-Scandinavian

[5] Julia Zernack, "On the Concept of "Germanic" Religion and Myth," in *The Pre-Christian Religions of the North: Research and Reception,* 2: *From c. 1830 to the Present*, ed. Margaret Clunies Ross (Turnhout: Brepols, 2018), 530-33.
[6] Annette Lassen, "Philological Studies of the Pre-Christian Religions of the North from Arni Magnusson to the Present," in Clunies Ross, *Pre-Christian Religions* 2, 553.
[7] For nineteenth- to twenty-first-century philological discussions of intersections between Norse mythology and Christianity, see: Lassen, "Philological Studies," 543-576, esp. 556; and Margaret Clunies Ross, "The Social Turn: The Pre-Christian Religions of the North in the Twentieth and Twenty-First Centuries," in Clunies Ross, *Pre-Christian Religions* 2, 577-592.
[8] See, e.g.: Dawn Hadley, *The Vikings in England: Settlement, Society and Culture* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2006), 215; Matthew Townend, *Viking Age Yorkshire* (Pickering: Blackthorn Press, 2014), 134.

sculpture is further complicated by using the terms 'secular' and 'pagan' interchangeably.

With this in mind, it is worth (re)-defining how the terminology applied to the sculptures and their iconographic programmes will be used here. As the carvings under discussion are found on crosses, an unequivocally Christian symbol, it seems pertinent to begin by defining 'Christian'. When applied to a person, this term denotes someone who affirms their belief in Christ as the son of God, enabling it to encompass all who could (nominally) be perceived as Christians by themselves or others, despite the potentially diverse articulations of this identity. Furthermore, it allows for variations in the extent to which an individual's moral or ethical code might be governed or influenced by Christianity. Conversely, the ideas, beliefs and objects belonging to, or associated with, people that cannot be described as 'Christian', will be referred to as 'traditional', rather than 'pagan'. Necessarily vague, this term enables the inclusion of the manifold and diverse range of beliefs, and the moral and ethical conceptions determined or influenced by them, which belonged to early medieval people not perceived to be 'Christian', by either themselves or others.

Conversely, the term 'pagan' is explicit and broadly designates 'anything not Christian', a wide-ranging frame of reference that suggests only that its meaning is inherently antithetical to 'Christian'. It thus denotes 'otherness', and so imbues anything labelled 'pagan' with negative connotations.[9] 'Pagan' is also used to establish a (spurious) distinction between oral cultures (and their associated religions) and the textual environments associated with Christianity, wherein oral cultures are deemed inferior.[10] Such connotations are evident even in early medieval texts, where the term is invoked to designate either the religion of Scandinavian raiders or the worldviews of Christians compiling the texts.[11]

Moreover, as 'pagan' applies to *all* polytheistic religions, it fails to communicate the potential diversity of practises or beliefs. Given that the label was created, used and understood by Christians to denote people or things that were

[9] Matthias Friedrich, "Image, Ornament and Aesthetics: The Archaeology of Art in the Merovingian World (*c.* AD 450-750)," (doctoral thesis, Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg, 2019), 30-34; Clunies Ross, "The Social Turn," 578.
[10] Margaret Clunies Ross, "The Character of the New, Comparative Scholarship," in Clunies Ross, *Pre-Christian Religions* 2, 65; Nicholas Higham, *The Convert Kings: Power and Religious Affiliation in Early Anglo-Saxon England* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1997), 12.
[11] E.g., in Frankish and Irish annals penned by Christians: Bernhard Maier, "Celtic-Scandinavian Contacts," in *The Pre-Christian Religions of the North: Research and Reception*, 1: *From the Middle Ages to c. 1830*, ed. Margaret Clunies Ross (Turnhout: Brepols, 2018), 64.

perceived as incompatible with Christianity, its use in identifying carvings present on monumental Christian crosses is questionable, at best. Alternatives have emerged in recent scholarship, such as 'non-Christian' and 'pre-Christian'; these, however, define all traditional beliefs in relation to Christianity, which undermines their potential diversity, any distinctions between their cultural significance and perpetuates a *moral* binary. The alternative, albeit more explicit, terms 'Norse/Germanic/Scandinavian mythology/cult' are also not without complications. For instance, Kopár rightly acknowledged that the legendary heroes Weland and Sigurd are not mythological figures, but argued simultaneously that they form "the majority of the pagan figural representations from Viking-Age England … [being] two popular characters of the Germanic narrative tradition".[12] Here, 'pagan' is applied to (secular) legendary subject-matter, implying an erroneous religious element, while the term 'Germanic' is invoked in the philological sense to encompass legendary *and* mythological narrative subjects; the terms 'Norse' and 'Germanic' originated in the field of linguistics, and Kopár's use implies that traditional beliefs should be defined according to the languages spoken by those holding them. In certain archaeological discussions these labels and the material evidence associated with them have also been conflated or used to represent a 'pan-Germanic/Norse' culture, rather than a shared linguistic field.[13] Further, using 'Germanic' or 'Norse' to replace 'pagan' implies not only linguistic homogeneity amongst the various regions and peoples sharing aspects of the root language, but also a homogeneity of belief defined by a common, shared language.[14] Moreover, these terms have a long and turbulent history; they continue to be used and corrupted by white nationalists to support extreme ideologies and agendas, most notably those of the Nazis.[15]

---

[12] Kopár, *Gods and Settlers*, 3. Despite exclusion from mythological episodes, images of Sigurd are referred to as 'pagan' intrusions at Nunburnholme or invoked as a 'pagan' analogue of St Michael: Ian R. Pattison, "The Nunburnholme Cross and Anglo-Danish Sculpture in York," *Archaeologia* 104 (1973): 230; David Stocker, "Monuments and Merchants: Irregularities in the Distribution of Stone Sculpture in Lincolnshire and Yorkshire in the Tenth Century," in *Cultures in Contact: Scandinavian Settlement in England in the Ninth and Tenth Centuries*, ed. Dawn M. Hadley and Julian D. Richards (Turnhout: Brepols, 2003), 194-95; Kopár, *Gods and Settlers*, 28-29.

[13] E.g., Friedrich ("Image, Ornament and Aesthetics," 14-22) criticises using thirteenth-century Icelandic literature to establish connections between the temporally and geographically distant seventh-century Anglo-Saxon England and thirteenth-century Iceland; cf. the conflation of Odin/Woden, underpinning Price and Mortimer's discussion of the Sutton Hoo helmet and sacral kingship: Neil Price and Paul Mortimer, "An Eye for Odin? Divine Role-Playing in the Age of Sutton Hoo," *European Journal of Archaeology* 17, no. 3 (2014): 517-18, 532-34.

[14] Friedrich, "Image, Ornament and Aesthetics," 5-13; Zernack, "On the Concept," 527-28.

[15] For 'Germanic': Friedrich, "Image, Ornament and Aesthetics," 9-12. For 'Norse': Margaret Clunies Ross, "Introduction to Volume II," in Clunies Ross, *Pre-Christian Religions* 2, xvii; Julia Zernack, "Old

Art-historical explanations of the term broadly conceive of legendary *and* mythological subjects as 'pagan'. For example, Kopár (falsely) equated both types of image with the term, implying a religious element to heroic images.[16] For her, certain legendary figures lost their 'pagan' connotations by the twelfth century, enabling them to be "elevated" to heroic status and understood as compatible with Christianity.[17] This implies that legendary figures formed part of a religious pantheon, and so were intrinsically incompatible with Christian ideals, thus eliminating their latent relevance when viewed alongside Christian iconographic subject-matter on monumental crosses in the Insular world.

The conflation of myth and legend, 'secular' and 'pagan' prevalent in art-historical scholarship highlights persistent misunderstandings of the visual material and the terminology used to denote these distinctions.[18] Moreover, these perceptions undermine the ways that heroic, legendary material already extant in early medieval Christian contexts was being received and understood.[19] Thus, to adequately address the crosses' nuanced iconographic arrangements, the figural carvings under discussion here will be understood (initially) to belong to distinct categories with the potential for intersection: Christian; legendary and heroic; and mythological.

2. Defining the 'Danelaw' and 'Northern Danelaw'

Given the late ninth- to tenth-century proliferation of sculpture in England at least partially attributed to Scandinavian settlers,[20] it follows that the geographical remit of this study is limited to the areas of Scandinavian settlement. Yet, the absence of documentary evidence establishing clear territorial boundaries or contemporary terminology relating to these regions means that the terms 'Danelaw' and 'Northern Danelaw', as established in historical scholarship, will be used here to refer to the areas of modern England that came under Scandinavian economic and political control

---

Norse Mythology and Heroic Legend in Politics, Ideology and Propaganda," in Clunies Ross, *Pre-Christian Religions* 2, 472-76.

[16] Kopár, *Gods and Settlers*, xxxiv-xxxvi.

[17] Ibid., 54-55.

[18] See further, Ch.1, 97, 108-12.

[19] E.g., the legend of Weland the smith is attested in Anglo-Saxon England before the late ninth-century Scandinavian settlement.

[20] See, e.g.: Bailey, *Viking Age Sculpture*, 81; Richard N. Bailey, *England's Earliest Sculptors* (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1996), 79-80; Dawn M. Hadley, *The Northern Danelaw: Its Social Structure, c. 800-1100* (London: Leicester University Press, 2000), 29-30; Stocker, "Monuments and Merchants," 179-82.

during the late ninth to tenth centuries. The nuanced socio-political, economic and religious organisation encompassed by these Scandinavian-settled areas warrants further explication.

Traditionally, albeit with some variation,[21] 'Danelaw' has denoted the Scandinavian-settled territory established in the *c.* 886-890 treaty of Alfred and Guthrum, although it does not refer to the region under Guthrum's control in this way.[22] Katherine Holman argued that the 1013 *ASC* entry designated Watling Street the official division between Wessex and those Scandinavians settled in East Anglia.[23] This implies that contemporaries recognised a further boundary between the Scandinavian-settled areas in East Anglia and those in Mercia and Northumbria.[24]

Alfred-Guthrum is the only known legal document produced in relation to areas of Scandinavian settlement before the end of the ninth century,[25] suggesting the Scandinavian political leaders were willing to work within the parameters of Anglo-Saxon administrative frameworks. Shane McLeod, however, interpreted Guthrum's involvement in the treaty as an *Anglian* accommodation of Scandinavians within West Saxon administrative standards.[26] Nevertheless, Alfred-Guthrum demonstrates *both* leaders' readiness to accommodate established Anglian legal practises in forming the treaty.

The two regions' separate legal systems were later recognised, and the term "*on Deone lage*" (in Dane law) was first invoked in the laws of Edward and Guthrum (II) and a law code issued on behalf of King Æthelred II, both produced by Archbishop Wulfstan II of York between 1002 and 1008.[27] Modern scholars have

---

[21] E.g., Townend, *Viking Age Yorkshire*, 22.

[22] Henceforth, Alfred-Guthrum. The boundaries follow the Thames east, then northwest along the River Lea to its source; from here it runs due west to Bedford, and then northeast along the Ouse to Watling Street: "The Treaty Between Alfred and Guthrum," in *EHD, c. 500-1042*, 1, ed./trans. Dorothy Whitelock (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1955), 380; "Alfred and Guthrum," in *The Laws of the Earliest English Kings*, ed./trans. F.L. Attenborough (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1922), 98; "Alfred und Guthrum," in *die Gesetze der Angelsachsen*, ed. Felix Liebermann, 1 (Halle: 1903-1916), 126-28; "Treaty of Alfred and Guthrum (AGu)," Early English Laws, Institute of Historical Research, Kings College London, 2021, accessed 14 April 2021. https://earlyenglishlaws.ac.uk/laws/texts/agu/.

[23] Katherine Holman, "Defining the Danelaw," in *Vikings and the Danelaw*, ed. James Graham-Campbell, et al. (Oxford: Oxbow, 2001), 5-6; Dawn Hadley, "The Creation of the Danelaw," in *The Viking World*, ed. Stefan Brink with Neil Price (London: Routledge, 2012), 376.

[24] Clare Downham, "The Vikings in England," in Brink with Price, *The Viking World*, 343; Hadley, "Creation," 375.

[25] Shane McLeod, *The Beginning of Scandinavian Settlement in England: The Viking 'Great Army' and Early Settlers, c. 865-900* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2014), 25.

[26] Ibid; cf. Holman, "Defining the Danelaw," 3.

[27] Hadley, "Creation," 375. Separate secular rights were previously ascribed to Danes, e.g., in the IV Edgar Law Code, which included the ability to decide on laws and the possession of goods rightly acquired: Holman, "Defining the Danelaw," 2.

adopted Wulfstan's term, which now refers to the *geographical* areas of Scandinavian settlement as defined in Alfred-Guthrum. The term's original designation of the separate *legal* rights of Danes nevertheless suggests that a distinction remained between the Scandinavian-settled areas of England and those formerly under West Saxon jurisdiction, well over a century after the earliest Scandinavian settlement began. Townend seized upon the cultural differences inherent in the term, claiming that it should be understood as "a cultural term that has a geographical element to it".[28] Given the cultural and legal distinctions between the Scandinavian-settled areas corresponding to Mercia and Northumbria and those corresponding to East Anglia, 'Danelaw' will be used here to designate Scandinavian-settled East Anglia.

The term 'Northern Danelaw' is undocumented in contemporary records, but emerged in modern historical scholarship, where it has been applied in the light of individual scholars' interpretations of the territories constituting the Scandinavian-settled north.[29] Furthermore, there is a tendency to divide the Scandinavian settlement into two phases: first, the settlement of East Anglia, Mercia and Northumbria; and second, the settlement of the northwest. As will be argued here, however, excluding the northwest from a more explicit definition of the 'Northern Danelaw' is potentially flawed.

One of its earliest political and geographical definitions restricted the region to the modern counties of Yorkshire, Lincolnshire, Nottinghamshire, Derbyshire, Leicestershire and Rutland (Fig. 1), which were linked by common cultural features.[30] Hadley subsequently revised this definition geographically, limiting it to the modern counties of Yorkshire, Lincolnshire, Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire, which acknowledges cultural differences between the northern territories and the remainder of the Danelaw.[31]

Further complications are posed by cultural discrepancies among these counties, which are most apparent in the 'Five Boroughs': Nottingham, Derby,

[28] Townend, *Viking Age Yorkshire*, 23.
[29] Hadley noted the diverse social and ecclesiastical organisations within the 'Danelaw' region overall, and so redefined the term according to the regional differences observed between northern and southern Scandinavian-settled regions: Hadley, *Northern Danelaw*, 1.
[30] E.g., local names of Scandinavian origin, use of the wapentake in land division, persistent political individuality and uniformity of tenurial custom: Frank M. Stenton, *Types of Manorial Structure in the Northern Danelaw* 2, Oxford Studies in Social and Legal History (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1910), 3-4.
[31] Leicestershire and Rutland differ significantly to the counties further north: Hadley, *Northern Danelaw*, 4

Leicester, Lincoln and Stamford.[32] Despite its different legal and administrative culture, Hadley still includes this region within the Northern Danelaw, given the political authority seemingly exercised by the Scandinavian armies who subjugated East Anglia and Northumbria,[33] and because the Five Boroughs eventually came under governance of Olaf *cuarán* (r. 941-45), a Scandinavian ruler of York.[34]

Townend further highlighted major political divisions within the Northern Danelaw, noting that Scandinavian leaders in York styled themselves as kings inheriting a kingdom (rather than accepting the title of earl used in the Five Boroughs), equating the subjugation of York with the whole of Northumbria because it was an archbishopric and major administrative centre.[35] York's archiepiscopal status is noteworthy, with several influential late ninth- and tenth-century archbishops often assisting secular Scandinavian leaders politically.[36] In this respect, the ecclesiastical organisation of the Five Boroughs differs from other areas within the Northern Danelaw, and will therefore be excluded here from the definition of Northern Danelaw due to its distinct legal, administrative and religious frameworks.

Others have attempted to broadly delineate the Scandinavian-settled areas in the north (without explicitly using the terms 'Danelaw' or 'Northern Danelaw'), with mixed success.[37] Clare Downham, for instance, suggested that by 894 the boundaries of Scandinavian-controlled Northumbria extended as far south as Stamford (Lincs.), although Northumbria's northernmost regions remained independently controlled by the Anglian lords of Bamburgh.[38] While offering reference points for the most southerly and northerly reaches of the region, the extent and nature of these borders remain undefined. The exclusion of such details derives from contemporary documentation, further complicating the application of modern terminology to a region that was unlikely to comprise a single, unified polity.

---

[32] E.g., it had its own court, administration and legal identity, but its classification as a separate region was not necessarily of Danish origin: Ibid., 10.
[33] Ibid.; The region also corresponds to portions of Mercia, the southern partition of which is partially documented in Alfred-Guthrum. McLeod, *Beginning of Scandinavian Settlement,* 221 proposed a diagonal division between eastern and western Mercia, while Barbara Yorke perceived modern Staffordshire (western Mercia), to lie outside the Danelaw: Barbara Yorke, "Historical Background," in Jane Hawkes and Philip Sideobottom, *Derbyshire and Staffordshire*, CASSS 13 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018), 41.
[34] David Rollason, *Northumbria, 500-1100: Creation and Destruction of a Kingdom* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 217-220.
[35] Townend, *Viking Age Yorkshire*, 22.
[36] See below, 48-54.
[37] E.g., McLeod, *Beginning of Scandinavian Settlement*, 214.
[38] Downham, "Vikings in England," 343.

Seeking to explain this, McLeod used the *HSC* to argue that the River Tyne formed a natural boundary dividing Northumbria into its original sub-kingdoms of Deira and Bernicia, with the former controlled by Scandinavians based in York and the latter by the earls of Bamburgh.[39] Unfortunately, this does not account for potential outliers settling on opposite sides of the Tyne,[40] whose settlement indicates that the borders of the Scandinavian-settled north were unfixed, enabling the possibility of permanent settlement to the north of what otherwise may have been considered a strictly enforced boundary. The view that the kingdom was divided by natural boundaries and ruled by two distinct polities nevertheless appears overly simplified and may not be supported by the documentary evidence. The boundaries proposed in the *HSC* may have been applied retrospectively from the mid-tenth to late eleventh or early twelfth centuries, for instance, in order to substantiate the Cuthbert Community's claims to estates located between the Tyne and Wear.[41] Additional documentary sources produced between the twelfth and thirteenth centuries further suggest that the three 'puppet' kings that ruled under Halfdan asserted their political authority beyond the Tyne, and therefore over the whole of Northumbria, rather than only the sub-kingdoms of either Deira or Bernicia, although these claims may also have been intended to promote the political authority of the Cuthbert Community in the region.[42]

The extent of Scandinavian settlement in the northwest is likewise debated, the region being perceived as largely exempt from the efforts of the Great Army, but facing later invasions by Scandinavians operating from Ireland.[43] Settlement in the northwest is typically attributed to the early tenth-century expulsion of the Hiberno-Norse from Dublin, recorded in Irish sources recounting the arrival of Ingimund in Chester.[44] Assuming that this singular event marks the beginning of all Scandinavian settlement in the northwest is misleading, however; Scandinavian groups began migrating between Ireland and Britain as early as the 870s, with the recurring

[39] McLeod, *Beginning of Scandinavian Settlement*, 215. For a full account, see *HSC*, ed./trans. Ted Johnson South (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2002), 53. See further, Rollason, *Northumbria*, 244.
[40] See: Rollason, *Northumbria*, 220; Christopher D. Morris, "Viking and Native in Northern England: A Case Study," in *Proceedings of the Eighth Viking Congress: Århus 24-31 August 1977*, ed. Hans Bekker-Nielsen, et al. (Odense: Odense University Press, 1981), 224.
[41] Alex Woolf, *From Pictland to Alba: 789-1070* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2007), 73-79. Thomas Pickles, *Kingship, Society and the Church in Anglo-Saxon Yorkshire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018), 196-98.
[42] Woolf, *From Pictland to Alba*, 77-79; Pickles, *Kingship, Society and the Church*, 198.
[43] Rollason, *Northumbria*, 213.
[44] Clare Downham, *Viking Kings of Britain and Ireland: The Dynasty of Ívarr to AD 1014* (Edinburgh: Dunedin Academic Press, 2007), 27-28; Gillian Fellows-Jensen, "Scandinavian Settlement in Cumbria and Dumfriesshire," in *Scandinavians in Cumbria*, ed. John R. Baldwin and Ian D. Whyte (Edinburgh: Scottish Society for Northern Studies, 1985), 65; Bailey, *Viking Age Sculpture*, 34-36.

movement of multiple divisions of the Great Army between both islands.[45] Such accounts suggest that there were abundant opportunities for Scandinavians to settle in north-western England prior to the early tenth-century date traditionally associated with its settlement. Moreover, the distribution of place-names ending in -by, a compound more frequently used in the east, supports Scandinavian occupation of the northwest by those from eastern England.[46]

While Scandinavian settlement in the northwest is indisputable, precisely dating its earliest stages is problematic. From the early tenth century the region was ruled by individuals styling themselves "King of the Cumbrians", beginning with Owain (r. *c.* 915–*c.* 937), but the meaning of this title and its associated reach is debated.[47] 'Regnal' records suggest that Scandinavians did not hold political supremacy in the northwest, and the place-name evidence cannot firmly establish when this phase of settlement began. McLeod argued that the *ASC* account of Edward sending an army to Manchester in 919 implies that it was already Scandinavian-controlled;[48] Rollason, however, claimed that Edward the Elder built *burhs* at Manchester and Thelwall, as if fortifying a frontier.[49] These observations suggest that the boundaries of Scandinavian settlement in the west extended at least as far south as Manchester, while illustrating their potential deviation due to military successes on either side. Although these sites provide a potential southern boundary, their presence in the historical record does not confirm precise dates of either Anglian or Scandinavian possession.

Overall, the term 'Northern Danelaw' is largely a modern scholarly construct open to interpretation, and including the Scandinavian-settled northwest in the Northern Danelaw does not therefore seem incongruous. Indeed, parts of modern Lancashire and Cumbria belonged to the archdiocese of York, and are included as such in the Domesday returns for Yorkshire.[50] Despite the northwest commonly being excluded from traditional definitions of 'Northern Danelaw', the region's ties to the

[45] Downham, *Viking Kings*, 21-24; Scandinavians also attacked Strathclyde in the 870s and 890s: Nicholas Higham, "The Scandinavians in North Cumbria: Raids and Settlement in the Later Ninth to Mid-Tenth Centuries," in Baldwin and Whyte, *Scandinavians in Cumbria*, 40.
[46] Ibid., 45-47; Rollason, *Northumbria*, 251; Fellows-Jensen, "Scandinavian Settlement," 65-82; James Graham-Campbell, "Irish Sea Vikings: Raiders and Settlers," in *The Middle Ages in the North-west*, ed. Tom Scott and Pat Starkey (Oxford: Leopard's Head Press, 1995), 74-75; Hadley, *Vikings in England*, 61.
[47] Rollason, *Northumbria*, 214.
[48] McLeod, *Beginning of Scandinavian Settlement*, 219-20.
[49] Rollason, *Northumbria*, 219-20.
[50] Townend, *Viking Age Yorkshire*, 17.

archdiocese of York and numerous scholarly assertions that it was settled by Scandinavians from eastern Northumbria form a convincing case for its inclusion. Documentary and place-name evidence further suggest that it may have been settled before the early tenth-century Scandinavian expulsion from Dublin. Moreover, associations between the Scandinavian-settled areas in the northwest and northeast are also attested by the iconographic programmes of the sculpture produced in both regions. The potential transfer of theological concepts and iconographic models between the two is thus likely to have occurred with the simultaneous settlement of both regions, rather than through two disconnected waves of settlers resulting in two independent settlement areas, as is usually proposed in historical scholarship. Scandinavian settlement in the northwest (namely, in Lancashire and Cumbria) should therefore be viewed as a phenomenon parallel to that in Northumbria and East Anglia. Given the expression of this in historical documents, place-names and sculptural iconographies, the northwest will be included here in the term 'Northern Danelaw', which will otherwise be considered to constitute the region identified by Stenton and Hadley, following the modern county lines of Yorkshire, Lincolnshire, Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire.[51]

3. Conversion and Christianisation

3a. Meaning and Motives

In art-historical scholarship it is generally assumed that the initial Scandinavian settlers maintained traditional beliefs, meaning that the production of stone crosses in the Northern Danelaw has been perceived as integral to their conversion and Christianisation, despite evidence that these processes began, albeit slowly, in Scandinavia from the early seventh/early eighth century.[52] Analysis of archaeological, documentary and sociological evidence from Scandinavia has demonstrated extensive contact between traditional and Christian cultures in the region prior to the tenth century.[53]

---

[51] For discussion of its religio-political history, see below, 44-67.

[52] See: Lesley Abrams, "History and Archaeology: The Conversion of Scandinavia," in *Conversion and Christianity in the North Sea World*, ed. Barbara E. Crawford (St Andrews: St John's House Papers No. 8, 1998), 110-11; Alexandra Sanmark, "The Role of Secular Rulers in the Conversion of Sweden," in *The Cross Goes North: Processes of Conversion in Northern Europe, AD 300-1300*, ed. Martin Carver (Woodbridge: York Medieval Press, 2003), 551-58.

[53] Abrams, "History and Archaeology," 113. For a general critique, see: David Petts, *Pagan and Christian: Religious Change in Early Medieval Europe* (London: Bristol Classical Press, 2011). Some

Nevertheless, the differences between conversion and Christianisation are not easily defined, given their potential to overlap. Lesley Abrams has perhaps offered the most succinct definitions: conversion represents the earliest stages of change, while Christianisation refers to the gradual process by which the new beliefs and practises became fully manifest in society.[54] These distinctions highlight that neither conversion nor Christianisation was instantaneous, and both could occur simultaneously. Indeed, Aleksandra McClain observed the transitional qualities of conversion and Christianisation, wherein the continuities and changes characterising transition are intertwined and coexist, rather than forming distinct phenomena; transition is contingent to its social and historical contexts because it is formed by people's individual *and* collective reactions to the shifts occurring in these contexts.[55] Here, the difference between change and transition is the human dimension present in transition; people and groups form a perceptive response to the changes occurring in their world, in turn facilitating modifications of behaviour, worldviews and relationships.[56] The transfer of emphasis from material objects to the people responsible for their creation and use enables a more comprehensive contextualisation of the objects' meaning and function within such environments during a period of conversion and/or Christianisation. Conversion can thus be viewed as a transitional progression, where those undergoing the change(s) will either adopt the new belief system and adapt, or adapt to and eventually adopt the new belief system. The first group would immediately convert to the new religion, but slowly change their lifestyle and practises over time, while the second would slowly change their lifestyle and eventually convert to the new religion, but perhaps not for many generations.[57]

---

analyses have maintained a bias toward prioritising traditional practises, despite the presence of Christian grave-goods: Sæbjorg Walaker Nordeide, *The Viking Age as a Period of Religious Transformation: The Christianisation of Norway, AD 560-1150/1200* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2011), 44, 39, 189, 277; cf. Abrams, "History and Archaeology," 123.

[54] Lesley Abrams, "Conversion and Assimilation," in Hadley and Richards, *Cultures in Contact*, 136.

[55] Aleksandra McClain, "The Archaeology of Transition: Rethinking Medieval Material Culture and Social Change," in *The Art, Literature and Material Culture of the Medieval World: Transition, Transformation and Taxonomy,* ed. Meg Boulton and Jane Hawkes (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2015), 23-24.

[56] Ibid., 25. Neil Christie likewise analysed how transitions during the conversion process are reflected in burials, the objects they contained and historical accounts in seventh-century Saxon and Lombard kingdoms: Neil Christie, "Becoming Christian, Being Christian in Early Medieval Europe," in Boulton and Hawkes, *Art, Literature and Material Culture,* 76.

[57] Christie, "Becoming Christian," 76-77. Transitional processes are also supported by Scandinavian archaeological evidence; e.g., Abrams, "History and Archaeology," 118. Linn Lager, "Runestones and the Conversion of Sweden," in Carver, *The Cross Goes North*, 497-500.

Furthermore, such change was often part of a 'top-down' model based on a constructed group identity, representing a leader's authority and their followers' allegiance, rather than spiritual beliefs. Abrams suggested that conversion occurred within two dominant frameworks: missionary enterprise and infiltration, with the first representing a politically-motivated model in which a group's leader(s) converted shortly after entering a new region, and Christianisation was enacted among their followers.[58] The perception of Christianisation as a process secondary to conversion presents the possibility that select members of a group were not immediately willing to accept a new religion or its practises, while others may not have rejected its adoption. Conversely, the infiltration model involves influence and exposure, marked by the group's gradual assimilation into another culture and its associated practises.[59] Although these models provide a theoretical explanation of how conversion and Christianisation were undertaken, neither would have been possible in the Northern Danelaw without an extant ecclesiastical infrastructure, which was certainly present.[60]

The political motives inherent in Abrams' missionary and infiltration models of conversion can be supplemented by other sociological or anthropological approaches. Przemysław Urbańczyk, for example, argued that early medieval documents preserve the perspectives of those with extant, comprehensive knowledge of Christianity, attempting to enact conversion on another group.[61] He proposed considering the hypothetical political implications of conversion by comparing "'pagan'" and Christian ideas, expressed through the social behaviours promoted by each belief system.[62] This approach broadly demonstrates conversion's effects, whether as a result of incoming missionaries or a group entering a previously Christianised region.

The absence of individual choice in conversion provides convincing support for more rapid conversions among certain groups; if smaller factions refused to reinforce their leaders' choices, they could be excluded from social activities. Alternatively, disapproval of a leader's conversion could lead to political destabilisation and the potential installation of a new leader whose values better

[58] Abrams, "Conversion and Assimilation," 137-39. For political loyalty as a primary motivation for conversion: Przemysław Urbańczyk, "The Politics of Conversion in Central Europe," in Carver, *The Cross Goes North*, 20.
[59] Abrams, "Conversion and Assimilation," 138-39.
[60] See below, 53-67.
[61] Urbańczyk, "Politics of Conversion," 16; Higham, *Convert Kings*, 2-3
[62] Urbánczyk, "Politics of Conversion," 16; Higham, *Convert Kings*, 1-2.

aligned with those of the majority. Further, Abrams claimed that the progress of Christianisation would require laws, social regulations and other social structures to be modified so they corresponded with the basic tenets of Christianity.[63] In the Northern Danelaw, external pressures from the local Christian populations likely prompted these changes among incoming Scandinavian groups, eventually resulting in the integration of the two societies. Modifications to laws and social customs that made them more appealing than their predecessors might have encouraged the spread of Christianity among certain groups, as appears to have been the case in Scandinavia.[64]

Basic Christian teachings also influenced political motives, according to Urbańczyk, by fostering intolerance and the desire for political and territorial expansion, with literate clergy controlling the flow of information, influencing what was recorded and how it was dispensed.[65] Intolerance for those who did not practise Christianity or practised the incorrect form could motivate and justify territorial expansion by political means. Moreover, certain political motives are implicated in records describing the conversions of early Anglo-Saxon kings. For instance, although Bede indirectly documents Augustine's conversion of Æthelberht, king of Kent, he notes that Æthelberht had prior knowledge of the religion through his marriage to a Frankish noblewoman, Bertha, who already practised Christianity and was accompanied by a Frankish bishop, Liudhard.[66] These details may appear irrelevant, but the marriage implies a political alliance between Kent and Soissons, demonstrating potential motives for Æthelberht's conversion.[67] Nicholas Higham argued that a Frankish bishop, rather than a lower-ranking cleric, may have served a deliberate political function as a link between the Frankish and Kentish courts.[68] Evidence for small Christian communities outside Canterbury suggests that Liudhard's presence might have enabled Æthelberht to exercise some control over Christian communities in Kent, prior to his own conversion.[69] Moreover, Higham proposed that Liudhard's death in the 590s may have been one factor that prompted Gregory to send the mission

[63] Abrams, "Conversion and Assimilation," 147-48.
[64] See, e.g., Anne-Sofie Gräslund, "The Role of Scandinavian Women in Christianisation: The Neglected Evidence," in Carver, *The Cross Goes North*, 485-87, 492; Jörn Staecker, "The Cross Goes North: Christian Symbols and Scandinavian Women," in Carver, *The Cross Goes North*, 467-68.
[65] Urbańczyk, "Politics of Conversion," 22-23.
[66] Bede, *HE*, I.25, in *Bede: Ecclesiastical History of the English People*, ed./trans. Bertram Colgrave and R.A.B. Mynors (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969), 73-75.
[67] Higham, *Convert Kings*, 71.
[68] Ibid., 73.
[69] Ibid., 87-88.

to Kent, implying possible links with Rome prior to Augustine's arrival.[70] Bede also records Edwin's conversion by Paulinus, following his marriage to Æthelburh (Æthelberht's daughter), recounting how the political advantages of this marriage and subsequent conversion were revealed to Edwin in a vision.[71] Here, Bede appears to draw parallels between Edwin's conversion and that of Æthelberht by including details of their wives' Christian heritage. Edwin's conversion may have been even more advantageous than Æthelberht's, however, cementing political alliances with Kent, in addition to Frankia and Rome.

There remained motives for conversion beyond the political; the inaccessibility of recorded and stored information may have prompted some individuals to convert to Christianity to gain increased knowledge of religious texts and their perceived authority. In turn, exclusive information may have encouraged an increase in sustained conversion, as the desire to access more information grew. After conversion, potential exclusion from society could pacify the masses, protect the sacral immunity of authority and establish the idea of a universal community, which enforced a Christian social identity and behavioural ideals.[72] The threat of excommunication would encourage a collective consciousness that fostered Christian behaviour, which might, in turn, encourage a more peaceful society if all its members ascribed to this model, thus providing protection for political leaders. Viewing conversion as a process establishes potential motives for accepting Christianity, and demonstrates the potential changes this could cause among social groups in converted communities. Overall, the evidence for conversion and Christianisation indicates gradual religious change enacted through missionary activity or infiltration, and motivated by spiritual and/or socio-political circumstances, with examples of resistance to Christianity explaining its slow uptake. The scholarship demonstrates that gradual and unstable rates of progression and the potential for backsliding are central elements in the way these phenomena were perceived and implemented in Anglo-Saxon England and Scandinavia. Together, these factors raise the possibility that those arriving in the Northern Danelaw from the Scandinavian homelands were exposed to Christianity before their arrival and settlement.

[70] Ibid., 74-75.
[71] Bede, *HE,* II.12-14, in Colgrave and Mynors, *Ecclesiastical History*, 175-89.
[72] Urbánczyk, "Politics of Conversion," 23-25.

3b. The Evidence

Documentary and material evidence indicate that Scandinavian conversion and Christianisation in the Northern Danelaw occurred within a relatively stable ecclesiastical context, although the Church's role remains largely unconsidered. Seeking to explain this, David Dumville suggested that authors of Insular chronicles were more concerned with documenting the political devastation caused by invading Scandinavian armies, while "the ecclesiastical results of their activities seem to have been of no compelling interest".[73] Nevertheless, the events that *are* documented have substantial implications for the Church's survival in the Northern Danelaw during Scandinavian settlement, its conversion and Christianisation of the new settlers and the production of the stone crosses.

The speed with which the settlers converted and assimilated to Christianity is debated,[74] but the ambiguity of these processes has numerous explanations: the limited archaeological evidence of 'paganism'; a paucity of documented ecclesiastical activities, baptisms or other formal Christian initiations; and finally, the various uses of the words "*pagani*" and "*hæþene*".[75] The continuity of ecclesiastical sites and saints' cults indicates that Christianity was at least tolerated by the incoming populations, something supported by the rearrangement of dioceses, without which baptisms, appointments of priests, consecrations or burials could not occur.[76] Richard Fletcher was among the first to address conversion, recognising the disturbances to monastic life and ecclesiastical hierarchy caused by Scandinavian raids and settlement, but noting that these disruptions did not obliterate Christian institutions in areas affected by the incursions, even at underprivileged religious settlements; this contradicts the views presented in art-historical scholarship.[77]

Although there is no conclusive evidence regarding the rate of conversion, diplomatic conversions were certainly documented and carried out within the first decades of Scandinavian settlement,[78] beginning with King Guthrum (*cyning*

---

[73] David Dumville, "Vikings in Insular Chronicling," in Brink with Price, *The Viking World*, 354.
[74] Rollason, *Northumbria*, 237; cf. Lesley Abrams, "The Conversion of the Danelaw," in Graham-Campbell, et al., *Vikings and the Danelaw*, 31.
[75] Abrams, "Conversion of the Danelaw," 32. See further: Pickles, *Kingship, Society and the Church*, 212-13.
[76] Abrams, "Conversion and Assimilation," 141-42.
[77] Richard Fletcher, *The Conversion of Europe: From Paganism to Christianity, 371-1386* (London: Harper Collins, 1997), 370-71; cf. Bailey, *Viking Age Sculpture*, 41; Rosemary Cramp, "The Anglian Tradition in the Ninth Century," in *Anglo-Saxon and Viking Age Sculpture and Its Context*, ed. James Lang, *BAR* 49 (1978), 11.
[78] *ASC*, MS D, 49-50.

Godrum), who accepted baptism sponsored by Alfred of Wessex in 878 with 30 of his most important warriors.[79] Æthelweard, however, does not mention Guthrum by name, documenting only his baptism and recording Alfred as witness.[80] Hadley argued that this event marks the earliest recorded example of an Anglian king sponsoring a Scandinavian ruler's baptism in England, though royal sponsorship of Scandinavian baptisms occurred earlier in Frankia.[81] This demonstrates that the secular elite in Wessex and the Anglian Church were interested in converting Scandinavian settlers from the earliest stages of settlement, and could successfully achieve this, perhaps following continental practises. Moreover, Guthrum's baptism highlights an efficient working relationship with the Church, a phenomenon also visible in the coinage produced for him.

As Mark Blackburn emphasised, Guthrum's regnal coinage is one of the few direct sources of evidence for Scandinavian settlement in this period actually produced by the Scandinavians themselves,[82] which significantly elevates the importance of its numismatic iconographies. The earliest issues attributed to Guthrum's reign are ascribed to 879/880; minted in his baptismal name, Æthelstan, these feature an imitative Temple design of Carolingian origin, as well as other Carolingian designs and the Frankish mint-name Quentovic.[83] These features emphasise Scandinavian connections to continental Europe, linking them to political and religious networks, and suggesting that Guthrum, or those who arrived with him, were familiar with their practises. Exploitation of the designs suggests that Guthrum or his retinue intended to promote his political leadership, equating him with both Anglian and Carolingian Christian rulers. The deliberate displays of Anglian and Carolingian Christian iconography on objects frequently encountered by many audiences imply that he was concerned to present himself with a universal royal Christian identity, rather than one aligned with specifically Anglian or Carolingian sovereignty.

Additional coinage produced under Guthrum, issued in his baptismal name, imitated Alfredian coinage, but one of the moneyers bore an Old Norse name.[84] This

---

[79] *ASC*, MS D/E, 49-50.
[80] Æthelweard, *The Chronicle of Æthelweard*, ed./trans. Alistair Campbell (London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1962), 43: "barbari pacem promittunt, inducias petunt, non negant obsides, iusiurandum confirmant, rex eorum scilicet suscipit baptismatis fontem, quem superstes de lauacro sumit rex Ælfred in Alnea insula paludensi."
[81] Hadley, *Vikings in England*, 30.
[82] Mark Blackburn, "Currency Under the Vikings Part 1: Guthrum and the Earliest Danelaw Coinages," in *Viking Coinage and Currency in the British Isles*, ed. Mark Blackburn (London: Spink, 2011), 2.
[83] Ibid., 10-11, 13-14; McLeod, *Beginning of Scandinavian Settlement*, 146-47.
[84] Blackburn, "Currency…Part 1," 14-15.

issue suggests that Guthrum, or those producing his coinage, recognised the significance of his conversion as an apparatus for establishing political supremacy. It also indicates that at least one (Scandinavian) settler was aware of the implications of minting coinage bearing their leader's baptismal name and mimicking the numismatic iconography of his baptismal sponsor. These appropriations imply that Guthrum intended to underscore his Christian Anglian connections, and so establish his political legitimacy amongst the Anglian groups under his rule.

Other archaeological material supplements the evidence for the adoption and adaptation of Christianity in documentary accounts. The relative absence of evidence for traditional burials in the Danelaw implies that the Church maintained sufficient stability and the first Scandinavian settlers in England converted to Christianity rapidly.[85] This contrasts with conversion in the Scandinavian homelands where traditional cult practises dominated, rather than an established Christian environment, and so the process was (unsurprisingly) assumed to be slow and gradual. Using funerary evidence from Repton associated with the 873-874 overwintering of the Viking Great Army, Julian Richards thus argued that the conversion of the initial settlers in England likely involved potential collective social and political advantages, or the re-formation of group identities.[86] The significance of the Repton burials is complicated by multiple factors: the site's status as the burial place of the Mercian royal house and the locus of the cult of St Wigstan; its strategic physical location at the meeting point of the valley to the west and the route across the River Trent; and its documentation as a (datable) site of Scandinavian activity.[87]

Without diminishing Repton's status as a monastic complex associated with the Mercian royal house, Richards analysed the historical context of the site's nuanced re-use and its implications for the Scandinavian burials undertaken there. For instance, while certain Scandinavian settlers maintained their traditional burial rites, many adopted Christian burial methods that established links with the Mercian royal house, thereby legitimating their own authority and succession.[88] He focussed on cremation as evidence of traditional burials, rather than inhumation or other potentially ambiguous grave goods. Observing the overall paucity of such burials in the Danelaw,

[85] E.g.: grave goods, grave orientation and evidence of cremation. Julian D. Richards, "Pagans and Christians at a Frontier: Viking Burial in the Danelaw," in Carver, *Cross Goes North,* 383.
[86] Ibid., 384-87.
[87] Martin Biddle and Birthe Kjølbye-Biddle, "Repton and the 'Great Heathen Army,' 873-4," in Graham-Campbell, et al., *Vikings and the Danelaw*, 47-50.
[88] Richards, "Pagans and Christians," 387-91.

he argued that only those Scandinavians settling in one area of South Derbyshire maintained traditional burial rites.[89]

This implies that the settlers swiftly adopted Christianity and explains the apparent disparity in funerary practises, while providing potential incentives for conversion in the Danelaw. The distribution of funerary practises within a particular population fosters an understanding of how conversion progressed among the settlers. This method is effective for analysing the Derbyshire burials because they are limited to a single population in one region, unlike those evaluated in the Scandinavian homelands across various geographical and temporal settings. The different regional sizes analysed in these distribution studies may be attributed to the disparate religious environments in Scandinavia and Anglo-Saxon England.

Further north, documented collaborative relationships with the Church and the production of regnal coinages remain integral evidence for the conversion and Christianisation of Scandinavian settlers in the region. Their first king, Guthfrith, succeeded to the throne *c.* 883, and seems to have ruled York until his death *c.* 895.[90] His appointment was arranged under the aegis of the Cuthbert community, by then based in Chester-le-Street, Co. Durham.[91] The miraculous nature of his accession, recorded in the late eleventh-century *HSC*, involved Cuthbert appearing to Eadred, the community's abbot at Carlisle, to instruct him to find Guthfrith among the Danish army and ceremonially install him as king.[92] It also records Eadred's respectful reception by the Danish army,[93] a detail potentially reflecting the army's understanding of the Church's prominent influence in the region's political and economic affairs. Though little is known about Guthfrith's reign, he appears to have maintained a cordial relationship with the Cuthbert community, witnessed by his granting land to the abbot.[94] The land transfer certainly indicates that Guthfrith recognised the community's influence, and their role in his selection further suggests they retained considerable influence in secular affairs, despite their departure from Holy Island in 875, attributed to disruption caused by Scandinavian invasion and settlement.

---

[89] Ibid., 392.
[90] Fletcher, *Conversion*, 392; *HSC*, ed./trans. Johnson South, 53, 59; McLeod, *Beginning of Scandinavian Settlement*, 119.
[91] For the Cuthbert community's ninth- and tenth-century travels: *HSC*, 58-59.
[92] Ibid., 53.
[93] Ibid: "…ad barbarum exercitum sanctus ille abbas…a quo honorifice exceptus…"
[94] Ibid., 59.

Æthelweard records Guthfrith's death *c.* 895, labelling him king of the Northumbrians, and reports his burial in the high church in York,[95] a setting, Townend argued, that verifies the tale of his miraculous accession, and implies the beginnings of Christian kingship among Scandinavian settlers.[96] Although the documentation does not record whether Guthfrith and his followers were already Christian at his accession, or whether he was subsequently converted, his burial in the high church would have been unlikely had he not been baptised and it further implies a relationship with Wulfhere, the Archbishop of York.

Wulfhere's career as Archbishop, from 854 until his death *c.* 892, was significantly impacted by Scandinavian incursions;[97] a letter attributed to Symeon of Durham retrospectively records his flight from York *c.* 867 to his estate at Addingham (W. Yorks.), in the Wharfe valley,[98] indicating the impact of the invasions on ecclesiastical stability in the North. While Wulfhere appears to have returned to York before 872, ongoing Scandinavian activities caused his expulsion with the client king Ecgberht in that year, and McLeod suggested that his return in 876 can be attributed to his collaboration with the Scandinavian invaders.[99] Peter Sawyer further argued that such cooperation enabled Wulfhere to recover the see of Lindsey and enhance his authority in other Mercian dioceses.[100] His experiences certainly imply that he recognised the benefits of working with the Scandinavian army, and later, the first Scandinavian king of York. In turn, this indicates Scandinavian perception of archiepiscopal leverage over secular interests. Moreover, Guthfrith's accession demonstrates that both monastic and secular ecclesiastical communities were prepared to negotiate with the army to preserve something of their own political influence and authority in the region. Indeed, the influence of the see of York and the Cuthbert community appear to have been recognised and called on by West Saxon kings.[101]

---

[95] Æthelweard, *Chronicle*, 51: "Transeunte etiam anni unius decrusu obiit et Guthfrid, rex Northhymbriorum, in natalitia sancti Bartholomæi apostoli Christi; cuius mausoleatur Euoraca corpus in urbe in basilica summa."
[96] Townend, *Viking Age Yorkshire*, 45.
[97] McLeod, *Beginning of Scandinavian Settlement,* 180.
[98] Symeon of Durham, *Incipit epistola Simeonis monachi ecclesiae Sancti Cuthberti Dunelmi ad Hugonem decanum Eboracensem de archiepiscopis Eboraci,* in *Rerum Britannicarum Medii Aevi Scriptores* 75 vol. 1, ed. Thomas Arnold (Lessing-Druckerei: Kraus Reprint, 1965), 225.
[99] McLeod, *Beginning of Scandinavian Settlement,* 180.
[100] Peter Sawyer, "Scandinavians and English in the Viking Age," *HM Chadwick Memorial Lecture, Department of Anglo-Saxon, Norse and Celtic, Cambridge University* (Cambridge: Target Litho, 1995), 5:7.
[101] Pickles, *Kingship, Society and the Church,* 219-23.

After *c.* 900, the historical record becomes more fragmented, contributing to dependence on numismatic evidence to contextualise Christianisation in the Northern Danelaw.[102] Nevertheless, Sawyer argued that at least two of the archbishops succeeding Wulfhere likely collaborated with the Scandinavian settlers: Æthelbald was consecrated in London in 900, which Sawyer attributed to the absence of any bishops in Northumbria to complete the rite, underscoring the apparent decline of the northern Church, and Hrothweard died in 931, whereabouts unknown.[103] Little is known of Guthfrith's successor, Sigeferth, though he possibly arrived from Ireland after the Scandinavian expulsion.[104] Numismatic evidence indicates that he ruled between *c.* 895 and *c.* 900; it also designates the reign of his successor, Cnut, to between *c.* 900 and *c.* 905.[105] The numismatic iconographies produced for these rulers include numerous cross-types accompanied by liturgical legends (Fig. 2a-b), suggesting ecclesiastical involvement in their production;[106] the resulting designs differ from contemporary Anglo-Saxon and Carolingian issues.[107] Blackburn argued that the liturgical phrases indicate the presence of "highly literate and innovative" contributor(s), who deliberately and intentionally paired obverse and reverse designs.[108] Taking this further, Tom Pickles observed that the liturgical legends were often disposed in the order of a blessing, accompanied by "professedly Christian" numismatic iconographies, indicating "a good level of literacy and a secure knowledge of the liturgy".[109] Likewise, the cruciform arrangement of CNUT, read in the order of a blessing, presents an intriguing composition that has precedents on the Ruthwell cross in Dumfriesshire and further afield in Rome.[110]

Thus, the sophistication of the designs and their obvious ecclesiastical influences suggest that these two rulers approved of their arrangements, and potentially understood the significances of their meanings. The issues also signify the kings' intent to present themselves as Christian rulers to the various audiences that would encounter the coins. Moreover, there would have been little value to the

---

[102] Mark Blackburn, "Currency Under the Vikings Part 2: The Two Scandinavian Kingdoms of the Danelaw, *c.* 895-954," in Blackburn, *Viking Coinage and Currency*, 32; Pickles, *Kingship, Society and the Church*, 211.
[103] Sawyer, "Scandinavians and English," 5:7.
[104] Rollason, *Northumbria*, 216.
[105] Townend, *Viking Age Yorkshire*, 47.
[106] Hadley, *Vikings in England*, 48-49.
[107] Blackburn, "Currency…Part 2," 33.
[108] Mark Blackburn, "The Coinage of Scandinavian York," in Blackburn, *Viking Coinage and Currency*, 285.
[109] Pickles, *Kingship, Society and the Church*, 209.
[110] Blackburn, "Coinage," 286.

liturgical inscriptions "Dominus Deus Rex" and "Dominus Omnipotens Rex", unless they had converted.[111] Furthermore, minting coins with subtle, yet deliberate, combinations of designs suggest that ecclesiastical figures familiar with the liturgy and Christian symbolism were involved in their production, and potentially had the ability to influence the production of stone sculpture and the selection of its iconographies.

Further regnal coinage issued between *c*. 905 and 927 (with only a single disruption) has been dubbed "the St Peter's coinage", given the absence of a named individual ruler; it displays SCI PETRII O on the obverse (Fig. 3) and the Latin name of the city (EBORACEI) on the reverse. Blackburn suggested that the inscriptions were inspired by the St Edmund coinage of the southern Danelaw and ninth-century Carolingian issues.[112] As with the Sigeferth and Cnut coinage, the motive of presenting and emphasising the Christian nature of the kingdom is achieved, albeit less explicitly.[113]

Townend, however, claimed that although the Christian message of these coins appears both local and (universally) institutional with the dedication of York Minster to St Peter, the extent of ecclesiastical influence is debatable, given the incorporation of an apparent Thor's hammer in some of the designs.[114] Nevertheless, this symbol, displayed on the obverse of the coins with the name of St Peter, can also be understood as a Tau-cross, something unrecognised in the scholarship. If viewed upside-down, it might even recall Peter's crucifixion in this position. The design of the coins certainly implies continuity with the earlier issues presenting varied representations of crosses, while perhaps also incorporating a more Scandinavian expression of identity. Indeed, Pickles suggested Christian alternatives for several other ambiguous symbols included in the St Peter's series, such as the sword, raven and triquetra,[115] suggesting that the iconography of the St Peter's coinage was intended to be deliberately ambiguous, consciously incorporating motifs with multivalent frames of reference whose symbolic significance(s) could be accessed by a range of secular and ecclesiastical audiences.

The St Peter's issues were briefly interrupted by a series of coins minted for Rægnald, whose reign in York is only well-documented between *c*. 919-920/1, during

[111] Pickles, *Kingship, Society and the Church*, 211.
[112] Blackburn, "Coinage," 289.
[113] Rollason, *Northumbria*, 226.
[114] Townend, *Viking Age Yorkshire*, 52.
[115] Pickles, *Kingship, Society and the Church*, 212.

a period of Scandinavian resistance to West Saxon advances northwards.[116] The iconographies of this coinage included martial motifs (Fig. 4a), which Townend regarded as a return to a definitively 'pagan' iconography ascribed to Rægnald's arrival from Dublin.[117] *Contra* Townend, Blackburn argued that the Rægnald iconographies were politically influenced to emphasise Scandinavian claims to the territories of the Northern Danelaw.[118] This explains the martial motifs as attempts to legitimise Rægnald's claims, while the dual nature of the Tau-cross/hammer (Fig. 4b) suggests Scandinavian ability to accommodate Christian frames of reference. Furthermore, the monogram "karolus" was included on Rægnald's coinage (and that of Cnut), perhaps indicating a baptismal name.[119] Even if this is not the case, the imitation of Carolingian coinage or a West Saxon imitation of Carolingian issues indicates a public appropriation of the trappings associated with Christian kingship. The accommodation of traditional Scandinavian and martial motifs alongside Christian symbols in Rægnald's regnal coinage and the conversion of Hiberno-Norse groups thus contextualises analogous patterns of combining sacred and secular motifs in the stone sculpture commissioned after their settlement in the Northern Danelaw. Indeed, the martial motifs incorporated within Christian frames of reference in the iconographic programmes of tenth-century stone crosses may well point to analogous political aspirations or motives.[120]

The reign of Sihtric *caoch*, Rægnald's successor, is ascribed to 920/1-927, and in 926, he met with Athelstan of Wessex at Tamworth and married his sister.[121] Hadley argued that this was a diplomatic strategy Athelstan employed on several occasions,[122] but it also indicates Sihtric's ambitions to foster a diplomatic relationship with the West Saxon dynasty, legitimising his rule over the Northern Danelaw. His attempts to undertake a diplomatic transaction – confirmed sacramentally – within West Saxon (Christian) cultural norms suggests that he or his advisors (*contra* Rollason) recognised the strategic advantages of such an agreement.[123] The extent of

[116] Blackburn, "Coinage," 289-290.
[117] Townend, *Viking Age Yorkshire*, 55-56. cf. Downham, *Viking Kings*, 34: A significant number of Scandinavians active in Dublin had accepted Christianity by the early tenth century.
[118] Blackburn, "Coinage," 290.
[119] Pickles, *Kingship, Society and the Church*, 211.
[120] See Ch.5, 226-37.
[121] Rollason, *Northumbria*, 262; *ASC*, MS D, 268.
[122] Hadley, *Vikings in England*, 64.
[123] Rollason, *Northumbria*, 227.

West Saxon authority is obscure, but Athelstan's rule (r. 927-939) in the north may have benefited the Church by enabling ecclesiastical contact between the two regions.

Political stability, however, became increasingly fragmented, with several West Saxon and Scandinavian leaders vying for supremacy throughout the 940s and 950s, but the involvement of archiepiscopal figures, such as Wulfstan I, who became Archbishop of York in 930 or 931, remained a feature of ecclesiastical activity.[124] The *ASC* entry for 943 documents the success of a Scandinavian army led by Olaf *cuarán*, in a battle at Tamworth. Edmund, Athelstan's successor, subsequently besieged him and Wulfstan at Leicester, after which a treaty was brokered.[125] Edmund subsequently sponsored Olaf's baptism, and later, the confirmation of another king, Ragnald Guthfrithson,[126] potentially as a result of the peace treaty; if so, it suggests West Saxon attempts to exert authority over the northern kings. The negotiation of these baptisms was likely achieved through the efforts of Wulfstan and Oda, Archbishop of Canterbury.[127] Oda's role in these negotiations demonstrates that archiepiscopal political involvement was not limited to the see of York; rather, it was a widely accepted archiepiscopal responsibility. The peace was apparently short-lived, however; Edmund expelled both Olaf and Ragnald Guthfrithson from Northumbria in 944, though the *ASC* entry for 945 suggests that he faced uprisings in the northwest, requiring him to ravage Cumberland.[128]

This pattern of alliance, broken treaties and military retribution continued under Edmund's successor, Eadred (r. 946-955), with archiepiscopal interventions playing a significant role in both the alliances and broken treaties.[129] Indeed, Wulfstan's imprisonment in 952 suggests that he supported whichever leader seemed most likely to succeed, regardless of their ethnic or political persuasion – although Hadley argued he was probably motivated by his desire to prevent, or at least inhibit, West Saxon expansion, and thus retain independence for the kingdom of York.[130]

Before his death in 956, Wulfstan was certainly reinstated to the bishopric in Dorchester, a see with close connections to Oda's Anglo-Scandinavian family. As

[124] Townend, *Viking Age Yorkshire*, 84; *ASC*, MS D, 71.
[125] *ASC*, MS D, 71.
[126] Ibid.; Fletcher, *Conversion*, 380.
[127] *ASC*, MS C, 71; Townend, *Viking Age Yorkshire*, 128.
[128] *ASC*, MS D, 71-72.
[129] Ibid., 72-73; John Blair, *The Church in Anglo-Saxon Society* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 314; Fletcher, *Conversion*, 394-95; Hadley, *Northern Danelaw*, 236.
[130] Hadley, *Northern Danelaw*, 290. For references to continued upheavals, see, *ASC*, MSS D and E, 73-74.

Julia Barrow observed, they had close contacts with the house of Wessex and were educated outside the Danelaw.[131] Oda himself was taken on pilgrimage to Rome, where he returned in 941 to accept the pallium.[132] The see of Dorchester replaced that of Leicester, and although little is known of its earliest bishops, Oscytel (another family member) succeeded to the see in 949/950.[133] Upon Wulfstan's death, he held the archbishopric of York in plurality with Dorchester,[134] and absorbed Nottinghamshire into the archdiocese, adding Sutton and Southwell to its estates, along with Helperby (Yorks.).[135] The next significant family member, Oswald, was educated at Fleury and later became bishop of Worcester, holding the see in plurality with the archbishopric of York from 971.[136] As archbishop, he attempted (unsuccessfully) to establish a Benedictine community at Ripon, having been introduced to the reform at Fleury;[137] this venture underscores Oswald's continental connections, and emphasises the potential exchange of religious beliefs. Furthermore, Oda's journeys to Rome indicate the potential transmission of Christian theological concepts between the Continent and the Danelaw. This has significant implications for the production of stone sculpture, suggesting the possibility that iconographies could be imported alongside ideologies. Oscytel's attempts to increase archiepiscopal land-holdings in the Northern Danelaw further imply that maintaining authority in the region remained an important objective even after the final Scandinavian king was expelled. Thus, the (archi)episcopal efforts to preserve the region's ecclesiastical infrastructure likely influenced the conversion and Christianisation of the Scandinavian settlers, and by extension, the frameworks necessary for producing stone sculpture.

Despite the political turmoil conveyed by these records, they demonstrate significant ecclesiastical influence over political affairs, particularly from the archbishops of York and Canterbury, as well as the potential to oversee the conversion and Christianisation of incoming Scandinavian groups, and the subsequent production

---

[131] Julia Barrow, "Survival and Mutation: Ecclesiastical Institutions in the Danelaw in the Ninth and Tenth Centuries," in Hadley and Richards, *Cultures in Contact*, 159.
[132] Ibid., 162; Simon MacLean, "Britain, Ireland and Europe, *c.* 900-1100," in *A Companion to the Early Middle Ages: Britain and Ireland, c. 500-1100*, ed. Pauline Stafford (Oxford: Blackwells, 2009), 362.
[133] Barrow, "Survival and Mutation," 159.
[134] Ibid., 160.
[135] Ibid., 160-161.
[136] William M. Aird, "Northumbria," in *A Companion to the Early Middle Ages: Britain and Ireland, c. 500-1100*, ed. Pauline Stafford (Oxford: Blackwells, 2009), 361. See also Blair, *Church in Anglo-Saxon Society*, 350.
[137] Blair, *Church in Anglo-Saxon Society*, 350. See also, Hadley, *Vikings in England*, 203.

of stone crosses. In her analysis of the ecclesiastical change and continuity wrought by Oda's family, when considering changes to the diocesan map and the appointment of bishops, the tenth-century spread of Benedictine foundations in the Fenlands and the tenth-century administration of pastoral care, Barrow demonstrated how, contrary to the prevailing opinion that Scandinavians refused to allow the appointment of new bishops, West Saxon kings prevented succession to the sees where bishops were driven away or killed in the late ninth century.[138] This suggests that changes to the ecclesiastical structure were implemented to fulfil the politically motivated objectives of West Saxon kings, in turn implying that they equated expanded political control over the Danelaw with control of the Church, further indicating its continued survival in the region. In this context, Barrow also noted that York was the only (archi)episcopal see in the Danelaw that operated without being moved or abandoned – likely due to the archbishops' mutual cooperation with Scandinavian political leaders – indicating further that the Church managed to perform at least the minimum functions required to maintain its existence, though its organisation may have adapted.[139]

Changes to ecclesiastical organisation are most evident in the substantial mid-tenth-century expansion of churches occurring at the parochial level in northern and eastern England, which Barrow attributed to ownership of estates by secular landowners or eminent figures in urban areas.[140] This implies that the majority of the incoming Scandinavian groups had converted and adopted Christian cultural and religious practises by this time, values they expressed monumentally and ecclesiastically.

Indeed, sculptural evidence has been invoked as further evidence of conversion and Christianisation in the Northern Danelaw. David Stocker considered monuments in Lincolnshire and Yorkshire to designate contemporary Christian graveyards, and regarded sculptural "irregularities" as representing cultural shifts.[141] By these means, he argued that the early tenth-century elite in these regions were largely Christian, but non-Christian scenes incorporated in the monuments' decoration indicated a composite religion combining traditional and Christian beliefs that persisted for at least one to two generations.[142] Yet, the assumed hybrid religious practises are

[138] Barrow, "Survival and Mutation," 155, 158.
[139] Ibid., 161.
[140] Ibid., 165. See further below, 61-65.
[141] Stocker, "Monuments and Merchants," 180.
[142] Ibid., 194-96.

supported by only a minute fraction of the corpus of extant sculpture bearing presumed 'pagan' images, and the monuments themselves occur frequently at Christian sites and in Christian forms.[143] Nevertheless, Stocker did demonstrate that the majority of Anglo-Scandinavian monuments in Lincoln occur at *newly* founded churches,[144] suggesting that the (recently) converted community expressed their piety by establishing new churches and commissioning large, permanent monuments for display at these foundations. Ultimately, the sculptural distributions in Lincolnshire and Yorkshire show the popularity of sculptural production, thus establishing the relative importance of each parochial and ecclesiastical site in the tenth century.

Phil Sidebottom likewise conducted a regional distribution survey of Anglo-Scandinavian stone monuments and social identities in Derbyshire, assessing the monuments' stylistic features and associations with land divisions.[145] While this did not engage with sculptural distribution relative to conversion, it nevertheless determines the strategic positioning of sculpture within the landscape to demonstrate territorial claims. In terms of conversion, Sidebottom argued, however, that Scandinavians were unlikely to erect Christian monuments and simultaneously dismissed as ineffective the Church's authority, West Saxon conquests and the subsequent monastic revival in formerly Scandinavian-controlled areas,[146] claiming "the apparent religious fervour, necessary to erect so many Christian monuments, difficult to reconcile".[147] This contrasts starkly with Stocker's more nuanced view of the Scandinavian settlers' willingness to convert and to promote new ecclesiastical institutions. Sidebottom's rejection of sculpture as evidence for religious affiliations despite the Christian form and/or imagery of so many monuments is analogous to claims that crosses in Scandinavia cannot or do not demonstrate the presence of Christianity.[148] His reluctance to acknowledge the potential Christian connotations of the monuments is even more problematic, as Christianity was the dominant religion in the areas brought under Scandinavian occupation.

[143] Bailey, *England's Earliest Sculptors*, 85, 94
[144] Stocker also discussed hogbacks, concluding they may not reflect conversion to Christianity, but the ambiguity of these monuments limits their relevance in this respect: Stocker, "Monuments and Merchants," 187, 198-99.
[145] Phil Sidebottom, "Viking Age Stone Monuments and Social Identity in Derbyshire," in Hadley and Richards, *Cultures in Contact*, 218-21.
[146] Ibid., 214.
[147] Ibid., 232.
[148] E.g.: Nordeide, *Viking Age as a Period*, 39.

Philip Rahtz and Lorna Watts also used material evidence to postulate a three-stage process of conversion between the fourth to eleventh centuries at a single site in North Yorkshire: Kirkdale,[149] and considered evidence from the building and its surrounding landscape for their third stage: the late ninth- to early eleventh-century Scandinavian conversion to Christianity. No Scandinavian funerary practises or grave-goods were found among the excavated ninth- to tenth-century burials, but numerous sculptures from the period with Christian motifs were recovered,[150] and the absence of (furnished) Scandinavian burials suggests that those who settled in this area converted quickly, or were already converted when they arrived, and adopted the sculptural tradition extant at Kirkdale.

The remainder of their study focusses on the inscribed sundial plaque set on the south entrance of the rebuilt eleventh-century church building:

> Orm, son of Gamal, bought St Gregory's church when it was completely ruined and collapsed, and he had it constructed recently from the ground to Christ and St Gregory, in the days of King Edward and in the days of Earl Tosti. And Haward made me and Brand the priest.[151]

This enabled them to determine the *terminus ante quem* for Scandinavian conversion at Kirkdale. Given the church building's apparently ruinous status (*tobrocan; tofalan*) and contemporary funerary sculpture in the adjacent burial ground, the inscription may suggest that the churchyard was used for burials, but the minster was not used for other liturgical or sacramental purposes. Although the tenth-century use of the site is unclear, the community nevertheless chose to erect their stone monuments at a site with previously established Christian connections and functions. Moreover, contemporary Christian burial required the use of a consecrated churchyard or burial ground, if not the church building itself,[152] suggesting the building may have been

[149] Philp Rahtz and Lorna Watts, "Three Ages of Conversion at Kirkdale, North Yorkshire," in Carver, *The Cross Goes North*, 289.
[150] Ibid., 304-05.
[151] Ibid., 289: "+Orm Gaman svna bohte scs Gregorivs Minster ðonne hit wes æl tobrocan. Tofalan. He hit let macan newan from grunde xpe. scs Gregorivus in Eadward dagvm cng. In Tosti dagvm eorl++. Hawarð me wrohte. Brand prs."
[152] Helen Gittos, *Liturgy, Architecture and Sacred Places in Anglo-Saxon England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 42-54. High status figures could also be buried *within* churches, often at significant locations within the building: Gittos, *Liturgy, Architecture and Sacred Places*, 61-64, 89-90, 200-01.

more delipidated than ruined when Orm refurbished it, incorporating tenth-century stone crosses into the restored fabric.[153] Compared with regional distribution models, the study of phased conversion at one site provides a more profound insight into the processes of conversion and Christianisation by analysing sculptural evidence within its original setting(s) and contexts. This underscores the material's relative permanence and enables it to be understood as monumental proclamations of its patrons' social, political or religious associations.

Together, therefore, documentary, numismatic and other material evidence demonstrates that the conversion and Christianisation of Scandinavians settling in the Northern Danelaw occurred relatively rapidly compared to groups in the Scandinavian homelands. A stable ecclesiastical infrastructure is implied by extant numismatic iconographies and documentary sources, which record cooperation between ecclesiastical communities and the Scandinavian elite, changes to diocesan boundaries and land-holdings in the Midlands and the increase in parochial churches in eastern England. Together with the proliferation of Christian stone monuments, re-use of ecclesiastical sites and repairs to ecclesiastical structures, these factors suggest that secular landholders likely converted early during Scandinavian settlement. The documentary and archaeological evidence thus indicate a different view of the late ninth- and tenth-century environments underpinning conversion and Christianisation, and subsequent sculptural production in the Northern Danelaw.

3c. Ecclesiastical Infrastructure in the Northern Danelaw

The ecclesiastical changes engendered by Scandinavian settlement involved the early stages of the shift from a monastic ecclesiastical structure to a parochial system; the ramifications of this are fundamental to understanding ecclesiastical influence on the production of the sculptures, given the fluctuating boundaries between the sacred and secular in the crosses' iconographies.

[153] Rahtz and Watts initially proposed that these crosses were added to the nave's south wall during late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century alterations to the building fabric based on coeval drawings. They later revised this opinion, arguing that the sculptures in the west wall were incorporated during Orm Gamalson's restoration: Lorna Watts, "Kirkdale – The Inscriptions," *Medieval Archaeology* 41, no. 1 (1997): 76-80; Lorna Watts, et al., *Archaeology at Kirkdale*, 8-9; cf. Rahtz and Watts, "Three Ages of Conversion," 305. Analogous patterns of re-use emerge in Scandinavia: Abrams, "History and Archaeology," 120-21.

Given the paucity of written sources from the ninth and tenth centuries, the ecclesiastical structure of the Northern Danelaw and its developments have been reconstructed using information about ecclesiastical organisation from earlier Anglian and later medieval documentation, with varying results.[154] Nevertheless, many episcopal, monastic or parochial communities survived, evolving after Scandinavian settlement. At the episcopal level, the territories under Scandinavian political control corresponded to the dioceses of York, Lindsey, Leicester, Elmham and *Dummoc*, and parts of the diocese of Lichfield.[155] Their organisation underwent numerous changes after Scandinavian settlement, but these cannot be ascribed solely to Scandinavian activities. Moreover, it is possible that the see of York retained its estates at Ripon, Otley and Sherburn throughout this period, and as many of its lands were located near Roman roads, it is likely that pastoral care continued to be provided.[156]

Prior to Scandinavian invasion, smaller churches in these dioceses were not well-documented, and pastoral care was likely provided by clerical members of minster communities.[157] The lack of documentation for smaller ecclesiastical communities after Scandinavian settlement therefore represents a continuation of earlier ecclesiastical practises, rather than an interruption provoked by Scandinavian incursions. Indeed, Blair observed that in Scandinavian-settled areas where textual evidence for small, rural communities is less common, stone monuments increase numerically, providing clear evidence of an ecclesiastical presence,[158] with minster or other ecclesiastical communities administering pastoral care, including formal baptism and burial within a consecrated graveyard.[159]

Certain ecclesiastical sites did suffer of course. The bishoprics of Hexham, Leicester and *Dommoc* disappeared in the ninth century, and episcopal activity at the sees of Lindsey and Elmham ceased for about a century.[160] Yet, Barrow, following Sawyer, argued that although *episcopal* activity was suspended at Lindsey, it fell under the authority of the archbishops of York, until it was re-founded in the mid-tenth century.[161] This may have had ramifications for the conversion of Scandinavian

[154] Sarah Foot, "Violence Against Christians: The Vikings and the Church in Ninth-Century England," *Medieval History* 1, no. 3 (1991): 14; cf. Blair, *Church in Anglo-Saxon Society*, 293.
[155] Barrow, "Survival and Mutation," 156.
[156] Pickles, *Kingship, Society and the Church*, 227-233.
[157] Barrow, "Survival and Mutation," 157.
[158] Blair, *Church in Anglo-Saxon Society*, 308.
[159] Ibid., 462-64.
[160] Abrams, "Conversion of the Danelaw," 33.
[161] Barrow, "Survival and Mutation," 160; Peter Sawyer, *Anglo-Saxon Lincolnshire* (Lincoln: History of Lincolnshire Committee, 1998), 149.

settlers and pastoral provision in the surrounding areas, but mediation by other ecclesiastical authorities probably prevented the complete cessation of activity. West Saxon political activities were also responsible for the late ninth-century decline in episcopal authority, with the kings preventing the consecration of new bishops to prohibit them from encouraging or reinforcing Scandinavian political authority.[162] Ecclesiastical fortunes, therefore, were affected by both Scandinavian and West Saxon attempts to establish their authority over areas recently settled by Scandinavians.

Monastic communities also declined – as at Jarrow, Wearmouth, Whitby and Coldingham – further suggesting that multiple types of ecclesiastical community were affected, regardless of status.[163] Indeed, Rollason argued that the circumstances of Hexham's decline and eventual disappearance are so obscure, they are unlikely to be due solely to Scandinavian activities.[164] Although some sites may have ceased to function as religious centres, they were not necessarily abandoned, as at Whithorn, which was replaced by a Scandinavian trading centre, thus enabling new settlers to encounter religious monuments affiliated with the site's original ecclesiastical status.[165]

The Cuthbert community also benefitted from nearby Scandinavian presence. Indeed, they left Lindisfarne to protect their lands further south, moving *closer* to areas of Scandinavian settlement.[166] Additionally, not all mother parishes had pre-Viking monastic origins; Chester-le-Street's increased status and the presence of stone sculpture from the mid-ninth century are probably attributable to the Cuthbert community's migrations.[167] The impact of their progressively permanent presence there, adjacent to areas of coeval Scandinavian settlement, is evident in their negotiations with Guthfrith to acquire lands after securing his accession,[168] thereby increasing their revenues. Hadley suggested that these transactions may have been motivated by the community's desire to obtain an ally against other Scandinavian groups,[169] but Guthfrith's land-grant also benefitted the Scandinavian settlers by establishing a buffer zone between the northern expanses of their territories and the

[162] Barrow, "Survival and Mutation," 158.
[163] Abrams, "Conversion in the Danelaw," 34.
[164] Rollason, *Northumbria*, 247, 251-252.
[165] Ibid.
[166] Hadley, *Vikings in England*, 39.
[167] Blair, *Church in Anglo-Saxon*, 392, 313.
[168] *HSC*, 59.
[169] Hadley, *Vikings in England*, 39-40.

earldom at Bamburgh.[170] Nevertheless, most of the community's land acquisitions made by 875 were still in their possession in the eleventh century,[171] including land-grants made by Athelstan, perhaps motivated by a desire to secure and reinforce West Saxon overlordship in the region.[172] These interactions with Scandinavian and West Saxon leaders suggest both secular parties recognised the community's influence in establishing or asserting kingship in the region.

This, however was not always the case; Rægnald seized a portion of the Cuthbert community's land from the vill of Eden to Billingham and from Eden to the River Wear after the battle of Corbridge (918), re-distributing it to his followers.[173] He also confiscated two additional estates from the community's tenant, Eadred, extending from Chester-le-Street to the River Derwent, from there to the Wear, and south to *Deorestrete*.[174] Thus, in addition to granting land to the Cuthbert community, Scandinavian rulers occasionally deprived them of their assets.

Other ecclesiastical sites in the Northern Danelaw were also affected by Scandinavian and West Saxon presence. For instance, one West Saxon grant, Amounderness (Lancs.), was probably purchased by Athelstan from "pagans", who provided it with its Scandinavian-derived name, and he subsequently presented it to the archbishopric of York in 934.[175] The Scandinavian place-name, however, does not indicate that its inhabitants practised 'paganism',[176] and the gift indicates the extent of their jurisdiction into the northwest. Rollason, however, argued that because it was located in a Scandinavian-settled area, it may not have benefited the archbishopric, possibly contributing to their loss of the territory before the Norman conquest,[177] but Townend contested this, suggesting that control of the territory was crucial to the English Church and state, given its proximity to Dublin, and its location between the Rivers Cocker and Ribble.[178] An earlier change in land-possession – between the Ribble and Mersey, from the archdiocese of York to the see of Lichfield – supports Townend's view; being the potential result of Edward the Elder's subjugation of the

[170] McLeod, *Beginning of Scandinavian Settlement*, 218-19.
[171] Hadley, *Vikings in England*, 39. See also, Rollason, *Northumbria*, 247.
[172] Aird, "Northumbria," 307.
[173] Morris, "Viking and Native," 224.
[174] Ibid., 225. For a full account, see *HSC*, 61-63.
[175] Peter Sawyer, "Conquest and Colonization: Scandinavians in the Danelaw and in Normandy," in Nielsen, et al., *Proceedings of the Eighth Viking Congress*, 129.
[176] The place-name comprises the Scandinavian personal name, "*Agmundr*", and the Scandinavian appellative, "*nes*" (headland), see: Gillian Fellows-Jensen, *Scandinavian Settlement Names in the North-West* (Copenhagen: C.A. Reitzels Forlag, 1985), 99.
[177] Rollason, *Northumbria*, 229.
[178] Townend, *Viking Age Yorkshire*, 66.

area,[179] it implies that archiepiscopal possession of Amounderness may be viewed as a reclamation of assets previously lost.

Other kings of Wessex also made endowments to the Church in the Danelaw. Eadred, for example, granted an unspecified amount of land at Bakewell to Uhtred in 949 for the foundation of an ecclesiastical community; as Uhtred already possessed a large estate in the area, it is unclear whether this grant was for a new foundation.[180] Hadley argued that it was granted for the endowment of a *coenubium*, and the church of Bakewell served two estates throughout the tenth and eleventh centuries.[181] Eadred's endowment nevertheless demonstrates secular interests that might strengthen the Church's influence in the Northern Danelaw, and cooperation with local lords to fulfil commitments to the Church.

Numerous donations and gifts from individuals with Scandinavian names are also documented: Grim and Æse are recorded on the dedication stone of the church they founded in York, St Mary Castlegate;[182] Ulf contributed lands and an ivory horn to York Minster; and his son Styr gifted Darlington to the Cuthbert community at Chester-le-Street.[183] Furthermore, it is likely that several high-status churches in Yorkshire survived the Scandinavian settlement, based on their extensive later land-holdings, parochial authority and/or the presence of stone sculpture.[184] Likewise, several minsters in the northwest survived, evidenced by the continuation of burials, production of sculpture and superiority over chapelries.[185] Carlisle and Heversham still had abbots in the late ninth century,[186] suggesting that these two communities experienced minimal disruption as a result of Scandinavian incursions. Other communities, such as Whitby and Hackness, were devastated, although both apparently maintained the memory of their cults.[187]

The destruction, abandonment and re-use of sites were certainly supplemented by other factors contributing to ecclesiastical decline. Relics were removed from their original locations by the West Saxon elite, resulting in their diminution.[188] Such

[179] Barrow, "Survival and Mutation," 160.
[180] Hadley, *Vikings in England*, 205. See also: Hawkes and Sidebottom, *Derbyshire and Staffordshire*, 40-41; 46. Eadred also granted Archbishop Oswald 20 hides at Southwell (Notts.) in 956: Rollason, *Northumbria*, 229.
[181] Hadley, *Northern Danelaw*, 230-231.
[182] Rollason, *Northumbria*, 236.
[183] Ibid.
[184] Townend, *Viking Age Yorkshire*, 124-25.
[185] Blair, *Church in Anglo-Saxon Society*, 310.
[186] Ibid.
[187] Ibid., 314.
[188] Hadley, *Northern Danelaw*, 236.

translations possibly had a dual function: to weaken local identities, and to warn members of the northern clergy against aiding Scandinavian lords in their attempts to establish political dominance – as seems to have been the case with the removal of Wilfrid's relics from Ripon in 948.[189] West Saxon and Anglo-Scandinavian interventions in ecclesiastical circumstances thus mirror the archiepiscopal mediation of political affairs between the two groups.

Furthermore, the proliferation of churches corresponds to ninth- and tenth-century Scandinavian settlement in the north, suggesting that the Church benefitted from Scandinavian appropriation of Anglian cultural conventions.[190] These new foundations frequently materialised in Scandinavian-settled areas, indicating that their inhabitants had the means and motivation to establish and patronise new churches. In turn, this implies that the necessary clergy were available to staff them and provide pastoral care. Most of the extant communities providing clergy for new foundations were not insular, and their ministrations were most likely overseen by minster communities, whose members were primarily clerics by the ninth century.[191]

Several historical and archaeological case studies have further illuminated the general and site-specific effects of founding new churches and providing pastoral care within the Northern Danelaw. Blair observed that parishes were established in both newly developing towns and provincial locations, but noted that the proliferation is more evident in the Northern Danelaw, particularly in York and Lincoln, than in Scandinavian-settled areas in East Anglia and the southeast.[192] Additionally, Hadley suggested that the tenth- and eleventh-century proliferation in urban locations in the east contrasted with the situation in towns in the south and west, which typically had fewer churches and pastoral privileges under the jurisdiction of mother churches.[193] Together, these observations indicate that urban ecclesiastical development in the Northern Danelaw was characterised by an abundance of churches, something generally absent in West Saxon territories; this provided an institutional framework for pastoral care, and by extension, the patronage of stone crosses.

---

[189] Ibid., 235-236; Blair, *Church in Anglo-Saxon Society*, 314; Townend, *Viking Age Yorkshire*, 124-25; *ASC*, MS D, 72-73.
[190] Rollason, *Northumbria*, 239; Pickles, *Kingship, Society and the Church*, 270-74.
[191] Hadley, *Northern Danelaw*, 293; Barrow, "Survival and Mutation," 157.
[192] Blair, *Church in Anglo-Saxon Society*, 407. See also, Barrow, "Survival and Mutation," 168.
[193] Hadley, *Vikings in England*, 174. See also, David Stocker and Paul Everson, "Five Towns' Funerals: Decoding Diversity in Danelaw Stone Sculpture," in Graham-Campbell, et al., *Vikings and the Danelaw*, 226-27.

Hadley established three categories of churches in the Northern Danelaw:

> those churches which have pre-Viking origins and are mother churches in the later Middle Ages; those churches which have pre-Viking origins but are not later mother churches; and mother churches without evidence for early origins.[194]

This suggests that some Anglian churches maintained superior status after Scandinavian settlement, while that of others declined, possibly enabling newly founded churches to acquire superior status, or at least rights associated with it. Indeed, many new mother churches were established, while others continued to supply pastoral care to large parishes.[195] In this context, Pickles argued for general continuity in the region's ecclesiastical structure, given that stone sculpture and parish boundaries demonstrate a correlation between sites associated with known Anglian religious communities and later mother churches.[196] Such continuity indicates that there was a sufficiently influential ecclesiastical environment in place to facilitate the production of stone sculpture.

Thus, at Lincoln and York there is evidence for the density of churches, the co-existence of multiple types of church and of how certain rights may have been distributed amongst them. For example, of the 35 parish churches in Lincoln, many had burial rites and graveyards from their establishment, distinguishing them from those in Wessex-controlled areas, where mother churches' superiority over dependencies typically included exclusive burial rights.[197] This implies that either the patrons of these churches or those staffing them intended them to have superior status, despite the likelihood that some did not possess the rights necessary to declare mother-church status. This is highlighted by Barrow's argument that the extant churches in Lincoln provided insufficient accommodation for its expanding urban population, prompting the foundation of numerous parish churches that were fully independent from the time of their inception.[198] This implies that the demands of urban populations began to determine the number of churches required and the distribution of certain

[194] Hadley, *Northern Danelaw*, 217.
[195] Ibid., 277.
[196] Pickles, *Kingship, Society and the Church*, 144-62, 225-26.
[197] Hadley, *Northern Danelaw*, 251.
[198] Barrow, "Survival and Mutation," 168.

rites among them, further suggesting that the Church was capable of adapting to support pastoral developments.

The number of churches in Lincoln with dominion over burial rites indicates that its inhabitants considered burial within a churchyard a fundamental pastoral provision, and the lack of restrictions has significant implications for the patronage of stone sculpture, particularly when considering the correlation between the distribution of monuments, the number of parish churches, and the provision of burial rites. Stocker and Everson argued that, with few exceptions, the tenth- and eleventh-century sculptures found in Lincolnshire and elsewhere in the Five Boroughs are funerary monuments, implying a direct link with burial rites.[199] They also observed an exceptional case where 20 monuments were found in the graveyard of the parish church of St Mark's, Wigford, Lincoln,[200] suggesting that some urban churches became preferred sites for the display of stone sculpture. Moreover, Hadley demonstrated that the abundance of churches in Lincoln and their accompanying sculpture reveal the beneficial nature of elite secular patronage.[201] Thus, the proliferation of churches, formation of parishes and pastoral provisions in Lincoln, as elsewhere in the Five Boroughs,[202] created an environment in which the secular patronage and display of stone monuments could flourish.

Similar patterns emerge at churches in and around York, which likely provided pastoral care. For the patrons of St Helen-on-the-Walls and St Mary Bishophill Senior, this included the administration of burial rites, as evidenced by the churches' inception between *c.* 950-1000,[203] implying that the city's inhabitants were eager to ascribe them markers of status that would previously have been present only at churches of superior status. Finally, the sculptural fragments found at new foundations, such as St Marks, Wigford, or St Mary Bishophill Senior, and the continuity of sculptural production at St Mary Bishophill Junior suggest that both extant and newly founded churches were considered appropriate environments for the display of monuments with ecclesiastical associations.

Moreover, ecclesiastical continuity may have extended to archiepiscopal estates beyond York, given the political involvement of their incumbents, and the

[199] Stocker and Everson, "Five Towns' Funerals," 224.
[200] Ibid., 225.
[201] Hadley, *Northern Danelaw*, 288.
[202] Stocker and Everson, "Five Towns' Funerals," 226-27.
[203] Barrow, "Survival and Mutation," 168.

presence of Anglian and Anglo-Scandinavian stone sculpture.[204] According to Hadley, the most significant causes of church proliferation in rural areas were the major churches' inability to serve large areas and the "fragmented tenurial geography of the region", which sometimes resulted in the division of estates among multiple lords or the fragmentation of large sokes across multiple vills.[205]

If major rural churches were unable to serve large congregations, this suggests that they were understaffed, or that the distances involved were too great to serve their populations. The increase in rural churches after Scandinavian settlement thus counters the assumed absence of clergy able to make ecclesiastical provisions, suggesting that secular landholders were motivated to establish new foundations on their estates. Among the new additions, such as Pickering or Sinnington (Yorks.), extant churches at Lastingham, Stonegrave or Hovingham (Yorks.) endured despite apparent upheavals to their original status.[206]

Analogous patterns of decline and re-establishment also emerge in the northwest, and some ecclesiastical reconstruction potentially included expansion into the western Pennine areas after Scandinavian settlement.[207] Monasteries at Dacre and Heversham (Cu.) apparently did not survive Scandinavian settlement,[208] but stone sculpture produced at Dacre and Heversham's status as a mother church with superiority over chapelries suggest both continued to function ecclesiastically;[209] although no longer (inward-looking) *monasteries*, they functioned as *minsters*. Other ecclesiastical estates seem to have experienced increased activity potentially involving the Cuthbert community's migrations; after leaving Lindisfarne, they proceeded west to their estate at Norham (Cu),[210] and burials and stone monuments there imply that priests affiliated with the community must have maintained ecclesiastical activities.[211]

Analysing onomastic evidence across the northwest, Gillian Fellows-Jensen identified at least 12 place-names derived from the Scandinavian appellative *kirkja* (church),[212] demonstrating that Old Norse-speakers in the area referred to these places as ecclesiastical, and a high proportion were either mother-parishes or in possession of

[204] E.g., Otley, Ilkley, Addingham, Weston: Townend, *Viking Age Yorkshire*, 125; Hadley, *Northern Danelaw,* 237-38
[205] Hadley, *Northern Danelaw*, 287-88.
[206] Blair, *Church in Anglo-Saxon Society*, 315.
[207] Ibid., 313.
[208] Rollason, *Northumbria*, 252.
[209] Blair, *Church in Anglo-Saxon Society*, 310.
[210] Ibid., 312.
[211] Ibid.
[212] Fellows Jensen, *Scandinavian Settlement Names*, 34.

earlier sculpture.[213] Furthermore, the name *kirkju-bý* was apparently given to settlements with extant churches upon Scandinavian arrival, as at Kirkby Thore and Kirkby Stephen,[214] demonstrating that a potentially significant ecclesiastical framework existed to facilitate both Scandinavian conversion and Christianisation, and the production of stone sculpture in the region. This naming pattern was also applied to several Yorkshire sites that were or became ecclesiastical, although *kirkja*-names were not typically applied to major Anglian centres.[215] Rather, the appellations were applied to land-holdings owned by, or in the vicinity of, these communities, likely to denote the Church's landownership.[216]

Given that most stone sculpture is assumed to have been commissioned by and for the secular elite in the Northern Danelaw, their involvement in ecclesiastical affairs is unsurprising. As Blair argued, continued activity at previously established ecclesiastical sites, however diminished, may result from gradual secularisation,[217] but there are other explanations, such as economic growth and social diversification, which possibly caused minsters to become more economically and materially involved with lay activities by providing a location for them.[218] These changes suggest that, to remain socially and culturally relevant, ecclesiastical centres and communities were inclined to adapt to the evolving needs of those who patronised them.[219]

Such secularisation, however, has also been recognised as a widely occurring tenth-century phenomenon outside the Northern Danelaw, which probably originated in the ninth-century struggles between bishops and kings for control of churches and their lands, often resulting in ecclesiastical land losses.[220] Thus, the impact of secular involvement on ecclesiastical organisation, including the secularisation of the Church, does not necessarily indicate decline as an explicit, negative consequence of Scandinavian settlement.[221]

Together, the secularisation of extant ecclesiastical sites, endowments to extant centres and the foundation of new churches indicate that the process mutually benefitted the Church and the Anglo-Scandinavian elite in the Northern Danelaw.

---

[213] Blair, *Church in Anglo-Saxon Society*, 310.
[214] Ibid., 311; Fellows Jensen, *Scandinavian Settlement Names*, 34; Bailey and Cramp, *Cumberland, Westmorland*, 120-25.
[215] Pickles, *Kingship, Society and the Church*, 251-52.
[216] Ibid., 252-53.
[217] Blair, *Church in Anglo-Saxon Society*, 294-95; Hadley, *Northern Danelaw*, 288.
[218] Blair, *Church in Anglo-Saxon Society*, 320-21.
[219] Ibid., 324
[220] Hadley, *Northern Danelaw*, 284-85; Pickles, *Kingship, Society and the Church*, 107-13.
[221] Hadley, *Northern Danelaw*, 285; Rollason, *Northumbria*, 229.

Furthermore, these phenomena imply the Church's adaptability to its new circumstances, imposed by external political and religious tensions, rather than an institution eradicated by Scandinavian invasion and settlement. Exchanges between ecclesiastical and secular communities, however, may have been driven by the requirement for pastoral provision and the Church to remain socially relevant. These factors suggest that the Church was regarded as culturally integral to those inhabiting the Northern Danelaw, and that they patronised it to an extent that ensured its survival and enabled its expansion. It further indicates that the remaining ecclesiastical infrastructure could be relied upon to facilitate the production of stone crosses for its patrons. In the light of the available evidence, the effect of Scandinavian invasion and settlement on the Church and ecclesiastical activity should not be understood as definitively destructive. Rather, these factors prompted the evolution and development of ecclesiastical infrastructure, enabled continued pastoral provision, and introduced newly developed continental Christian ideologies. Overall, the evidence indicates an ecclesiastical environment conducive to the swift conversion and Christianisation of Scandinavian incomers and the erection of stone crosses. The question of their Christian iconography must therefore be addressed alongside their apparent secular, 'pagan' imagery, but without prioritising one or the other.

4. Materiality and Audience Engagement

Given the extant stone-carving tradition in the Anglian period, incoming Scandinavian populations would certainly have encountered stone monuments in the landscape of the Northern Danelaw, and clearly chose to adopt the tradition in the context of their conversion and Christianisation. Of all the monument types available,[222] only the cross would be recognisable as an inherently Christian symbol, and so the Anglo-Scandinavian patrons' selection of the cross-form for the public display of figural carvings must be recognised as deliberate, indicating their awareness of its social and religious significance. Viewed on the surface of a monumental stone cross, the carvings would be consciously understood within Christian frames of reference, which were enhanced by the cultural significance(s) accrued by their medium. Together, the monumental cross-form and the materiality of stone could influence audience engagement and aid or inhibit the monuments' effectiveness in Christianising the

[222] E.g., columns, grave-slabs, hogbacks.

landscape. It is therefore worth addressing their potential to influence early medieval understandings of the monuments and carvings in some detail here.

The materiality of stone provides an appropriate starting point for this discussion: it provides a suitable substance for quarrying and carving, and its durability ensures that numerous early medieval stone sculptural crosses survived. Bailey argued that the tradition developed within the Insular world, given the lack of evidence for free-standing stone crosses on the Continent before 700 (or indeed the twelfth century), and although large wooden crosses existed, none are documented as displaying carved imagery.[223] Others, however, have argued that choosing stone as the material for these monuments invokes the earlier wooden crosses and creates a dialogue with them that facilitates the enhancement of social memory.[224] This perception of stone's agency assumes an audience engagement that allows the viewer to access memories and recall analogous monuments encountered or associated with cultural memory. Furthermore, the height, durability and relative immobility of stone renders free-standing crosses highly visible when viewers encountered them in the natural landscape or built environs, which both enables viewer orientation in the landscape and encourages audience engagement with the monuments. Viewed in this context, Scandinavian settlers' adoption of stone-carving traditions appears to emanate from encounters with this medium and its treatment in the Insular world.

Yet engraved and low-relief carved picture-stones from Gotland (Sweden) were produced from the fifth century onwards,[225] indicating that Insular and Scandinavian traditions emerged simultaneously. This implies that both Anglian and Scandinavian viewers were aware of stone's status and significance as a medium for public display, a factor that likely influenced the Anglo-Scandinavian patrons commissioning stone crosses in the late ninth and tenth centuries. Moreover, Scandinavian encounters with Christianity during their exploits in Ireland suggest that they would have encountered a contemporary tradition of erecting free-standing stone crosses there.[226] In contrast, the mushroom-shaped Gotlandic monuments nonetheless demonstrate how Scandinavian stone-carving traditions diverge from the Insular,

---

[223] Bailey, *England's Earliest Sculptors*, 45-46.
[224] E.g., the Northumbrian king Oswald's erected at Heavenfield: Howard Williams, et al., "Introduction: Stones in Substance, Space and Time," in *Early Medieval Stone Monuments: Materiality, Biography, Landscape*, ed. Howard Williams, et al. (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2015), 14; Bede, *HE,* III.2, in Colgrave and Mynors, *Ecclesiastical History*, 214-17.
[225] Bailey, *Viking Age Sculpture*, 76, 80. Lisbeth Imer "The Viking Period Gotlandic Picture Stones. A Chronological Revision," in Herlin Karnell, *Gotland's Picture Stones*, 115-18.
[226] McLeod, *Beginning of Scandinavian Settlement,* 122-26; Downham, *Viking Kings*, 34.

whose propensity for dressing and shaping their monuments in the form of a Christian cross informed the production of stone monuments in the Northern Danelaw. The sculptors' treatment of the carvings provides another important difference between the two stone-carving traditions: Anglian carvers produced images in deeper relief with greater modelling than those found on the Gotlandic picture-stones, which tend to be simply incised (Fig. 5a-b).

While stone is the primary material forming these crosses, it responded to other materials that were used to adorn it, accentuating or understating different aspects of the carved iconographic programmes. As early as the last quarter of the seventh century, gesso was applied to the stone, constituting an intermediary layer that could be decorated, and this tradition continued in the Northern Danelaw after Scandinavian settlement.[227] Layers of gesso applied to the stone surface could form a base for paint in colours like red, green or black, while colours could also be applied directly to the surface of the stone.[228]

Recent analysis of a tenth-century stone sculpture from York has shown that white paint was also applied over white primer to distinguish central grooves in an interlace panel (Fig. 6).[229] Here, the designers made a deliberate (and unusual) choice to create a pure white field and paired it with distinctively applied red and white pigments. This demonstrates that administering paint and gesso to monumental stone sculptures was consciously planned, likely with the intention of emphasising explicit details of carvings to elicit responses from their viewers. Paint and gesso would alter the geological features of carved stone by modifying its appearance and texture to mask mis-cuttings, change contours and hide geological discolouration,[230] and could therefore both enhance and inhibit viewer engagement. Other monuments received

[227] For gesso and pigment surviving on Anglian monuments, see: Rosemary Cramp, *County Durham and Northumberland*, CASSS 1 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977), 183-84 (Hexham 19), 187 (Hexham 24); Hawkes and Sidebottom, *Derbyshire and Staffordshire*, 302-07 (Lichfield 1); Warwick Rodwell, et al., "The Lichfield Angel: A Spectacular Anglo-Saxon Painted Sculpture," *The Antiquaries Journal* 88 (2008): 63-64, 83-94. See also James Lang, "The painting of Pre-Conquest Sculpture in Northumbria," in *Early Medieval Wall Painting and Painted Sculpture in England*, ed. Sharon Cather, David Park and Paul Williamson, BAR 216 (1990), 135-146; Dominic Tweddle, et al., *South-East England*, CASSS 4 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), 151-161 (Reculver 1). For gesso and pigment surviving on Viking-age monuments: Bailey, *Viking Age Sculpture*, 26; Bailey, *England's Earliest Sculptors*, 6; James Lang, *York and East Yorkshire*, CASSS 3 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), 184-85 (Middleton 3), 218-19 (Stonegrave 6); James Lang, *Northern Yorkshire*, CASSS 6 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 65-66 (Brompton 2).

[228] Bailey, *England's Earliest Sculptors*, 6.

[229] Bibi Beekman and Richard N. Bailey, "A Painted Viking-Age Sculpture from York," *YAJ* 90 (2018): 2-4, 6.

[230] Bailey, *England's Earliest Sculptors*, 26-27.

more subtle polychromed effects, however, which were achieved with sophisticated painterly treatments, such as the Lichfield Angel (Fig. 7).[231] A painted monument would thus appear conspicuous, efficiently establishing its location in the landscape and enabling it to transform its surrounding environs. Paint would further compel viewers to engage with monuments, and at an intimate distance, viewers would be able to recognise details distinguished by the applied media, such as facial features or particular items of clothing. Such close engagement might also yield the presence of painted patterns or textures not visible from further away.

These materials were clearly effective, but they were also used alongside paste, foil, metal and glass from at least the early ninth century, as on a fragment from Reculver (Kent) (Fig. 8a) and the crosses at Sandbach (Ch.) (Fig. 8b).[232] Bailey outlined several potential uses for these materials, including using metal strips to surround figural panels; decorating the central boss of a cross-head; adding attachments for a crown; and filling the drilled eyes of figures.[233] While these are only a few possible applications, the range demonstrates how they could potentially supplement primed and painted stone surfaces, and further indicates that there were no fixed methods for their administration. This implies that the crosses' designers made deliberate decisions regarding their treatment and how it would enhance the overall programme to encourage audience engagement. Environmental factors cause metallic and glass features to glitter or become dull, prompting such engagement with the (gleaming) crosses encountered in the landscape. Regardless of any applied decoration, fluctuating atmospheric phenomena would also reveal or conceal the depth of carved surfaces, imbuing the surface of the monuments with perpetual movement and transformation, despite their static, immovable substance and fixed location.[234]

Although applied materials were perhaps deliberately administered to disguise the underlying stone,[235] the skeuomorphic nature of stone crosses has also been

[231] Rodwell, et al., "Lichfield Angel," 83-94.
[232] Bailey, *England's Earliest Sculptors,* 6-8; Jane Hawkes, *The Sandbach Crosses: Sign and Significance in Anglo-Saxon Stone Sculpture* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2002), 84, 97-101, 145-47; Tweddle, et al., *South-east England*, 151-161 (Reculver 1); Richard Bailey, *Cheshire and Lancashire*, CASSS 9 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 99-120 (Sandbach 1 and 2).
[233] Bailey, *England's Earliest Sculptors*, 8.
[234] See: Tasha Gefreh, "Place, Space and Time: Iona's Early Medieval High Crosses in the Natural and Liturgical Landscape," (doctoral thesis, University of Edinburgh, 2015); Heather Pulliam, "Blood, Water and Stone: The Performative Cross," in *Making Histories: Proceedings of the Sixth International Conference on Insular Art York 2011*, ed. Jane Hawkes (Donington: Shaun Tyas, 2013), 266-77.
[235] Bailey, *England's Earliest Sculptors*, 123.

recognised.[236] Elizabeth Coatsworth argued that skeuomorphic monuments emphasised the fundamental significance of the cross by manipulating secular (rather than theological) understandings of material resplendence and its intrinsic cultural value.[237] This has compelling implications when considering Scandinavian viewers' interactions with such crosses, assuming they were unaware of any inherent Christian associations.[238] The crosses' metallic properties (and in some cases, appearances) might encourage such a viewer to recall the cultural significance(s) associated with smaller metalwork objects, perhaps increasing the likelihood of Scandinavian audiences adopting stone-carving traditions. Furthermore, the multi-media properties of decorated crosses might have made translating iconographies from portable media to stone more feasible, providing the monumental surfaces with the potential to imitate or redefine the texture, pattern, lustre, colour or imagery of portable objects.

Thus, Mark Hall argued (debatably) that although sculpted monuments possess no individual agency, viewer encounters with them are mediated by their materiality.[239] For instance, their multi-media decoration could inspire tactile encounters, such as periodic repairs or restorations to maintain, or possibly transform, a monument's decoration.[240] Such restorative encounters could potentially stimulate a viewer to thoroughly immerse themselves in a monument's iconographic programme, noting details and features that might provoke contemplation of the relationships between carved images. The deterioration of decoration and subsequent restorations indicates the continued social significance of the monuments for their intended audiences. Yet, the potentially selective application(s) of additional media imply that there were various early medieval methods for decorating stone sculptures with(out) paint that would emphasise or conceal different features, with the objective of encouraging audience engagement. Of course, those monuments originally erected

---

[236] E.g., Richard Bailey and Rosemary Cramp, *Cumberland, Westmorland and Lancashire North-of-the-Sands* CASSS 2 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988), 140-42 (Penrith 11); Lang, *York and East Yorkshire*, 162-63 (Kirkdale 8).

[237] Elizabeth Coatsworth, "Landmarks of Faith: Crosses and Other Free-Standing Stones," in *The Material Culture of the Built Environment in the Anglo-Saxon World*, ed. Maren Clegg Hyer and Gale R. Owen-Crocker (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2015), 134; cf. Hawkes, *Sandbach Crosses*, 145-47; Jane Hawkes, "Reading Stone," in *Theorizing Anglo-Saxon Stone Sculpture*, ed. Catherine Karkov and Fred Orton (Morgantown, WV: West Virginia University Press, 2003), 26-29.

[238] For the potential invocation of the eschatological *crux gemmata*, see: Jennifer Ní Ghrádaigh, "A Stone in Time: Saving Lost Medieval Memories of Irish Stone Monuments," in Williams, et al., *Early Medieval Stone*, 232.

[239] Mark Hall, "Lifeways in Stone: Memories and Matter-Reality in Early Medieval Sculpture from Scotland," in Williams, et al., *Early Medieval Stone*, 184.

[240] Williams, et al., "Introduction," 19; cf. Pulliam, "Blood, Water and Stone," 265-66.

indoors might require less frequent restoration, but encounters with these would nevertheless be mediated by their architectural surroundings.[241]

The materiality of stone monuments also had the potential to encourage other sensory audience encounters apart from the tactile; paint and other ornamental features could compel viewers to orient themselves beside or before such monuments, while reading runic inscriptions arranged in looping bands requires periodical repositioning of the head.[242] Ing-Marie Back Danielsson further argued that the phenomenon of 'properly' encountering carved and painted rune-stone inscriptions is radically different to Christian monuments whose inscriptions are presented in horizontal registers.[243] Yet, inscriptions on Christian monuments such as the Ruthwell cross are displayed in registers arranged horizontally *and* vertically, demanding they be read across and down, or down and across the stone's surface, resulting in a reading experience that requires viewer movement.[244] Such a fragmented reading experience would enable close sensory engagement with a (smaller) monument, perhaps inspiring a viewer to trace the outlines of its inscriptions and speak the words aloud when reading them.[245] If decorated with applied materials, the inscriptions could, in turn, encourage engagement among textually literate and primarily oral audiences. Further, if the decorated inscriptions corresponded to any accompanying carved images, textually literate audiences may have been inspired to contemplate such connections, enabling a more profound response to the overall intended symbolic significances of the monument's text and imagery.

In Anglo-Saxon England stone itself carried certain associations that linked it to the Church,[246] which would have enabled free-standing stone crosses to perform an

---

[241] Pulliam, "Blood, Water and Stone," 262-63.
[242] Ing Marie-Back Danielsson, "Walking Down Memory Lane: Rune-stones as Mnemonic Agents in Landscapes of Late Viking-Age Scandinavia," in Williams, et al., *Early Medieval Stone*, 70-71.
[243] Ibid., 76.
[244] Éamonn Ó Carragáin, *Ritual and the Rood: Liturgical Images and the Old English Poems of the Dream of the Rood Tradition* (London: British Library, 2005), 58-60. This also occurs on other (secular) Insular objects, most notably, the Franks Casket: Leslie Webster, *The Franks Casket* (London: British Museum Press, 2012), 8-9, 23; Leslie Webster, "The Iconographic Programme of the Franks Casket," in *Northumbria's Golden Age*, ed. Jane Hawkes and Susan Mills (Stroud: Sutton Publishing, 1999), 233, 241.
[245] Early medieval reading was an active performance that engaged several aspects of the body through audibly speaking words, culminating in aural and muscular memories of words; see: Jean Leclercq, *The Love of Learning and the Desire for God*, trans. Catharine Misrahi (New York: Fordham University Press, 1974), 15-17, 72-73.
[246] See, Blair, *Church in Anglo-Saxon Society*, 392; Michael Shapland, "The Cuckoo and the Magpie: Building Culture of the Anglo-Saxon Church," in Clegg Hyer and Owen-Crocker, *Material Culture of the Built Environment*, 100; John Blair, *Building Anglo-Saxon England* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2018), 84-86.

'active' role in Christianising the landscape. Its associations with the Church and therefore Rome in Anglo-Saxon England are well established, with Jane Hawkes observing that although stone structures were unusual during the late sixth century, they were connected to establishing the Church's physical presence during the seventh. The material was deliberately selected to evoke the Church of Rome, given its conscious evocation by association with late imperial Roman material culture.[247] The explicit connotations of this medium and its use in the Anglo-Saxon environment suggests that contemporary audiences would have recognised and understood these associations, or were at least being encouraged to do so. Moreover, stone not only implied the physical presence of the Anglo-Saxon Church in the landscape; its relative permanence could also be understood to indicate the enduring nature of Christianity and the Church generally, particularly when set against the ruinous state of the earthly imperium. When carved, stone monuments in the landscape would accrue an additional layer of symbolic significance, provided by stone's relationship to Rome, the Christian Church and the Church of Rome, imbuing the images with specific meanings related to these institutions.

This has additional implications for the continuity of stone carving during the Viking Age, particularly at sites of earlier Anglian sculptural activity. It suggests that Anglo-Scandinavian patrons deliberately adopted Anglian stone carving traditions and selected this medium and the monumental cross-form with the intention of evoking and continuing associations with Christianity and the Church of Rome, given their potential awareness of the associations between stone, Rome and the Church (of Rome).[248]

Thus, although the geological features of stone monuments may have been covered by other adornments, their association with Anglo-Saxon architectural environments nevertheless enhances their inherently Christian nature. The decision to erect a stone cross in the landscape implies that those responsible were aware of its Christian nature, supplied by both its form and material, and intended to pinpoint a site and establish it as a locus with Christian significance in Anglo-Scandinavian environments. A locale thus distinguished acquires additional importance as an individual point within a larger nexus of monuments, buildings and sites that are

[247] Jane Hawkes, "*Iuxta Morem Romanorum:* Stone and Sculpture in Anglo-Saxon England," in *Anglo-Saxon Styles*, ed. Catherine E. Karkov and George Hardin Brown (Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 2003), 69-72, 77.
[248] For analogues, see Anglo-Scandinavian coinage minted in the Northern Danelaw, which imitated Carolingian issues: Above, 46, 51-52.

associated with the wider Christian world, centred around the Church in Rome. Contemporary Anglo-Saxon audiences understood monumental stone sculptures to carry varied Christian symbolic significances; stone's permanence was associated with the eternal nature of the human soul, which contrasted with timber's perishable nature and associations with the transitoriness of human life.[249] In this context, the ecclesiastical associations of stone and its (theological) significance (associated with the eternal salvation of the human soul) present a Christian lens for viewing and understanding the meanings of the images carved on stone crosses. These associations are complicated when secular images are also included on these monuments, but these do not undermine the importance of the patrons' or designers' deliberate selection of monumental (cross-)forms, applied decoration and other imagery with Christian, ecclesiastical associations.[250]

5. Christianising the Landscape

It is also worth considering how the monumental features of stone crosses might have contributed to their overall significances for contemporary Anglo-Scandinavian viewers. Fred Orton argued that stone monuments were historically and culturally conscious presentations of their patrons' identities – past, present and future.[251] This implies that iconographic schemes were deliberately chosen as patronal responses to cultural concerns or identities, and it further suggests a potential impetus for selecting the monumental cross-form, which had already accrued symbolic meaning(s) associated with Christian theology. Indeed, displaying carved images on a monumental cross would also ensure that viewers could understand their fundamental meaning(s), at least on the level of symbol-recognition, given the intended Christian symbolism of the monument type.

Thus, the placement of the monumental cross-form in the landscape may reflect a deliberate effort to create a sacred place with Christian associations. Central to understanding how crosses could Christianise the landscape is the perception that they may have been erected at sites that already held sacred cultural significance, and which, over time, may have accumulated "strata of meanings" activated by audience

[249] Shapland, "Cuckoo and the Magpie," 100.
[250] See further, Chs.2-5.
[251] Fred Orton, "At the Bewcastle Monument, in Place," in *A Place to Believe In: Locating Medieval Landscapes,* ed. Clare A. Lees and Gillian R. Overing (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2006), 65.

encounters with the monuments there.[252] This phenomenon implies that those responsible for erecting crosses were potentially aware of the prior sacred significance(s) associated with landscape features and earlier monumental signifiers, but these were deemed incompatible with Christian theology, requiring them to be (re)claimed with a new, Christian monument.

Monuments can therefore project aspects of their patrons' social identities into the landscape and transform the surrounding landscape and contemporary audiences' perceptions of it. *Contra* Sidebottom, inserting a Christian cross into the landscape within or beyond the confines of a churchyard instils the environment with Christian signifiers, presented on a form affiliated with this faith. In turn, this would re-present the site, effectively Christianising it and the surrounding landscape. Sarah Semple and Howard Williams, for example, argued that stone crosses promoted their patrons' secular or ecclesiastical identities, noting that the monuments were occasionally located near crucial boundaries, routes or assembly sites (including churches), and the monuments Christianised the landscape by engaging with sites that had previously accrued other symbolic associations.[253]

This suggests that deciding *where* to erect these monuments was also a conscious choice, intended to use and manipulate extant natural and manmade features in the landscape. Furthermore, it implies that stone crosses created a dialogue with pre-existing monuments, responding to, and being informed by, each other. In this context, the cross-form acknowledges the presence of extant monuments in that area by attempting to undermine or enhance their particular symbolic significance and promote a different (theological) viewpoint.

Taking this further, Joanne Kirton argued that particular landscape locations were selected for their ability to affect a viewer's experience and memory, and also dictated a monument's appearance.[254] This implies that a monument's patrons or designers intended to elicit specific responses from its anticipated viewers, and consciously manipulated particular landscape features to achieve this. Although valid in certain circumstances, Kirton's suggestion that a monument's appearance is dictated

---

[252] Clare A. Lees and Gillian R. Overing, "Anglo-Saxon Horizons: Places of the Mind in the Northumbrian Landscape," in Lees and Overing, *A Place to Believe In,* 15. See further, Blair, *Church in Anglo-Saxon Society*, 478; Sarah Semple and Howard Williams, "Landmarks of the Dead: Exploring Anglo-Saxon Mortuary Geographies," in Clegg Hyer and Owen-Crocker, *Material Culture of the Built Environment,* 138-39.
[253] Semple and Williams, "Landmarks," 141.
[254] Joanne Kirton, "Locating the Cleulow Cross: Materiality, Place and Landscape," in Williams, et al., *Early Medieval Stone,* 36.

by its location may not always be observed. Crosses, for instance, were erected in non-ecclesiastical environments, and other, less conspicuously Christian monuments such as hogbacks could be erected within a churchyard. While several monument forms were available, certain types would be more visible within the landscape, and the height of certain stone crosses presents them with an advantage: they can be seen and recognised from great distances, while recumbent monuments may be misinterpreted as natural geological features.

Such 'landscape manipulation' is recognised in the scholarship, albeit in relation to architectural structures. Lydia Carstens, for instance, demonstrated that Scandinavian Iron-age halls were constructed in elevated terrains to communicate their importance to local audiences and outsiders.[255] Their proportions and placement along land- and sea-routes increased their visibility, and affected visiting audiences by causing them to feel relatively small and insignificant.[256] The proportions of certain stone crosses likely had an analogous effect that could be further enhanced by their placement on natural topographical features, increasing their perceived height. Their visibility would also be affected by placement along rivers and roads, and in churchyards – all locations that would have been frequently utilised and visited.[257] Early medieval land navigation was dependent on observation and directions describing landmark features and physical passage through or around them, and man-made features could assist with ordering such a landscape, functioning as markers for those traversing it.[258] Stone crosses viewed from a distance may have facilitated travel, but the complex iconographic programmes carved on many of them indicates this was not their sole function. Moreover, their vertical proportions are effective in enforcing their own monumentality; they force the viewer to look up the height of the shaft, towards the cross-head and ultimately to the celestial environments forming the backdrop to this particular feature, and this emphasis on monumentality could also be supplemented by carved imagery.[259]

---

[255] Lydia Carstens, "Powerful Space. The Iron-Age Hall and its Development During the Viking Age," in *Viking Worlds: Things, Spaces and Movement*, ed. Marianne Hem Eriksen, et al. (Oxford: Oxbow, 2015), 16.
[256] Ibid.
[257] E.g., the cross of St Martin on Iona is still prominent when approaching the island by sea from Mull.
[258] Kirton, "Locating the Cleulow Cross," 47-49.
[259] E.g., angelic figures carved in the cross-heads at Eyam, Bradbourne and Bakewell (Derbys.) encourage the viewer's contemplation of the divine, and two figures disposed on the cross-shaft at Bakewell reach toward the Crucifixion depicted above: Jane Hawkes, "Gregory the Great and Angelic Mediation: The Anglo-Saxon Crosses of the Derbyshire Peaks," in *Text, Image, Interpretation: Studies in Anglo-Saxon Literature and its Insular Context in Honour of Éamonn Ó Carragáin*, ed. Alastair

Kirton recognised that crosses erected on a mound, as at Cleulow (Chs.), may have been intended to recall Christ's procession with his cross to Golgotha.[260] This provides one example of how biblical landscapes could be recreated in ecclesiastical *or* secular surroundings by emulating the moment of Christ's Crucifixion, arguably the most significant event in the Christian history of salvation. It further implies that the patron was potentially aware of the effect(s) achieved by using the monumental cross-form to manipulate natural features.

However, the apparent binary between sacred and profane landscapes is insufficient; it neglects the connections between the two, and the overall context of a sacred place.[261] If stone crosses were intended to create and denote sacred (Christian) places in the landscape, they may have been encountered and interpreted differently depending on the identity of their intended audiences. Furthermore, extant stone monuments at sites where crosses were subsequently set up could contextualise the later crosses, and introduce the possibility that Anglo-Scandinavian patrons commissioned monuments and their carvings *in response* to those already present at the site, perhaps with the intention of counteracting their perceived deficiencies.[262]

Stone monuments' abilities to establish and communicate social memory, especially by preserving texts and images, is also relevant and suggests that their imagery reflects the tastes of local, contemporary patrons or designers and their communities.[263] While this may indeed be the case, the iconographic programmes of stone crosses in the Northern Danelaw have ties to communities and works produced elsewhere in the Insular world and further afield,[264] suggesting that their patrons had previously encountered sources of inspiration that were deemed to possess substantial cultural value, warranting inclusion in their own commissions. This is best evinced by the selective incorporation of schemes with potential Irish connections, which provide parallels with earlier Anglian borrowings from Merovingian sculpture.[265] These indicate continuity of earlier sculptural practise and suggest that imported schemes

---

Minnis and Jane Roberts (Turnhout: Brepols, 2007), 438-48; Hawkes and Sidebottom, *Derbyshire and Staffordshire*, 105-13 (Bakewell 1), 147-52 (Bradbourne 1), 179-83 (Eyam 1).

[260] Kirton, "Locating the Cleulow Cross," 56; Iris Crouwers, "The Biographies and Audiences of Late Viking-Age and Medieval Stone Crosses and Cross-Decorated Stones in Western Norway," in Williams, et al., *Early Medieval Stone*, 169.

[261] Sarah Hamilton and Andrew Spicer, "Defining the Holy: The Delineation of Sacred Space," in *Defining the Holy: Sacred Space in Medieval and Early Modern Europe*, ed. Andrew Spicer and Sarah Hamilton (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005), 3-5.

[262] E.g. Stonegrave, Leeds and Middleton.

[263] Williams, et al., "Introduction," 10-11; Bailey, *England's Earliest Sculptors*, 11.

[264] See Ch.2, 133-38, and Ch.3, 168-71.

[265] Bailey, *England's Earliest Sculptors*, 41.

were selected with the intention of adding meaning to an iconographic programme. The incorporation of alternate iconographic schemes further implies that those already available as prototypes were considered insufficient by the Anglo-Scandinavian patrons. In turn, the accretion of iconographic elements from different origins at an individual site enables such locations to be understood as assemblages, where the carved imagery on one monument generates dialogues with that on others.

Stone crosses and their inherent monumentality thus impacted viewer experiences of the landscape by mediating their passage through it; facilitating the re-use or reclamation of the landscape or sacred sites to Christianise the landscape; and manipulating natural features. Moreover, monumentality influenced early medieval understandings of the monuments themselves, as features inserted into the landscape to achieve the aims or objectives of their patrons. Together, these aspects of monumentality suggest that the erection of stone crosses reflects a series of deliberate decisions undertaken to achieve a desired effect: a response from those encountering the crosses.

6. Taking Thematic Approaches to the Sculpture

This overview of terminological and cultural issues demonstrates that another approach is required to overcome the 'pagan'-Christian binary in art-historical studies of Anglo-Scandinavian sculptures arising from the prioritisation of twelfth- and thirteenth-century Icelandic texts for identifying the 'pagan' figures, and the resultant exclusive focus on those figures. Therefore, a thematic investigation of the sculptures that facilitates Christian *and* secular perspectives will be adopted here to enable a nuanced engagement with the carvings' carefully constructed art-historical and socio-political relationships, and their iconographic significances as they might have been understood by contemporary audiences. With an understanding of the varied phenomena underpinning the erection of the crosses, it is possible to undertake such an approach.

6a. Moving Forward: Methodological Approach

The full data-set of extant stone sculptures or sculptural fragments produced in the modern counties of Northumberland, Durham, Cumbria, Lancashire, Cheshire and

Yorkshire during the period of late ninth- to tenth-century Scandinavian settlement is exceptionally large, numbering approximately 988 fragments.[266] This number of sculpted stone monuments produced during the period of Scandinavian settlement represents a fivefold increase in the number produced during the pre-Viking period.[267] Given the extremely vast and varied nature of this corpus of material, it is necessary to limit it here according to a focus on those monuments and fragments decorated with figural carvings. Of the 988 extant fragments of any monument type dating to the late ninth to late tenth centuries, only 197 contain figural carvings, the majority of which are displayed on cross-shafts.[268] The sub-set of material under discussion here is thus further limited by monument type, to include only those figural carvings displayed on cross-shafts and cross-shaft fragments dating to the relevant period: of which there are 107.

The decision to limit the data-set under discussion here to these fragments has been influenced by the arguments presented for the definition of each fragment as a cross-shaft in the relevant CASSS volumes. The cross-shafts vary in scale from the truly monumental (*c.* 433cm) to the diminutive (*c.* 86cm), but due to the fragmentary nature of many monuments and the difficulty of accurately reconstructing them, scale and proportions were therefore not taken into account when classifying the monuments.[269] Cross-shafts can be distinguished from other monument types by a number of features, however, including their general typology. They are typically roughly square in section, as opposed to thinner slabs, and taper from the base to the top.[270] Complete or near-complete monuments, such as those at Middleton (Yorks.), retain their cross-heads, while in certain cases where monuments have become fragmented, they nevertheless retain vestiges of elements denoting the transition into another part of the monument, which would have formed the cross-head, as at Dacre (Cu.) or Whalley (Lancs).[271] In the case of fragments carved with figural decoration,

[266] This number was calculated using the dates provided for the monuments in the relevant CASSS volumes for each of the modern counties: Cramp, *County Durham and Northumberland*; Bailey and Cramp, *Cumberland, Westmorland, Lancashire North-of-the-Sands*; Lang, *York and Eastern Yorkshire*; Lang, *Northern Yorkshire*; Coatsworth, *Western Yorkshire*; Bailey, *Cheshire and Lancashire*.
[267] Bailey, *England's Earliest Sculptors*, 79.
[268] See Appendix I.
[269] Cramp, *County Durham and Northumberland*, xiv.
[270] Slab-like cross-shafts do occur at certain sites, e.g., Alnmouth (Nld) and Dacre (Cu.), though the Dacre shaft may originally have been slightly wider, as Face C has been cut away: Cramp, *County Durham and Northumberland*, 161-62 (Alnmouth 1); Ch.3, 165-75; Appendix I.2; Bailey and Cramp, *Cumberland, Westmorland and Lancashire North-of-the-Sands*, 91-92 (Dacre 2); Ch.3, 148-58; Appendix I.27.
[271] For Middleton 1 and 2, see: Lang, *York and Eastern Yorkshire*, 181-84; Ch.3, 158-65; Ch.5, 227-37; Appendix I.68; Appendix I.69. For Whalley 3, see: Bailey, *Cheshire and Lancashire*, 245-48.

the arrangement of the decoration itself can indicate the original format of the monument. Those fragments deemed to have originally belonged to free-standing cross-shafts tend to be carved on all four sides, with the decoration generally, but not exclusively, arranged within mouldings that extend vertically up the lateral edges of the fragments. Many of the cross-shaft fragments and complete monuments also retain horizontal mouldings that separate the decoration into panels, although there are certainly exceptions to this arrangement, as at Gosforth (Cu.) or Stonegrave (Yorks.).[272] The orientation of the carvings themselves can also be taken into account here; it is characterised by a vertical orientation, wherein the decoration is not arranged on the fragment as if intended to be viewed while it is lying horizontally.

Given the fragmentary nature of the Anglo-Scandinavian sculptures, it is necessary to take into account the potential transmission of the material from its inception to the present day. As noted, with very few exceptions,[273] most of the pieces have experienced varying degrees of weathering, damage or reuse as building material in the construction of later churches.[274] Nevertheless, fragmentation does not preclude the possibility that the sculptures produced within areas of Scandinavian settlement remain in the original locations of their erection. This is supported by geological and stylistic evidence, which demonstrates that, with very few exceptions, the sculptures were largely produced *in situ*, using locally available stone.[275] The complex geological relationships of the sculptures have been fully analysed and usefully summarised in the relevant CASSS volumes.[276] Apart from geological considerations, there are also practical factors to consider; for instance, it is unlikely that the stone, once quarried and transported to the site of carving (whether a workshop or the site of its erection), would have been subsequently moved, as this would risk damage to the carvings. The incorporation of fragments into subsequent building fabric also ensures that they remain at the site of their original erection.

Furthermore, despite any weathering, damage or reuse that may have occurred, it is possible to infer the approximate numbers of the original corpus of Anglo-Scandinavian material at individual sites using the surviving sculptural fragments at

---

[272] Bailey and Cramp, *Cumberland, Westmorland*, 100-104 (Gosforth 1); Ch.4, 209-22; Appendix I.36; Lang, *York and Eastern Yorkshire*, 215-16 (Stonegrave 1); Appendix I.93.
[273] E.g., the Gosforth cross.
[274] Bailey, *England's Earliest Sculptors*, 4.
[275] Ibid., 11-12.
[276] Cramp, *County Durham and Northumberland*, 13; Bailey and Cramp, *Cumberland, Westmorland*, 7-9; Lang, *York and Eastern Yorkshire*, 11-15; Lang, *Northern Yorkshire*, 13-19; Coatsworth, *Western Yorkshire*, 23-34; Bailey, *Cheshire and Lancashire*, 11-17.

that site. This process involves calculating the minimum and maximum number of monuments (of any type), by counting the total number of fragments, with the implication that high concentrations of monuments at certain sites may reflect continuing or revived ecclesiastical communities, whose presence elicited elite patronage and commemoration.[277] For sites that contain both fragmentary cross-shafts and cross-heads, the minimum number of monuments can be counted by assuming the cross-heads belong to the extant shaft fragments. For example, at Kirby Hill (Yorks.), there are six cross-shaft fragments, two fragmentary cross-heads and two grave covers, indicating a minimum number of eight monuments (six cross-shafts with cross-heads, and two grave-covers).[278] By contrast, the maximum number of monuments can be inferred by counting the total number of fragments at one site. At Kirby Hill, this would mean a maximum of ten monuments: eight cross-shafts, the additional two implied by the fragmentary cross-heads, and two grave-covers.[279] At other sites the variation in the number of potential monuments could be even more significant, as at Lythe, where a minimum of 19 and a maximum of 35 monuments are suggested by the surviving six cross-shaft fragments, two fragmentary cross-heads, 17 hogback fragments, two grave-marker fragments and eight cross-shaped grave-markers.[280] This method of calculation and the Kirby Hill and Lythe examples thus demonstrate that the potential minimum and maximum numbers for any given site can vary significantly. The implications of this method of calculation for the 107 extant Anglo-Scandinavian cross-shafts or fragments depicting figural imagery is that this number reflects the potential maximum number of monuments displaying figural imagery in the Northern Danelaw, while also allowing for the possibility that the total number of original, complete monuments may have been significantly lower at sites with both fragmentary cross-shafts and heads.

Having surveyed the monumental and decorative features that characterise free-standing stone crosses and the survival of the sculptures into the present, it is worth briefly also reviewing the dating frameworks used in CASSS to determine the approximate late ninth- to tenth-century dates for the corpus of material assessed in this study. As established in the general introduction to CASSS, a hierarchy of traditional dating methods are combined to determine the approximate dates of the

[277] Pickles, *Kingship, Society and the Church*, 266-69.
[278] Ibid., 266; Lang, *Northern Yorkshire*, 129-34.
[279] Pickles, *Kingship, Society and the Church*, 266.
[280] Ibid.; Lang, *Northern Yorkshire*, 153-66.

stone monuments, including inscriptions; associations with particular datable archaeological or historical contexts; and finally, the typology and style of the monuments.[281] This hierarchy of dating methods has been utilised since the late nineteenth-century works of Calverley and Collingwood, and remains in use today, with certain modifications: analogous motifs in manuscript and metalwork material are now drawn upon as comparative material for the sculptures.[282] As with the geological relationships of the sculptures, the dating criteria are usefully summarised, and the stylistic motifs invoked to determine the resulting dating frameworks are argued for in each CASSS volume.[283]

Despite the relative subjectivity of the criteria, the scholarship regarding the Anglo-Saxon material has now reached the point where the dates of the Viking-age material have been more or less agreed upon by scholars considering it from diverse points of view, including the cultural, stylistic, historical and archaeological. Most monuments assigned to the Anglo-Scandinavian period lack inscriptions, meaning that scholars have relied upon datable find contexts, such as those at Coppergate or the Minster in York, for establishing the dates of the material.[284] More often, however, stylistic and typological features are the primary evidence that is taken into account when determining a date for the sculptures that are coeval with the period of Scandinavian settlement. Such features include the ring or circle enclosing the arms of a cross-head, an element assumed to have been imported in the early tenth century from Ireland, as well as the three dominant Scandinavian styles of ornament found in the north of England: the Borre, Jellinge and Mammen styles, although these could be combined with revived Anglian styles.[285] Due to the comprehensive nature of the dating frameworks proposed in CASSS, which take into account epigraphic evidence, datable find contexts, stylistic relationships to comparative material and typological features, the dates assigned to individual sculptures in CASSS will be accepted and used for the purposes of this discussion.

---

[281] Bailey, *England's Earliest Sculptors*, 13-14; Cramp, *County Durham and Northumberland*, xlvii-xlviii.
[282] Bailey, *England's Earliest Sculptors*, 16-18. For further discussion of Calverley and Collingwood's work, see Ch.1, 89-96.
[283] Cramp, *County Durham and Northumberland*, 23-33; Bailey and Cramp, *Cumberland, Westmorland, Lancashire North-of-the-Sands*, 10-18, 23-40; Lang, *York and Eastern Yorkshire*, 16-37; Lang, *Northern Yorkshire*, 20-50; Coatsworth, *Western Yorkshire*, 66-77; Bailey, *Cheshire and Lancashire*, 19-40.
[284] Bailey, *England's Earliest Sculptors*, 13.
[285] Ibid., 14-16; See further, Ch.1, 99-100.

After a full review of the potential corpus of material, which, as noted, includes 197 monuments of any type bearing figural decoration, the decision was made to further limit the material discussed in this study to the 107 cross-shafts or fragments bearing figural imagery. This decision has been largely guided by this study's overarching interest in the interplay of sacred and secular figural imagery on individual monuments. These 107 cross-shafts and fragments have been collected into a single corpus forming an appendix, which underscores the size of the corpus of surviving material and demonstrates the full range of material from which the case studies discussed in the ensuing chapters were selected. It further provides detailed descriptions of each of the 11 case-studies under consideration here, which are supplemented by descriptions of the remaining 96 late ninth- to tenth-century cross-shafts and fragments with figural images, in order to avoid detracting from the discussion of the cas-studies' iconography. The 11 case studies discussed here have therefore been selected according to the following criteria: (i) the monument dates to the late ninth to tenth-century, according to the date assigned in CASSS, which has been determined using the dating hierarchy outlined above; (ii) the form of the monument has been concluded to be that of a cross-shaft or fragmentary cross-shaft because its features correspond to those typical of the monumental form, as outlined above; (iii) the monument is complete or near complete; and, (iv) the carved programme of the monument bears extensive figural imagery, which, in certain cases, has been assumed to depict Norse legendary or mythological subject-matter. Taken together, these criteria enable the monuments and their iconography to be considered according to a variety of thematic frameworks that are relevant to the phenomena of the ongoing conversion and Christianisation of Scandinavian groups coeval with the erection of the monuments.

6b. Moving Forward: Overview of Study

In the light of the considerable size of the full data-set of stone monuments bearing figural imagery and the complexities of its dating and distribution as outlined above, as well as the issues inherent in its reception by antiquarians and scholars from the late nineteenth to twenty-first centuries, this study begins with a full review of the scholarship addressing the Anglo-Scandinavian monuments and their figural imagery (Chapter 1). Following this, the first sculpture-focussed chapter (2) considers the

themes of tradition and innovation. It analyses surviving Anglian sculptural traditions and the new contributions Scandinavian settlers made, which resulted from new cultural links and networks. Here, the transmission of visual languages is fundamental to understanding the sculptural tradition that survived and was re-invented in the Northern Danelaw. Three crosses erected at Ilkley, Leeds (W. Yorks.) and Whalley (Lancs.) coincide with Scandinavian arrival and settlement and their designs indicate ecclesiastical concerns involving the Second Coming and/or Last Judgment. The sculptural and documentary evidence demonstrates that the Ilkley cross was probably influenced by the Archbishop of York, and its iconographic programme emerges as a potential response to late ninth-century Scandinavian incursions and settlement in the region. That at Leeds demonstrates formal stylistic links with earlier Anglian monuments, but also incorporates visual material of Scandinavian origin. Finally, the Whalley cross likewise maintains thematic and visual links with earlier Anglian and Christian traditions, in order to emphasise Christ conquering evil, the significance of individual salvation, the absolving of sin and the penitential emulation of Christ.

The phenomenon of monumentality underpins Chapter 3, with the understanding that it can compensate for the reality of a monument's current fragmentary nature. It enables the putative crosses from Dacre (Cu.), Middleton (Yorks.) and Alnmouth (Nld.) to be perceived as Christianising the landscape, through their monumental form and iconographic programmes. The Dacre cross indicates that the site either maintained or re-established its previous ecclesiastical status or associations. Moreover, its iconographic programme invokes themes of redemption and salvation and their presentation on a public monument indicates their relevance to contemporary audiences, while the medium (stone) underscores their potential Christian associations. At Middleton the monumental cross-form is also foregrounded to demonstrate how it informs understanding of its iconographies by invoking Christian frames of reference. These are further complemented by its medium (stone), which integrates it into a larger network of monuments associated with Christianity, the Church and its liturgical and theological traditions. Consideration of the Alnmouth cross emphasises the cruciform, rather than the inscriptions highlighted in the scholarship, with the depiction of Christ's Crucifixion on the shaft of the cross likely intended to invoke the veneration of the cross, and so highlight its form.

Having engaged with the effect of monumentality on the viewer, Chapter 4 addresses the sculptures from the perspective of audience encounter, contesting the

assumption that secular or ‘pagan’ carvings must imply an expected ‘pagan’ audience; thus, documentary evidence is invoked to support the concept of varied audience engagement with monuments. This shows that the crosses were not encountered exclusively by ecclesiastics, but were also erected on secular estates and encountered by secular audiences, implying that the intended audience(s) for the crosses at Collingham, Nunburnholme (Yorks.), and Gosforth (Cu.) must be deduced by recovering the meanings inherent in their carvings.

The influence of patronage anticipated in Chapter 4 forms the focus of Chapter 5, where it is argued that patrons deliberately selected carved schemes to present their ideological inclinations or aspirations to the monuments’ anticipated audiences. This approach diverges from the scholarship, which invokes patronage to establish the assumed ethnic or social identities of those who erected stone monuments in the Northern Danelaw by identifying Scandinavian decorative motifs and heroic legendary and traditional mythological figural carvings that are assumed to express their patrons’ Scandinavian affiliations and traditional beliefs. Yet, these approaches undermine the crosses’ nuanced complexities by ignoring the significance of their monumental form, and its associations independent of ethnicity or social ranking. Consideration of their cross-form enables a more nuanced iconographic assessment of the crosses at Middleton (Yorks.) and Halton (Lancs.), revealing potential aspects of their patrons’ complex aspirations, motives and objectives.

Thus, rather than assuming the crosses emanated from exclusively ‘pagan’ patronage, consideration of their Christian *and* secular schemes undertaken here – thematically – enables the overall iconographic programmes to be examined and perceived as complex commentaries on contemporary theological concepts, produced under the aegis of well-informed patron(s), in contrast to the prevailing scholarly presumptions concerning the legendary and mythological carvings found on the Anglo-Scandinavian crosses in the Northern Danelaw.

CHAPTER 1

Creating a Binary Scholarship: Approaches to the Figural Carvings on Anglo-Scandinavian Stone Crosses

1.1 Introduction

In order to address the persistent 'pagan'-Christian binary in art-historical scholarship on Anglo-Scandinavian stone crosses, the studies that address the monuments must first be considered. As few studies address the figural iconography – namely those by Bailey and Kopár, following Browne and Calverley – their scholarly context must be established, to situate them alongside the wider art-historical body of interest in the stylistic and typological aspects of the monuments, and Anglo-Saxon stone sculpture, generally.

1.2 The Nineteenth Century

Although the earliest studies did address the Anglo-Scandinavian monuments' figural iconography, they focussed primarily on identifying the figures within 'pagan' frames of reference. In his 1885 study on the Leeds cross, George Forrest Browne identified, amongst others included in the figural programme, the legendary figure of Weland the smith, depicted at the moment where he carries off and marries a swan maiden.[286] The woman's identity and the episode referred to have since become the subject of much scholarly debate.[287] Significantly, Browne diverged from the tendency of his contemporaries to focus exclusively on the carvings' presumed 'pagan' nature, by arguing that the other figures probably depicted Christ, the Evangelists or the Apostles.[288] This attempt to analyse the iconographic programme with due consideration for its Christian frames of reference presents a significant exception to the established scholarly trend of considering apparently 'pagan' schemes in isolation from their monumental and iconographic contexts.

Building on his identification of Christian figures, Browne claimed that the bird of prey accompanying the lower figure on A at Leeds implies that the figure was

[286] Browne, "Ancient Sculptured Shaft," 138-39; Appendix, I.64.
[287] See below, 95; Ch.2, 130-31.
[288] Browne, "Ancient Sculptured Shaft," 135-36.

intended to depict John the Evangelist.[289] He confused this, however, by deciding the interlace motif accompanying the figure could be associated with a serpent, as in eleventh-century Scandinavian images of Sigurd the Völsung.[290] He further regarded the claw-like hand of the upper figure as an attribute of Mark, and 'invented' diagnostic features of the "claws of a leopard" and the "hoof of an ox" for the middle and upper figures on C to identify them as Matthew and Luke.[291] Thus, although he considered the images accompanying Weland at Leeds to have Christian associations, his propensity to fabricate iconographies undermined this view for future scholars. Further, he did not explain why figures from secular legend were carved on a monumental cross bearing Christian frames of reference. Nor did he engage with how the figures were arranged on the cross-shaft, which would influence the viewing experiences of contemporary audiences; admittedly, at the time, this was of less concern than it is today.

William Slater Calverley assessed the sculptures in the diocese of Carlisle, including the cross-shafts from Dacre, Gosforth and Halton, the latter two being deemed to contain 'pagan' imagery.[292] The figures at Dacre had been previously identified as having "a symbolic meaning in Norse paganism", representing Thor, Odin, Freyr and the tree, Yggdrasil.[293] Significantly, Calverley rejected this identification, recognising that the 'Yggdrasil' scheme was the Fall, and explained the remainder of the figural carvings as representing a baptism.[294] Although this indicates the antiquarian tendency to prioritise 'pagan' interpretations of Anglo-Scandinavian carved schemes with little regard for what was actually depicted, an approach which has persisted in later scholarship, Calverley's rejection of the earlier interpretation demonstrates that it was possible to explain Viking-age carved schemes within a Christian frame of reference.

Apart from this engagement with the Dacre shaft fragment, Calverley generally upheld the interest in the apparently 'pagan' subject-matter of Anglo-Scandinavian material, as is clear in his typological discussion of the Gosforth monument. This, he argued, resembled "a gigantic Thor's hammer" from a distance,[295] thus undermining

[289] Ibid., 136-37.
[290] Ibid., 139-41.
[291] Ibid., 136-37.
[292] Calverley, *Notes*, 113-17, 139-67, 183-94. See Appendix, I.27, I.36, I.39.
[293] Rev. Canon Mathews, "The Dacre Stone," *TCWAAS* ser. 1, 11 (1891): 227.
[294] Calverley, *Notes*, 113.
[295] Ibid. 141.

the significance of its cross-form, which also includes a stepped-base, a feature now known to reference significant Christian sites and events.[296] Furthermore, it elides the fact that the monument does not resemble the (inverted) T-shape associated with Thor's hammer pendants, such as those from Björkö, Stockholm, Sweden and Mandemark, Denmark.[297] He nevertheless analysed the carvings in the light of later Old Norse texts, arguing that they illustrated 'pagan' mythological subjects associated with Ragnarök.[298] The single identifiable Christian scene on the cross, a cross-less Crucifixion, Calverley identified as depicting one of three Norse gods: Baldr, Odin or Heimdallr – or an amalgamation of the three,[299] and he explored the potential parallels between their mythological narratives and the Crucifixion, including blindness, a lamenting woman and a serpentine adversary.[300] Although a Christian parallel was pursued here, the remainder of the carvings on the cross were not considered in this way, being deemed entirely 'pagan' in origin and meaning.

At Halton, the focus was likewise on apparently 'pagan' imagery, though Calverley observed the Christian nature of the Crucifixion carved on A.[301] Yet, to interpret the figures carved on C he invoked later Icelandic texts and visual comparanda from Sweden and Norway, arguing that they depicted episodes from the story of Sigurd: the forging of the sword; Sigurd's horse Grani; the roasting of the dragon's heart; Sigurd's conversation with the birds; and the beheading of Reginn the smith.[302] For Calverley, the use of temporally distant textual and visual sources, produced in non-Insular contexts, was incontestable; indeed, the Halton carvings 'illustrated' textual accounts of the Sigurd legend, comprising "his story, written in stone".[303] His approach and notion of sculptural illustration have, of course, become common in later twentieth- and twenty-first century scholarly engagements with Anglo-Scandinavian sculptures, even when more (geographical and temporally) relevant comparanda may have been available.

---

[296] For the stepped-base in Insular sculpture, see: Helen M. Roe, "The Irish High Cross: Morphology and Iconography," *JRSAI* 95, no. 1/2 (1965): 220-24; Martin Werner, "On the Origin of the Form of the Irish High Cross," *Gesta* 29, no. 1 (1990): 100-6.
[297] For Björkö: Statens Historiska Museet, Stockholm, SHM 181798, https://historiska.se/upptack-historien/object/181798-hange-torshammare-av-jarn/. For Mandemark: Nationalmuseet, Copenhagen, C1787, https://samlinger.natmus.dk/DO/asset/10698.
[298] Calverley, *Notes*, 141-166.
[299] Ibid., 155-60.
[300] Ibid., 161-63.
[301] Ibid., 183, 186; Appendix, I.39.
[302] Ibid., 190-92.
[303] Ibid., 191.

Thus, Browne and Calverley's works significantly established the standard methodological approach to the monuments: that of invoking later Icelandic and Norwegian texts and later Swedish and Norwegian sculptural material to explain the carvings found on the Anglo-Scandinavian stone crosses, and so undermined their (occasional) attempts to acknowledge the potential Christian nature of the monuments and/or carvings.

1.3 The Early Twentieth Century: W.G. Collingwood

Following the compilation and publication of Calverley's works, interest in the figural iconographies of Anglo-Scandinavian sculptures waned, with scholarship of the intervening period prioritising consideration of the monuments' formal stylistic and typological relationships. This was largely due to Collingwood's use of style and typology to create a chronology that allowed him to distinguish the Anglo-Scandinavian material from the Anglian, undertaken in three major studies of the Anglian and Viking-age material from the North, East and West Ridings of Yorkshire.[304] Perhaps his most significant observation of the material emerged in his assessment of the Leeds cross, where he noted that, despite the legendary subject and potential secular portrait included in its iconographic programme, the cross should not be considered and understood exclusively as a Scandinavian ('pagan') monument.[305] This 'insight' provides the scope necessary to assess the Christian nature of the Leeds cross and its figural iconography here, and the rationale to apply this methodology to analogous monuments with apparently atypical figural imagery that have featured (as 'pagan') in subsequent scholarly discussions.

This said, Collingwood systematically undermined such observations by adopting the view that incoming Scandinavian populations were "people who destroyed churches",[306] and contextualising the monuments according to ethnicity, on the understanding that the Danish (rather than Norse) incomers destroyed churches

[304] W.G. Collingwood, "Anglian and Anglo-Danish Sculpture in the North Riding of Yorkshire," *YAJ* 19 (1907): 273; W.G Collingwood, "Anglian and Anglo-Danish Sculpture in the East Riding of Yorkshire with Addenda to the North Riding," *YAJ* 21 (1911): 264-65; W.G. Collingwood, "The Dispersion of the Wheel-Headed Cross," *YAJ* 28 (1923): 322, 329, 331. See further: Bailey, *Viking-Age Sculpture*, 71.
[305] W.G. Collingwood, "Anglian and Anglo-Danish Sculpture in the West Riding with Addenda to the North and East Ridings and York, and a General Review of the Early Christian Monuments of Yorkshire," *YAJ* 23 (1923): 214-16.
[306] Collingwood, "Sculpture…North Riding," 272.

and their associated sculptural schools.[307] Conversely, he understood the 'Norse' settlers to have 'invaded' only in the tenth century, having been Christianised during their time in Ireland or the Isles, meaning they were unlikely to burn churches.[308] The decline in the quality of sculptures being produced during this period was nonetheless attributed to Danish incursions and settlement.[309] Whatever the historical probity of such statements, this allowed him to present a temporal lacuna between two phases of sculptural productivity in Anglo-Saxon England: pre-Scandinavian and Scandinavian. He could thus argue that, unlike their Anglian counterparts, the Viking-age sculpture consisted of "roughly hacked" stones displaying Danish motifs.[310]

Alongside such typological concerns, Collingwood provided a significant list of the potential figural subjects displayed on Anglian and Anglo-Scandinavian monuments, albeit without detailed discussion. It is notable that most subjects were apparently Christian, including Adam and Eve, the *Agnus Dei*, the Crucifixion and ecclesiastical or saintly figures.[311] Nevertheless, any further discussion of Anglo-Scandinavian figural imagery reverts to the tendency to prioritise that apparently derived from, or associated with, 'pagan' mythological or heroic subjects. Thus, in addition to assuming that two figures on the weathered broad face of the Staveley cross (Yorks.) represented a Norse mythological episode, because their attributes find parallels at Gosforth and Jurby (Isle of Man),[312] Collingwood's discussion of Anglo-Scandinavian figural schemes is limited to the sculptures from Penrith (Cu.) and Gosforth, both apparently depicting subjects from Snorri Sturluson's *Edda*, and the monuments from Gilling (Yorks.), Leeds and Neston (Ch.), which display carvings allegedly associated with the Weland legend, as recorded in *Völundarkviða.* Compared to later iconographic studies of Anglo-Scandinavian sculpture, however, Collingwood observed that the Weland legend is *not* a variant of the Sigurd episodes in the *Völsungssaga*; he therefore did not pursue parallels between them.[313]

---

[307] Collingwood, *Northumbrian Crosses of the Pre-Norman Age* (London: Faber & Gwyer, 1927), 76. George Baldwin Brown likewise distinguished Scandinavian ethnicities, but only to emphasise apparent *artistic* distinctions between the Danish and Norse: *Anglo-Saxon Sculpture*, The Arts of Early England 6 Part 2 (London: John Murray, 1937), 153.
[308] Collingwood, *Northumbrian Crosses*, 123.
[309] Ibid., 106. This perception was further supplemented by Collingwood's discussion of Anglo-Scandinavian animal ornament, which he described as "comparatively rude", to distinguish it from its Anglian counterparts: Collingwood, "Sculpture…West Riding," 159, 282. See also: W.G. Collingwood, "Anglian and Anglo-Danish Sculpture at York," *YAJ* 20 (1909): 153.
[310] Collingwood, "Sculpture…North Riding," 271.
[311] Ibid., 279-82.
[312] Collingwood, "Sculpture…West Riding," 242. Coatsworth, *Western Yorkshire*, 254-55; Appendix, I.92.
[313] Collingwood, "Sculpture…West Riding," 214; cf. Kopár, *Gods and Settlers*, 32.

Collingwood appears to have considered carvings such as these to underscore the (perceived) differences between the figural imagery of Anglian and Anglo-Scandinavian sculpture, the latter assumed to represent the secular (and therefore 'pagan') influence and interests of its patrons. Indeed, he explains the Sigurd episodes depicted at Halton as an attempt to imitate the Bewcastle cross (Cu.), a comparison intended to emphasize the superiority of the complex Christian iconographic programmes of earlier monuments.[314]

Of those Anglo-Scandinavian monuments containing figural imagery, Collingwood deemed the Nunburnholme cross particularly compelling. Despite the Scandinavian features he identified in the warrior 'portrait' on A, such as the helmet and sword,[315] he significantly eschewed the trend of assigning a 'pagan' or legendary identification to the pair of over-carved figures on D,[316] to (initially) suggest that they represented the soldiers of the Crucifixion, providing an analogue to the diminutive figures in the scene's counterpart on C.[317] Evidently he was able to analyse the figural imagery of monuments whose carvings may contain Scandinavian stylistic features without assuming they were entirely 'pagan'. Nevertheless, he rejected his Christian identifications at Nunburnholme on the basis of shared arrangements with schemes from Barwick-in-Elmet and Kirklevington (Yorks.) to associate the figures with the Sigurd legend.[318] He further argued that none of the schemes could represent biblical subjects because the garments worn by the central figure were incompatible with those typically depicted in images of Christ, and any early Christian representations of Christ blessing children, which might confirm the identities of the figures in these Anglo-Scandinavian schemes, were non-existent.[319]

As noted, the Gosforth cross featured prominently in Collingwood's discussion of Anglo-Scandinavian sculpture bearing 'pagan' figural imagery, despite his previous insistence that Norse Scandinavians settling in Cumbria established new Christian foundations in the region.[320] Here, he maintained Calverley's view that it depicted subjects from the 'pagan' mythological accounts preserved in the *Völuspá*, a mythology that he argued was both "current" and "the centre of Norse life",[321] thus

[314] Collingwood, "Sculpture…North Riding," 294; Collingwood, "Sculpture…York," 152-53.
[315] Collingwood, "Sculpture…East Riding," 266; Appendix, I.75.
[316] See Appendix, I.75.
[317] Collingwood, "Sculpture…East Riding," 267-68.
[318] Collingwood, "Sculpture…West Riding," 137. See Appendix, I.8 and I.58.
[319] Ibid.
[320] Collingwood, *Northumbrian Crosses*, 127; Appendix, I.36.
[321] Ibid., 156-57.

presenting a contradictory socio-religious account of tenth-century Cumbria and inadequately explaining the presence of apparently 'pagan' carvings in a monumental Christian context. The preservation of such perceptions further suggests that carvings of a 'pagan' nature were commonplace within the (arguably) Christian socio-religious context of the Northern Danelaw.

More troubling, however, are Collingwood's statements that "a 'literary subject' was set for him [the Gosforth sculptor] to illustrate", and that as "the Heysham hogback has attracted attention by its 'literary subject' … we should see in it an illustration of the *Völuspá*, as at Gosforth".[322] This implies that he, like Calverley, viewed the carvings as decorations subsidiary to the textual accounts, depriving them of any potential symbolic significance in their own right. Such scholarly 'downplaying' of the carvings further diminishes the significance of their monumental contexts, undermines the potential agency of those responsible for selecting the images and erases any potential responses they may have been intended to elicit from their intended audience(s). Nevertheless, perception of the carvings as illustrations persisted in ensuing studies of the iconography of Anglo-Scandinavian sculpture, albeit less explicitly.

Overall, Collingwood's understanding of Anglo-Scandinavian crosses as 'inferior' disregards their patrons' potential attempts to protract or revive Anglian monumental forms and sculptural features and diminishes the impact of the Church in the Northern Danelaw. Moreover, Collingwood juxtaposed the "pagan" and "illiterate, ill-mannered heathen" Scandinavian incomers with the "cultivated Christian folk of Northumbria",[323] implying that a perceived degeneration of style and sculptural ability can be attributed to the Scandinavian destruction of artistic networks associated with the Church and monasteries of Northern England – an understanding of the Anglo-Scandinavian sculpture that has prevailed in twentieth-century scholarship. Such characterisations are highly problematic, not least because they present an arbitrary historical account based on the presumed ethnicity of various incoming Scandinavian groups. Perhaps even more significant, however, is that they present a simplified 'pagan'-Christian binary, which precludes any possibility of the Scandinavians' prior engagement with Christianity, their potential conversion or Christianisation.[324] Thus, although Collingwood's publications established a solid foundation for future

[322] Ibid., 157, 170.
[323] Ibid., 120-21.
[324] See Introduction, 44-67.

formalist studies of Anglo-Scandinavian sculpture, his contradictory views of conversion and Christianisation, (over)emphasis on Scandinavian ethnic divisions and claims that several monuments were 'illustrations' of 'literary subjects', would have a lasting and negative impact on subsequent iconographic studies of the material. Clearly, the perpetuation of these 'pagan' stereotypes should be abandoned in favour of a more nuanced approach, which considers the carvings' sacred and secular natures within their monumental and cultural contexts.

1.4 The Early to Mid-Twentieth Century

Subsequent scholars adopted a more rational view toward the apparent distinctions between the figural and zoomorphic ornament carved on Anglian and Anglo-Scandinavian sculptures. George Baldwin Brown, for instance, insisted that zoomorphic motifs were the primary elements introduced by incoming Scandinavians, but followed earlier approaches when characterising the figural carvings as "drawn from northern mythology".[325] The figural carvings, unlike the zoomorphic motifs, were thus understood to diverge from earlier traditions and to reject both the naturalistic quality of the Anglian figural imagery and its Christian nature, features Brown assumed the Scandinavian patrons adopted only after converting to Christianity.[326] What is significant here is the implication that Scandinavian populations *did* convert to Christianity after settling in the region.

Nevertheless, this does not seem to have impacted his assessment of Anglo-Scandinavian figural iconographies, where he generally followed Collingwood – even when his claims are difficult to substantiate. For example, he identified the carvings on the "Christian cross" from Staveley as "figures from the pagan mythology of the north", although the carving is "so indistinct that … no one seems ever to have noticed it".[327] Given that the carving's 'indistinct' nature is due to weathering, it is difficult to confirm its 'pagan' mythological subject-matter and, moreover, Brown's assumption ignores the monument's Christian nature, expressed by its cross-form, which further elides the distinction between legendary and mythological material, the latter associated with traditional beliefs. Furthermore, his claim that figural images from northern mythology "present themselves with some abundance" in the tenth and

[325] Baldwin Brown, *Anglo-Saxon Sculpture*, 157.
[326] Ibid., 185, 228-29, 252.
[327] Ibid., 234-35; Appendix, I.92.

eleventh centuries disproportionately emphasises two factors.[328] It overestimates the number of Anglo-Scandinavian sculptures that contain figural imagery, which actually comprise a minority within the overall corpus, and it implies that among those monuments containing figural imagery, a greater number display mythological subject-matter, compared to Christian or secular subjects.[329]

Against this background, it is perhaps unsurprising that a 'pagan'-Christian paradigm became entrenched in early twentieth-century scholarship. Nowhere is this more apparent than in Thomas Downing Kendrick's work, which promoted and sensationalised the binary. Like Collingwood, his discussions are framed by the perception that Northumbria was invaded by Danes, who burned and plundered monasteries and churches.[330] Large portions of his 1941 article devoted to the Anglo-Scandinavian sculpture in the north of England reappeared in a 1949 book chapter,[331] whose opening statement is, perhaps unsurprisingly given its post-war context, fraught with nationalistic tendencies. For instance, he regarded the tenth-century erection of crosses "as … not only the brave tokens of a sturdy resistance, but, more than that, of the veritable triumph of the northern Christians in the face of adversity".[332]

Here, Kendrick appears to characterise the crosses as commemorating war, erected as Christian signs of resistance against invading "pagan Northmen".[333] These allusions reduce the monuments to Christian memorials erected in reaction to a 'pagan' enemy, and so undermine the nuanced complexities of their figural programmes. This perception of the monuments as Christian 'war memorials' further prohibits the possibility that sacred and secular iconographies could even appear in the same monumental context, let alone offer commentary upon one another as they had in the past, on objects such as the Franks Casket. Furthermore, it assimilates 'pagan' mythology and secular legend,[334] which may account for similar misunderstandings in later scholarship.

Alongside the 'pagan'-Christian binary, Kendrick presented a related paradigm that offsets the "barbaric" art and material culture produced in the Danelaw against that of Wessex, which he perceived as superior,[335] thus establishing a 'Danelaw-

[328] Ibid., 231.
[329] See Introduction, 81-84.
[330] T.D. Kendrick, *Late Saxon and Viking Art* (London: Methuen & Co., 1949), 55.
[331] T.D. Kendrick, "Late Saxon Sculpture in Northern England," *JBAA*, ser. 3, 6 (1941): 1-19.
[332] Kendrick, *Late Saxon*, 56.
[333] Ibid., 55.
[334] E.g., Ibid., 59-60.
[335] Ibid., 57.

Wessex' binary. This understanding of the Anglo-Scandinavian art reflects the perception that the Church in the north was destroyed as a result of Scandinavian settlement, while the Church in Wessex is assumed to have flourished in a Christian institutional continuum. This, of course, contradicts Kendrick's view of the crosses erected in the Danelaw as Christian memorials, something that would have been impossible if the Church had been obliterated to the extent he proposed. Consequently, it further neglects ecclesiastical continuity in areas of the Midlands where Scandinavian and West Saxon supremacy were disputed.[336]

Moreover, he argued that the Scandinavian art brought to England was "nothing but abstract barbaric ornament", contrasting with that produced in Wessex, which he deemed sophisticated and representative of the classical tradition because it portrayed human figures naturalistically.[337] Taking this further, he suggested that the imported Scandinavian styles were associated with 'heathendom', confirming his belief in the apparently 'pagan' nature of art produced in the Danelaw.[338] These perceptions extinguish the possibility that Anglo-Scandinavian art held any symbolic significance. They also deny that those responsible for producing sculpture were (plausibly) aware of the nuanced complexities of the images they selected for display, and the potential effects that their placement within the monuments' programmes could have on their intended audiences.[339] Such dismissals promote the assumption that the carvings lacked significance and were chosen haphazardly as mere decoration. These observations may account for later scholars' reluctance to address the carvings in a way that acknowledges and engages with factors beyond their apparently 'barbaric', 'pagan', (and decorative) natures. The formal stylistic evolutions and relationships of certain sculptural motifs thus remained central to scholarly interests throughout the twentieth century.

1.5 Moving the Discipline Forward

The formal comparative methodology initially adopted by Collingwood culminated in a symposium that addressed his works in the light of new sculptural discoveries and advancements in the field. Three of the resulting essays considered Anglo-

[336] See Introduction, 35-37, 46-47, 52-56, 60-62.
[337] Kendrick, *Late Saxon*, 107.
[338] Ibid., 87.
[339] E.g., Ibid., 60-61; see further Ch. 2, 126-39.

Scandinavian sculpture, focussing on its stylistic developments and the implied chronologies. Although these studies demonstrated significant scholarly shifts, at least one of Collingwood's concepts was reiterated: namely, that the decline of monastic institutions and their associated artistic networks could be attributed to Scandinavian settlement, but with the added caveats that while the incoming groups brought new motifs, the sculptors continued to "cannibalistically" reproduce extant Anglian ornament.[340]

The extent of lay patronage was also debated, with Rosemary Cramp observing that it began as early as the seventh century, which implies that it was not an unusual practise prior to Scandinavian settlement, despite being a factor associated with the increase in sculptural production post-settlement.[341] Nevertheless, as James Lang argued, the secular patronage of Anglo-Scandinavian monuments is often overemphasised, despite the figural iconography of certain monuments suggesting ecclesiastical input in its selection and arrangement.[342] This demonstrates that scholars were beginning to recognise the advantages of caution in analysing apparently secular carvings.

Another factor recognised as inhibiting the study of Anglo-Scandinavian sculpture was the increase in monuments by a factor of four to five, with the potential result of significant variation in quality.[343] Additional issues were raised with dating the sculpture, such as the persistence of Anglian motifs and the comparative lack of zoomorphic ornament produced in stone, which had been central to establishing stylistic chronologies in other media.[344] Bailey thus suggested that approaching the sculpture by means other than the formal may be fruitful and could complement the extant chronologies, and proposed template analysis as a complementary methodology. Its application enabled him to identify regional schools of carving and specific workshops across northern England, which may have served larger areas than may be accounted for in traditional stylistic analyses.[345] Lang, however, returned to earlier formalist interests, intending to reassess several monuments in the light of the

[340] Cramp, "The Anglian Tradition," 3, 14; Richard Bailey, "The Chronology of Viking-Age Sculpture in Northumbria," in Lang, *Anglo-Saxon and Viking Age Sculpture*, 174-75.
[341] Cramp, "The Anglian Tradition," 2.
[342] James Lang, "Continuity and Innovation in Anglo-Scandinavian Sculpture," in Lang, *Anglo-Saxon and Viking Age Sculpture*, 146-47: E.g., the typology of the Nunburnholme warrior's sword need not indicate exclusively Scandinavian patronage.
[343] Bailey, "Chronology of Viking-Age Sculpture," 173-75.
[344] Ibid., 175-76.
[345] Ibid., 180-85; Bailey, *England's Earliest Sculptors*, 114-15.

then newly excavated sculptural assemblage from York Minster, which he viewed as crucial to understanding developments in the sculptural sequence.[346] Lang's findings were significant, implying that although Scandinavian motifs were certainly introduced, they did not obscure extant Anglian elements, but rather enabled them to be modified in keeping with the recently introduced styles.

Others, however, focussed on formal comparative analyses of style in a different manner by exclusively discussing the newly introduced Scandinavian styles. Following this line of enquiry, David Wilson reprised and revised aspects of his earlier work on the Borre, Jellinge, Mammen, Ringerike and Urnes styles, and recognised that they often overlap, inhibiting the establishment of precise chronologies.[347] While a thorough understanding of the various features included in these styles is critical for defining chronological sculptural developments and identifying frequently occurring key stylistic elements (which may thus have been produced in keeping with contemporary tastes), they are less fruitful for analysing other aspects of the sculptures. They offer little in terms of establishing a particular monument's patronage, as they could occur in secular or ecclesiastical contexts, and may have been displayed alongside ecclesiastical figural imagery.[348]

While many formalist studies had considered the plant and animal ornament of Anglo-Scandinavian sculpture, only one was devoted to the sculptures' figural imagery: Rosemary Cramp's 1982 study on the 'Viking Image'. She addressed human figures represented within Scandinavian-settled England using the same formalist methodologies applied in analyses of other ornamental forms, and argued that unlike animal ornament, human figural imagery seemed to demand iconographic interpretations, which were not necessarily relevant.[349] The comparatively late date of her study suggests that formalist analyses of Anglo-Scandinavian *figural* imagery had been considered inadequate and unable to provide evidence of connections between potential regional workshops or changes in stylistic development. Moreover, Cramp's suggestion that iconographic interpretations may be unnecessary appears to suggest that the figural carvings produced in Anglo-Scandinavian England lacked any

[346] Lang, "Continuity and Innovation," 145-49.
[347] For full details, see: David M. Wilson, "The Dating of Viking Art in England," in Lang, *Anglo-Saxon and Viking Age Sculpture*, 136-43; David M. Wilson and Ole Klindt-Jensen, *Viking Art* (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1966), 87-160; Signe Horne Fuglesang, "Stylistic Groups in Late Viking Art," in Lang, *Anglo-Saxon and Viking Age Sculpture*, 205-16.
[348] E.g., at Gosforth, Borre ring-chain elements accompany a cross-less Crucifixion: see Appendix, I.36.
[349] Rosemary Cramp, "The Viking Image," in *The Vikings*, ed. R.T. Farrell (London: Phillimore, 1982), 8.

potential symbolic significance, and were intended to represent 'portraits'. This is further supported by her claim that "Viking figural art remains hieroglyphic and visually incoherent",[350] implying that the images cannot be deconstructed or understood as meaningful, and so denies any potential iconographic import.

Despite these unfortunate observations, Cramp's study nevertheless sits between the infrequent iconographic studies and the formalist analyses that dominate the sculptural scholarship. Her broad survey of the material addresses some of the earliest examples of "Northern Germanic" figural types being combined with Christian imagery,[351] which significantly enabled her to observe such connections in the Anglo-Scandinavian figural imagery.[352] The third figural type Cramp addressed was that of the horseman, and here, her discussion departs from more formalist interests (ironically) to those of the iconographer: horsemen mounted on an eight-legged horse, or accompanied by snakes or ravens are assumed to signify the god Odin, while other mounted figures at Gosforth represent additional gods,[353] despite the absence of any identifying attributes. Thus, the scholarly trend to equate imagery emerging from a secular visual repertoire with mythological subject-matter is confirmed, as is evident in Cramp's brief discussion of female figural types, which feature the distinctive "pigtails" and trailing dress associated with coeval Scandinavian visual representations of women, who in an Anglo-Scandinavian context may represent Valkyries.[354] Such issues notwithstanding, Cramp's study offers a valuable, wide-ranging survey of the figural types imported to Anglo-Saxon England by Scandinavian settlers, and acknowledges the reciprocal innovations to secular Scandinavian and Christian carved figural imagery wrought by the interplay of these two distinct visual traditions.

1.6 Iconographic Studies

Before the Collingwood symposium, Lang had produced one of the first studies dedicated entirely to Anglo-Scandinavian figural iconography, which analysed the legendary figures of Sigurd and Weland in order to situate a newly discovered grave-

[350] Ibid., 9.
[351] Ibid., 10-11: E.g., a fifth- to sixth-century grave-stone from Niderdollendorf.
[352] Ibid., 12-15. See further Ch.4, 190-208; Ch.5, 227-37.
[353] Ibid., 15.
[354] Ibid., 16.

slab from York Minster within its wider art-historical context.[355] Unlike later iconographic studies devoted to Sigurd, he focussed in detail on the Insular carvings from Yorkshire and Lancashire,[356] invoking the later Swedish and Norwegian comparanda only to confirm certain iconographic details of Anglo-Scandinavian carvings, which might otherwise be questionable.[357] This survey enabled him to establish the full range of diagnostic motifs used to identify depictions of the legend: the slaying of the dragon Fafnir; the roasting of its heart and Sigurd's meal; the beheaded smith, Reginn; birds in a tree; Gunnar in the snake-pit; and the horse, Grani.[358] Significantly, Lang considered the monumental context of the motifs associated with the legend, marking an important departure from other iconographic discussions of secular ('pagan') imagery.[359] He further attempted to consider the carvings of certain monuments holistically,[360] and so demonstrated how such an approach enables a more meaningful understanding of its symbolic import for contemporary audiences. Like Cramp, he also recognised the potential for Sigurd motifs to be associated with Christian figural imagery,[361] and suggested that certain aspects of the legend's visualisations may have potential Christian counterparts, such as the dragon and the birds in the tree and episodes in Genesis devoted to Adam's illicitly gained knowledge, engendering his mortality.[362]

Comparatively, Lang dedicated little attention to depictions of the Weland legend, likely because fewer examples survive, and almost all are confined to a single motif: Weland in his flying machine. The discussion was thus limited to two fragmentary panels from Leeds, two from Sherburn and one from Bedale (Yorks.), and established the motif's Scandinavian visual counterpart, the Gotlandic picture-stone, Ardre VIII.[363] He identified the accompanying female figure at Leeds as either Beadohild (referred to in the Old English poem, *Deor*) or Weland's swan-maiden wife invoked in the Old Norse *Völundarkviða*.[364] Thus, discussion of the monumental contexts was confined to the reconstructed cross-shaft at Leeds, where Lang reiterated

[355] James Lang, "Sigurd and Weland in Pre-Conquest Carving from Northern England," *YAJ* 48 (1976): 83.
[356] Ibid., 83-89; see below, 96-99, 101-02.
[357] Ibid., 86: E.g., that at Kirby Hill.
[358] Ibid., 93.
[359] Ibid., 86.
[360] Ibid., 86-89.
[361] Ibid., 89.
[362] Ibid., 94.
[363] Ibid., 90-92.
[364] Ibid.

Browne and Collingwood's identifications of the other figural carvings on the cross, suggesting that their wing-like garments and the wings of Weland's flying contrivance were potentially intended to reference Christian cherubin.[365] Although his discussion of the Weland material was disappointingly minimal, Lang presented comprehensive iconographic analyses of certain monuments displaying Sigurd and Weland subject-matter, with consideration of their accompanying imagery and monumental contexts. He thus presented a more balanced approach to the Anglo-Scandinavian figural material that neither prioritises later textual accounts of the legends nor isolates the secular carvings at the expense of their monument type or any accompanying Christian imagery, and so facilitated a more thorough understanding of a monument's potential symbolic significance(s). Unfortunately, Lang's approaches had little influence on subsequent studies of Anglo-Scandinavian figural iconography, which reverted to nineteenth-century attitudes of prioritising apparent mythological or heroic subject-matter.

For instance, Sue Margeson's discussion of carvings associated with the Völsung legend was prefaced by the observation that the diagnostic criteria were drawn exclusively from the late literary and visual examples of the legend, including the Ramsund runestone, Norwegian stave-church portals and Old Norse texts, dating from the eleventh to thirteenth centuries.[366] In this way she followed earlier scholarship, retroactively applying the Scandinavian and Icelandic visual and textual evidence to tenth-century carvings produced in an Insular context.

This said, Margeson's survey was not limited geographically to Scandinavia or Iceland; she engaged thoroughly with the Insular material from Man and northern England,[367] with evidence from the latter region incorporating what Lang and others had previously identified as involving Sigurd. Here, her assessment of the material diverged significantly from the preceding scholarship, with her claim that the only well-defined Sigurd scene from northern England is that at Halton.[368] This enabled Margeson to engage with alternative iconographic sources that may have formed more appropriate visual analogues within their monumental contexts, where they were selected to complement the imagery they accompanied.

---

[365] Ibid.
[366] Sue Margeson, "The Völsung Legend in Medieval Art," in *Medieval Iconography and Narrative*, ed. Flemming G. Anderson (Odense: Odense University Press, 1980), 183-84; Appendix, I.39.
[367] Ibid., 185-191.
[368] Ibid., 189-91.

Moreover, she diverged from earlier analyses by arguing that it was impractical to categorise tenth- and eleventh-century visual material as 'pagan', given the potential conflation of 'pagan' and Christian ideals in this period and the fact that Völsung imagery survives on Christian monuments, indicating that the legend was acceptable to the Church.[369] This was a rare attempt to contextualise 'secular' visual material to recognise its validity to 'pagan' and Christian audiences, and suggests a potential ecclesiastical influence in supporting or facilitating its public display. Unfortunately, this reasonable approach to the 'pagan'-Christian binary, which addressed both the complications of the paradigm and the Church's influence over the production of sculpture, also failed to impact subsequent scholarship.

The work that did impact was Richard Bailey's 1980 monograph devoted exclusively to Anglo-Scandinavian sculpture. Written during the earliest stages of the Corpus of Anglo-Saxon Stone Sculpture (CASSS) project, it was intended as a general introduction to the material, focussing on monuments in northern England.[370] It largely follows the scholarly trends current at the time, engaging with typological analyses of the Viking-age monuments and the formal stylistic aspects of their carvings to establish chronological developments and regional schools of production.[371] He diverged notably from such approaches, however, by attempting to situate the monuments within their historical contexts, including the role and fate of the Church. Here, he suggested that most of the incoming Scandinavians were 'pagan', an assumption based on the term's use in documents produced by the court of Wessex and the Archbishop of York, Wulfstan II.[372] Despite the propagandizing elements of this documentation, Bailey invoked it to exaggerate ecclesiastical disruption and concluded that "monastic life in the north was finally obliterated in the tenth century",[373] a theme articulated no fewer than five times.[374] While this may have been the case, the subsequent transfer of sculptural production from monastic to secular workshops apparently resulted in the absence of available sculpted Christian figural models, which prevented the selection and arrangement of nuanced figural programmes with theological complexity.[375] This view fails to acknowledge the

[369] Ibid., 208-210.
[370] Bailey, *Viking-Age Sculpture*, xiii.
[371] Ibid., 53-58; Bailey, *England's Earliest Sculptors*, 13-22.
[372] Bailey, *Viking Age Sculpture*, 43.
[373] Ibid., 41.
[374] Ibid., 41, 84, 96, 145, 231.
[375] Ibid., 96, 145-46.

significant role of secularised establishments, such as minster churches,[376] however, with the implication that any sculptural production after Scandinavian settlement could not have involved the Church, and so must be inherently secular, and therefore, 'pagan'. Bailey's correlation of the decline of monasticism with the secular nature of Anglo-Scandinavian sculpture thus resulted in his view of the monuments' iconographic programmes as less ruminative and complex.[377]

Despite these shortcomings, Bailey's monograph nevertheless remains the most comprehensive introduction to the styles, typologies and historical contexts of Viking-age sculpture, and one chapter focussed on figural subject-matter. It was framed by an interest in the potential correlations between 'Germanic' and Christian images and beliefs, established by nineteenth-century philologists.[378] In his discussion of Weland – and despite the figure's presumed secular associations – Bailey objectively considered the material, acknowledging the figure's visual precedents in Anglian and Scandinavian art, and its juxtaposition with Christian imagery on the Franks Casket.[379] He thus observed that Anglo-Scandinavian Weland schemes could have potential Christian connotations,[380] but nevertheless ignored such possible iconographic relationships and their implications. Overall, Bailey thoroughly assessed the pre-Viking contexts for Weland depictions in Anglo-Saxon England and Scandinavia and the textual preservations of the legend, but did not present a detailed and contextual consideration of the Anglo-Scandinavian portrayal at Leeds.

In his survey of the Insular and Scandinavian Sigurd imagery, however, Bailey argued that the "best approach" to understanding the tenth-century Anglo-Scandinavian material is through later eleventh- and twelfth-century Norwegian and Swedish depictions of the legend.[381] His methodology thus prioritises later Scandinavian monuments, supplementing them with twelfth- and thirteenth-century Icelandic texts – ignoring the Christian worldviews of the Icelandic authors – before proceeding to consider (earlier) Manx monuments exhibiting apparent Sigurd imagery, and finally addressing the Anglo-Scandinavian monuments at Halton, Kirby Hill and Nunburnholme – where he omits reference to most of the associated Christian

[376] Blair, *Church in Anglo-Saxon Society*, 294-98, 306-41. See Introduction, 58-67.
[377] Bailey, *Viking Age Sculpture*, 145-46; Bailey, *England's Earliest Sculptors*, 76-79.
[378] Ibid., 101.
[379] Ibid., 103-04, 106.
[380] Ibid., 116.
[381] Ibid., 117. See also: Bailey, *England's Earliest Sculptors*, 92-93.

imagery.[382] This highlights the predilection for prioritising Scandinavian legendary or mythological carvings at the expense of accompanying material, but Bailey nevertheless offered several explanations for including the Sigurd legend. These were organised around potential parallels with Christian theology: the legendary battle with the serpent or dragon corresponds to concepts of the struggle between God and Evil; the tree was perceived as a symbol of knowledge both in the legend and in scripture; and Sigurd's mystic meal, understood to provide strength and perception, was linked with the Eucharist.[383]

In fact, Bailey's general tendency to avoid discussion of Christian traditions in favour of the 'pagan' is partly balanced by his focus on the Gosforth cross, whose carvings apparently illustrate Ragnarök, with one significant exception: the Crucifixion.[384] Here, he departed from earlier analyses by emphasising the parallels between traditional and Christian theologies apparently preserved in the carvings to conclude that they offer a commentary on the end of three worlds.[385] Significantly, no visual comparanda from Scandinavia or the Insular world was invoked for the apparent Ragnarök iconography at Gosforth, implying either that the cross is unique in depicting these mythological episodes, or that its carvings cannot be confirmed as illustrating the narrative. Like the potential Sigurd schemes from northern England, the Gosforth carvings are presumed to capitalise on potential connections between Christian theology and Scandinavian traditions.[386]

Indeed, in the succeeding chapter dedicated to Christian monuments and their figural iconographies, Bailey noted that "Christian scenes are far from common",[387] although he later observed that a substantial variety of Christian figural imagery survived in Anglo-Scandinavian sculpture.[388] As with the Sigurd iconography, Bailey approached this material by prioritising an analogous group of monuments that emerged from different geographical and socio-political contexts. Rather than focussing on Scandinavian material, however, he invoked crosses from Ireland, apparently produced within strongly ecclesiastical contexts and under secular patronage, to emphasise their comparative abundance of Christian iconography and

[382] Bailey, *Viking Age Sculpture*, 120-25; Appendix, I.39, I.49, I.75.
[383] Ibid., 124-25.
[384] Ibid., 127; Appendix, I.36.
[385] Ibid., 87-90.
[386] Ibid., 129-30. See further, Ch.4, 209-22; Appendix, I.36.
[387] Ibid., 145.
[388] Bailey, *England's Earliest Sculptors,* 80.

the inferior quality and quantities of Anglo-Scandinavian carvings.[389] Bailey considered the Anglo-Scandinavian figural iconography to lack "theological subtlety",[390] implying that it is inherently secular, despite its presentation on a monumental cross. Moreover, this perceived deficiency undermines any potential symbolic significance in the Christian carvings, thus impeding any understanding of possible theological resonances. The emphasis on the secular nature of the sculptures likewise downplays the agency of those responsible for selecting and arranging the schemes within the overall programmes. In turn, this prevents any possibility of eliciting insight into the ways the monuments and their iconographic programmes may have been viewed and understood by contemporary early medieval audiences.

This said, Bailey did address some ambiguous Christian iconographies,[391] while arguing that the models for these (northern) carvings were more provincial, obsolete or antiquated than those in the south.[392] While possible, this does not account for the influx of iconographic models from Scandinavia, continental Europe or beyond, and their innovative integration into the figural programmes of Anglo-Scandinavian sculptures. This, however, may be partially attributed to the relatively early publication of Bailey's monograph; the CASSS was still embryonic, and internet access to image searches or other online databases was unavailable, preventing an analysis of all potential iconographic models accessible today. However, Bailey also argued that northern Crucifixion schemes were irrelevant to other figural iconographies they may have accompanied on the same monuments.[393] This unfortunately isolates a particular iconographic type from its monumental context, and suggests that the construction of such publicly displayed schemes was erratic at best. Although Bailey's unequivocal views of monastic decline and the subsequent lack of sufficient ecclesiastical influence for producing complex sculpted monuments in the region are now superseded, and certain methods applied to the sculpture are flawed, his work nevertheless established a critical foundation for future studies of the iconography of Anglo-Scandinavian sculpture, particularly through its invocation of visual comparanda.

However, while others followed Bailey in considering Anglo-Scandinavian sculpture, there were no major studies on the subject until 2012, when Lilla Kopár set

[389] Bailey, *Viking Age Sculpture*, 143.
[390] Ibid., 145.
[391] Ibid., 148-50.
[392] Ibid., 151-52.
[393] Ibid., 154.

out to analyse sculptures with iconography allegedly derived from Norse mythology as "cultural documents" of the intellectual process of religious accommodation, by using "'figurative thinking'".[394] This, she proposed, was an ideal substitute for the typological comparisons invoked in biblical exegesis because it facilitates potential connections between Christian scriptural accounts and characters emerging from beyond Christian contexts, without prioritising linear time.[395] While Kopár's approach initially appears to diverge from earlier iconographic studies, she nevertheless upheld the precedent of focussing on images presumed to derive from Norse mythological and/or legendary sources.

Like Bailey, she began by surveying monuments apparently depicting episodes from the Weland and Sigurd legends, arguing that these form the "majority of pagan figural representations from Viking-age England".[396] While such carvings may indeed be the most numerous, Kopár has implied that the depictions emerge entirely from a 'pagan' cultural milieu. Moreover, her view further prioritises the legendary at the expense of any accompanying Christian carvings, and dismisses the monumental form on which they are displayed. These assumptions are particularly evident in her discussion of the Leeds, Halton, Kirby Hill and Nunburnholme crosses. Indeed, she employs the same methodology used by Bailey and Lang, invoking and prioritising many of the same twelfth- and thirteenth-century Old Norse, Icelandic texts, and eleventh- to thirteenth-century Scandinavian visual material.[397] Her assessment of the sculptures themselves is limited to description, with any analysis largely reiterating Lang, Bailey and Margeson's observations and arguments, thus failing to provide any original assessment of the carvings and their significance(s).[398] Echoing Kendrick, Kopár appears to view the carvings solely as evidence for the pre-twelfth-century circulation of the Völsung legend, arguing that despite the late date of the earliest texts, the sculptures can confirm the circulation of the major narrative scenes related to the Sigurd cycle.[399] Apart from any inherent circularity, this reduces the carvings to 'illustrations' of the legend rather than a significant cultural product in their own right, in turn preventing any potential understandings of how the carvings were viewed and understood by their contemporary ninth- and tenth-century audiences.

[394] Kopár, *Gods and Settlers*, xxi-xxv.
[395] Ibid., 172.
[396] Ibid., 3.
[397] Ibid., 23-29.
[398] Ibid., 33-41.
[399] Ibid., 30.

The predilection for relying on Old Norse texts to identify the Anglo-Scandinavian sculptural material dominates Kopár's study. In her discussion of Weland carvings, for example, she argued (without any supporting evidence) that they represent an apparent shift in the literary narrative from an extant variant that emphasised Weland's "supernatural" or "elvish" powers to a rationalised version, attributed to its reception in Anglo-Saxon England.[400] Here, she used the thirteenth-century *Þiðrekssaga af Bern* to explain the visual components of the eighth-century Franks Casket panel – despite the text and object emerging from disparate cultural backgrounds, geographical locations and their temporal separation of five centuries.[401] This enabled her to argue that the legend's primary iconographic focus on the Casket is Weland's craftsmanship, supported by his pairing with the 'Maegi' presenting gifts to the Christ-child, although the panel's potential Christian iconographic import as discussed elsewhere in the scholarship is entirely ignored.[402] Given that this is the singular visual representation of the legend emerging within a pre-Viking, Anglo-Saxon context, such a superficial analysis can only be considered, at best, an oversight. As with the Sigurd carvings, the Anglo-Scandinavian sculptures are invoked as evidence to confirm the existence of a particular version of the textual legend and to reconstruct *its* assumed content; discussion of the carvings is limited to descriptions and summaries of arguments previously made in the scholarship.[403]

The textual reconstruction of myths and legends, and the perception of the carvings as 'illustrations', also occur in Kopár's discussion of sculptures apparently displaying mythological material. She concludes that such carvings indicate an alternative narrative tradition to that preserved in Old Norse texts, but their ambiguity prevents the full reconstruction of the (assumed) Insular textual variants.[404] In discussing potential Ragnarök iconography at Gosforth, for instance, Kopár argues that the later texts are invoked to "understand and reconstruct the [Insular] eschatological story".[405] The carvings are thus perceived as images representing regional written and oral variations of the Ragnarök myth that circulated at the time, or

[400] Ibid., 20-22.
[401] Ibid., 8.
[402] Ibid., 9. See, e.g.: Webster, "Iconographic Programme," 227-246; James Lang, "The Imagery of the Franks Casket: Another Approach," in Hawkes and Mills, *Northumbria's Golden Age*, 247-255; Amy L. Vandersall, "The Date and Provenance of the Franks Casket," *Gesta* 11, no. 2 (1972); 9-26; Richard Abels, "What Has Weland to do with Christ? The Franks Casket and the Acculturation of Christianity in Early Anglo-Saxon England," *Speculum* 84, no. 3 (July 2009): 549-581.
[403] Ibid., 11-16.
[404] Ibid., 80.
[405] Ibid., 90-91.

as substitutions for narrative features no longer attested elsewhere, with the result that a singular, 'pagan' religious significance is conferred upon the carvings. Moreover, viewing them as a component involved in retroactively reconstructing a myth implies that this is their sole function, diminishing the impact of their monumental settings, their arrangement within these settings and any symbolic significances that may have been perceived by their patrons and intended audiences as a result of the carvings' conscious selection and placement.

Kopár also considered more ambiguous carvings, which she labelled "secular" because they cannot be securely identified with either Christian or pagan iconographic traditions. Here, misunderstandings of both documentary and sculptural material are brought to bear in her attempt to establish parallels between the Norse god Odin and the Anglo-Saxon Woden. She implied that cultic practices involving Woden were prevalent in Anglo-Saxon England at the time of Scandinavian settlement, and Scandinavian influence inspired changes to the name of the god and cultic practises, further arguing that the anglicised Norse version of the name used by Ælfric and Wulfstan (II) referred either to specifically Scandinavian cultic practises, or to a conflated understanding of the two gods.[406] Lacking supporting evidence, these claims are unsubstantiated, resting on the preconception that there is a certain amount of homogeneity and interchangeability between traditional beliefs, which cannot be securely attested. Furthermore, without any clearly identifiable depictions of the figure, any discussion of Odin iconography in Anglo-Scandinavian sculpture is questionable.[407] Nevertheless, the ambiguity of Anglo-Scandinavian carvings enabled Kopár to argue that any figures with the attributes of spear, bird(s) or horse imply a potential identification with the god, or warriors associated with his cult, even if they are not included in a narrative context or shown engaging in ritual practises – on the grounds that these symbols were associated with Odin at some point in time.[408] This reasoning assumes that *all* carved figures with ambiguous attributes should be viewed within 'pagan' frames of reference, without supplying any visual or textual evidence to reinforce these identifications, which also disregards the carvings' visual contexts and the monumental forms they adorn.

[406] Ibid., 106-107.
[407] Cf. Gotlandic picture-stones from Tangelgårda and Ardre, which depict Odin with his eight-legged horse, Sleipnir.
[408] Ibid., 110, 121.

Such (wilful) misunderstandings of the sculptures are not limited to potential Odin depictions, though they sometimes occur simultaneously. For example, Kopár stated that a rider in the upper panel of a cross-shaft fragment from Sockburn (Co. Durham) is "different from other Anglo-Scandinavian depictions of horsemen", though she did not explain how, and suggested that the presence of the bird indicates affiliations with Odin and the veneration of warriors.[409] Building on this 'pagan' interpretation, she rejected Cramp's identification of the figures in the panel below as a cleric and secular figure, instead viewing the left-hand figure as a woman welcoming the other 'warrior' figure (though only a portion of its head survives), to Valhalla, as on the Gotlandic picture-stones.[410] Due to the break in the stone, it is impossible to know whether the left-hand figure wore the trailing dress typical of female figures depicted in Scandinavian contexts. What is certain, however, is that it lacks the profile arrangement and knotted hairstyle characteristic of Scandinavian images of so-called 'valkyries'.[411] Indeed, the only attribute shared between the Sockburn and Scandinavian depictions is the drinking horn, but as the mid-ninth-century fragmentary cross-shaft from St Mary Bishophill Junior demonstrates, horns were not an attribute associated exclusively with (Scandinavian) female figures. [412] Nevertheless, Kopár argued that such figures portrayed according to Scandinavian visual conventions on other monuments, such as Leeds or Gosforth, may be interpreted as Valkyries.[413] While this might appear unproblematic, it implies that *all* female figures depicted according to Scandinavian visual traditions should be equated with Valkyires, denying the possibility that this figural type may have been intended as a general gendered (female) signifier, rather than one associated with traditional beliefs.

Kopár's analyses thus demonstrate the continuation of the long-standing, art-historical tendency to view the sculptures within 'pagan' frames of reference, contrary to the visual evidence. This is clearly expressed by her conclusion that the carvings "demonstrate a continued interest in and survival of iconographical traditions of pagan Scandinavian origin in Anglo-Scandinavian England",[414] which perpetuates the

[409] Ibid., 116; Cramp, *County Durham and Northumberland*, 136-37; Appendix, I.84.
[410] Ibid., 117.
[411] E.g., the Alskjog Tjangvide I picture-stone: http://www.kringla.nu/kringla/objekt?itemLabel=4171&referens=shm/object/108203. Metalwork figurine Öland, Köping, Sweden: http://mis.historiska.se/mis/sok/fid.asp?fid=108864&page=2&in=1.
[412] Lang, *York and Eastern Yorkshire*, 83-84.
[413] Kopár, *Gods and Settlers*, 128.
[414] Ibid., 136.

carvings' apparently 'pagan' nature at the expense of their potential reception(s) by Anglo-Scandinavian audiences, facilitated by their monumental settings. Indeed, there is very little evidence to suggest that Scandinavian figural types used in Anglo-Scandinavian contexts are equivalent to an interest in or preservation of Scandinavian traditional beliefs. Yet, Kopár apparently understood "heroic" images of horsemen and warriors to have religious associations, which only gradually migrated "into the realm of secular and Christian commemorative practices".[415] This suggests that any figure that is not immediately identifiable as Christian must be viewed within 'pagan' frames of reference, even before considering its potential secular associations.

The implications of such binary assumptions thus presuppose that all secular figures, even those carved in the pre-Viking period or depicted on cross-shafts, must originally have had a 'pagan' function. In turn, this minimises the potential for any nuanced complexities in the carvings' frames of reference as understood by contemporary audiences, and implies, at the very least, that Anglo-Scandinavian audiences were unaware of the distinctions between 'pagan' and secular imagery. Thus, Kopár's assumptions indicate that the images were not consciously selected and arranged on their monuments to fulfil their patrons' aims or objectives, and/or to inspire audience engagement with the monuments. Rather, it would seem that they were selected haphazardly, with the intention of expressing 'pagan' beliefs and associated cultural values, a view which fails to account for the carvings' potentially deliberate ambiguity.

Such misconceptions are not limited to interpretations of individual carvings, however; the sparse discussion of monument types and their potential functions contains at least one factual error. Kopár claimed that stone crosses were intended to operate as "preaching crosses", serving as a "visual backdrop" for liturgical functions and acts of "preaching" carried out before the monuments, possibly with references to individual images carved on them.[416] Such hypotheses are derived from nineteenth-century, clerical antiquarian accounts, and have been rejected by other scholars of Anglo-Saxon stone sculpture. For instance, Éamonn Ó Carragáin observed the potential difficulties of using the Ruthwell cross to preach, including: the sequences of panels being disrupted; carvings on four sides of the cross requiring circumambulation of the monument; and any carved texts or *tituli* limiting a potential preacher's subject-

[415] Ibid., 137.
[416] Ibid., 199.

matter.[417] The weather may also have provided obstacles to interpreting the carvings or their *tituli* in preaching contexts; they may have been obscured by sunlight. Although acknowledging these complications, Kopár nevertheless perpetuated this view of the crosses as "visual backdrop[s]" for preaching or liturgical ceremonies,[418] despite the fact that this negates her views of the carvings' 'pagan' nature.

Furthermore, her understanding that the Anglo-Scandinavian monuments and their carvings emerged from a 'pagan' cultural milieu presents further misconceptions, such as the fragmentary nature of most Anglo-Scandinavian monuments meaning it is reasonable to assume that other monuments may have originally included "similar unorthodox iconography".[419] This claim cannot be substantiated, given the impossibility of reconstructing the carvings' layout in the absence of the missing fragments needed to do so. Moreover, although Anglo-Scandinavian sculptural fragments survive in quantities quintuple those of Anglian fragments,[420] the number of extant figural carvings remains low, and this number is further reduced when considering those that can be categorised as 'pagan' or 'secular', when classifying the images according to a 'pagan-Christian' binary. Thus, although Kopár attempts to analyse the carvings within a new framework as the products of the intellectual processes of religious accommodation, her methodology perpetuates the paradigms established in earlier art-historical studies of the sculptures' figural iconography. This prevented her from adequately analysing the monuments according to her own criteria of religious accommodation and "figurative thinking", as this methodology prioritises only those carvings apparently associated with Norse mythology. It thus precludes any consideration of the monument type and any Christian imagery it included, demonstrating the flaws inherent in applying a 'pagan-Christian' binary to the monuments.

1.7 Re-assessing Anglo-Scandinavian Figural Iconographies

With a 'pagan'-bias so clearly entrenched in the sculptural scholarship, it is apparent that a new methodology is required to reconsider the iconographic programmes of the

[417] Ó Carragáin, *Ritual and the Rood*, 54-55.
[418] Kopár, *Gods and Settlers*, 199.
[419] Ibid., 205.
[420] Bailey, *England's Earliest Sculptors*, 79. For the number of Anglian fragments with figural carving in Northumberland, see: Jane Hawkes, "Anglo-Saxon Sculpture: Questions of Context," in Hawkes and Mills, eds, *Northumbria's Golden Age*, 204-205. See also, Introduction, 81-84.

Anglo-Scandinavian stone crosses. Approaches undertaken in art-historical analyses that examine the iconography of pre-Viking sculpture produced in the region within its various cultural and political contexts have yielded fruitful results, and their methodologies may be more applicable to the Anglo-Scandinavian sculptures than has previously been accepted.[421] Such studies consider numerous factors informing the erection of sculpted monuments, with a particular emphasis on the patrons' understanding of conventional Christian iconographies,[422] which was supplemented by the knowledge of poetic, homiletic, liturgical and patristic texts that were circulating *within* the region, contemporary with the sculptures' production.[423] This knowledge was further augmented by an awareness of the texts' propensity to complement and comment on one another, thus enriching the viewers' understandings of scriptural accounts.[424]

Conversely, those methodologies applied to Anglo-Scandinavian monuments prioritise temporally and culturally distant textual accounts and visual comparanda produced beyond the Insular world in order to emphasise their 'pagan' nature, preventing any meaningful consideration of the monuments' iconography, and their symbolic, social and cultural significances. The methodological approaches established in scholarship devoted to Anglian sculpture have been comparatively effective in these respects; however, the relevance of Christian textual influences have yet to be considered in relation to the Anglo-Scandinavian monuments, despite the continued patronage of Christian monuments featuring Christian iconographic programmes.

The methodologies established in the (Anglian) sculptural art-historical studies will thus be adopted here, supplementing visual analyses of the monuments' iconography, to produce a more thorough understanding of their intended symbolic significance(s), both sacred and secular. To accomplish this, *contemporary* archaeological and textual sources will be analysed, including vernacular literature (Old English poetry) and coeval and regionally-accessible biblical exegesis and homiletic texts, rather than twelfth- and thirteenth-century Icelandic texts concerning traditional myth and legend.[425] This will elucidate a series of themes that provide a

[421] See: Ó Carragáin, *Ritual and the Rood*; Hawkes, *Sandbach Crosses*.
[422] Bailey, *England's Earliest Sculptors*, 59.
[423] Ibid.; Jane Hawkes, "The Rothbury Cross: An Iconographic Bricolage," *Gesta* 35 no. 1 (1996): 77-94; Ó Carragáin, *Ritual and the Rood*, 7-9; Hawkes, *Sandbach Crosses*, 138-48.
[424] Bailey, *England's Earliest Sculptors*, 59.
[425] The dates of the monuments under consideration here are those established in CASSS.

framework for investigating the sculpture within its historical and cultural context, and that additionally enable consideration of the following factors: tradition and innovation; monumentality and materiality; audience encounters; and patronage. Together, these thematic frameworks and consideration of contemporary texts will demonstrate the nuanced complexity of Anglo-Scandinavian crosses' iconographic programmes, as reflecting the beliefs and understandings of those who engaged with them, as patrons and/or viewers. To demonstrate the validity of such an approach, the following chapter considers the implications of tradition and innovation and the transmission of motifs for the articulation of complex theological commentaries on Christ's Second Coming.

CHAPTER 2

Survival, Sea Change and the Second Coming

2.1 Introduction

Given the view that the mid-ninth-century Scandinavian arrival in northern England caused the large-scale destruction of monastic life and the economic, religious and artistic networks associated with it,[426] many coeval monuments are considered to eschew Anglian iconographic traditions by including presumed secular and/or 'pagan' figures. Yet, these often comprise only one component of the monuments' programme, suggesting that their inclusion and symbolic significance was dependent on their relationship to the other, often ecclesiastical, imagery included in the complex iconographic schemes. Although Lang cautioned four decades ago against overemphasising the secular patronage of Anglo-Scandinavian sculpture,[427] such monuments (produced under non-ecclesiastical patronage) and their divergence from Anglian precedents remain a preoccupation among Viking-age scholars. For example, Kopár argued that the imagery reflects an apparently "widespread" knowledge of Norse mythology and 'pagan' traditions, demonstrating the secularity of the sculptures' iconography.[428] Here, consideration of the 'secular' images has led to generalisations about the overall 'pagan' nature of the monuments' iconography. While only a small percentage of monuments display secular, or even 'pagan' associations, many others exclude any affiliation with traditional beliefs.

Furthermore, despite the scholarly perpetuation of the carvings' 'pagan' character, the monuments themselves, as Bailey and Cramp pointed out, seem to indicate some survival of Anglian sculptural tradition alongside Scandinavian styles.[429] Yet, such continuums of form and style have not been fully explored within the wider cultural and religious context of the Northern Danelaw where the incoming Scandinavians offered their own contributions to stone carving.[430] Scandinavian cultural links and networks enabled the transmission of new visual languages and modes of representation, but as Cramp argued, these were incorporated alongside elements of indigenous Anglian imagery. The amalgamation of these visual languages,

[426] Bailey, *Viking Age Sculpture*, 41. See also, Cramp, "The Anglian Tradition," 11.
[427] Lang, "Continuity and Innovation," 146.
[428] Kopár, *Gods and Settlers*, 145.
[429] Bailey, "Chronology of Viking-Age Sculpture," 175; Cramp, "The Anglian Tradition," 11.
[430] Cramp, "Tradition and Innovation," 87.

which also included Celtic motifs,[431] enabled the creation of iconographic schemes that could communicate complex theological concerns to contemporary Anglo-Scandinavian audiences.

To determine the extent of this iconographic fusion, the crosses' programmes must be considered in their entirety, rather than prioritising the seemingly exceptional secular additions. Of the monuments produced during Scandinavian settlement, the decoration and figural iconography of the cross-shafts surviving at Leeds and Whalley offer examples of continuity in Anglian design principles – with the exception of the two lower panels at Leeds, which contain apparently secular figures. Their inclusion in an otherwise ecclesiastical iconographic program nevertheless suggests they were deliberately chosen for incorporation into the overall scheme, implying that they were intended to produce a complex theological commentary. The figures at Whalley are unaccompanied by obvious secular signifiers, and the cross bears an iconographic programme largely derived from an Anglian ecclesiastical tradition. Although those responsible for the crosses have approached them differently, reading their iconography through that preserved on the late Anglian crosses at Ilkley demonstrates that Viking-age sculptors and patrons maintained earlier visual and theological traditions, though they sometimes engaged with new modes of representation to fulfil their purpose.

2.2 The Ilkley Crosses

Of the three cross-shafts surviving at Ilkley, two containing figural imagery date to the mid- to late ninth century.[432] Of these, Cramp regards Ilkley 1 (Fig. 2.1), a complete cross, to be slightly earlier than Ilkley 3, a fragmentary cross-shaft carved nearer to the end of the ninth century, and whose zoomorphs precede later Anglo-Scandinavian types.[433] She suggested that Ilkley 1 dates nearer to the mid-ninth-century Scandinavian conquest and settlement because its form and style were copied during the tenth.[434] Although both pieces were dated broadly on formal stylistic grounds and were unlikely to have been carved simultaneously, their dates place them significantly

[431] Ibid.
[432] Coatsworth, *Western Yorkshire*, 169-171.
[433] Cramp, "The Anglian Tradition," 10; Appendix, I.43 and I.44.
[434] Rosemary Cramp, "The Position of the Otley Crosses in English Sculpture of the Eighth to Ninth Centuries," in Cramp, *Studies in Anglo-Saxon Sculpture*, 62.

at the earliest stages of Scandinavian settlement. It is therefore worth establishing their context before turning to examine their iconography.

As noted, the Archbishop of York, Wulfhere (installed in 854), was well-established when the Scandinavian army attacked York in 866, and probably held his title until his death in 892.[435] His archiepiscopal career was significantly influenced by Scandinavian activities in the 860s and 870s,[436] and Symeon of Durham retrospectively reports that at this point, Wulfhere fled to his estate at Addingham,[437] only three miles (Fig. 2.2) from Ilkley, raising the possibility that he exerted some influence over the site. Indeed, Coatsworth, following Ian Wood, noted that the Archbishop's estates included Otley and incorporated the subsidiary church at Ilkley.[438] Such (archi)episcopal presence in the region around Otley finds a parallel in Stephen of Ripon's account of Wilfrid's much earlier, miraculous visit to the vill of *Ontidannufri*, which has been identified with modern Tidover in the parish of Kirkby Overblow (North Yorks.).[439] It is unclear whether Wilfrid or the community at Ripon owned *Ontidannufri*, but this miraculous narrative does suggest that Wilfrid and the community held jurisdiction over these lands, and that they were deemed significant enough to name in connection with Wilfrid and the community at Ripon.[440] Along with *Ontidannufri*, Stephen's account listed further consecrated places that had been abandoned by British clergy, such as *Ingeadyne*, which has been identified with the region around Yeadon, south of Otley.[441] In this context, Otley's explicit mention by Symeon suggests the estate was well-known and could be used to identify Addingham's location, where the archbishop had taken refuge. Wulfhere's probable working relationship with the Scandinavians suggests ecclesiastical influence in the area surrounding York,[442] and an increased archiepiscopal presence in the land-holdings at Addingham, Otley and Ilkley.

Ecclesiastical influence in the early years of Scandinavian settlement is further validated by later events. York was ruled by Guthfrith from *c.* 882 until *c.* 895,[443] and

[435] McLeod, *Beginning of Scandinavian Settlement*, 180.
[436] *ASC*, MS D/E, 45. See Introduction, 48-49.
[437] Symeon of Durham, *Incipit epistola*, ed. Arnold, 225.
[438] Ian Wood, "Anglo-Saxon Otley: An Archiepiscopal Estate and Its Crosses in a Northumbrian Context," *Northern History* 23 (1987): 20-38; Elizabeth Coatsworth, "The Cross in the West Riding of Yorkshire," in *The Place of the Cross in Anglo-Saxon England*, ed. Catherine E. Karkov, et. al. (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2006), 17.
[439] Pickles, *Kingship, Society and the Church*, 248.
[440] Ibid.
[441] Ibid.
[442] See Introduction, 48.
[443] Bailey, *Viking Age Sculpture*, 31.

while the document recording his appointment by the Cuthbert community post-dates the Ilkley crosses, it suggests that the community was also accepted and active in a region hosting Scandinavian settlers, with the concomitant expansion of their estates.[444] Guthfrith's *c.* 895 burial in the high church at York suggests the Christian nature of his kingship,[445] and, if Wulfhere remained in office until his death in 892, it is likely that Guthfrith gained permission from him or his successor to be buried there. Guthfrith's death date and burial place thus indicate that the Church, and particularly the see of York, maintained a prominent political profile during the period of early Scandinavian settlement.

While these retrospective documents may lack accuracy, they do offer insight into the political and ecclesiastical milieu of the Ilkley crosses' erection: they imply that the crosses were produced within the context of the Church and Scandinavian leaders supporting each other. Further, the documented ecclesiastical presence to the west of York seems to be confirmed by the Ilkley sculptures. Both the complete and fragmentary cross-shafts exhibit ecclesiastical interests in their carved reliefs.[446]

On Ilkley 1 these interests are represented by the nimbed, frontal figure holding a rod at the top of A (Fig. 2.3), identified as a *Maiestas*,[447] while the four figures contained within separate panels on the opposing broad face, C (Fig. 2.4), can be identified as anthropomorphised evangelist symbols.[448] Cramp reaffirmed this identification, first made by Collingwood, but also noted that they are arranged upwards in the order of the gospels, with Matthew at the bottom of the shaft and John at the top.[449] She further observed that their placement on the cross-shaft may invest the figures with different theological significance than the apocalyptic one attributed to them when found on cross-heads.[450] Yet, the fact that the zooanthropomorphic symbols accompany the solitary, nimbed figure of Christ in Majesty nevertheless implies an apocalyptic association.[451]

---

[444] See Introduction, 47-48, 59-60.
[445] Townend, *Viking Age Yorkshire*, 45.
[446] See further, Cramp, "Position of Otley Crosses," 56
[447] Collingwood, *Northumbrian Crosses*, 50; Coatsworth, *Western Yorkshire*, 169. For description, see: Appendix, I.43.
[448] See: Appendix, I.43.
[449] Rosemary Cramp, "The Evangelist Symbols and their Parallels in Anglo-Saxon Sculpture," in *Bede and Anglo-Saxon England: Papers in Honour of the 1300th Anniversary of the Birth of Bede, Given at Cornell University in 1973 and 1974*, ed. Robert T. Farell, BAR 46 (Oxford: BAR, 1978), 126; Collingwood, *Northumbrian Crosses*, 49.
[450] Cramp, "Evangelist Symbols," 126.
[451] For association of the Maiestas with the apocalypse, see, e.g.: Michele Fromaget, *Majestas Domini: Les Quatre Vivants de L'Apcoalypse dans L'Art* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2003), 3.

Zooanthropomorphic evangelist symbols were an early medieval innovation frequently found in gospel books, particularly those produced in Breton centres under Insular influences.[452] Despite their popularity in this portable medium, the figures appear less often on stone monuments, with only two extant depictions occurring on the late eighth-century stone sarcophagus cover at Wirksworth (Derbys.) and at Halton (Lancs.), on a fragmentary ninth-century cross-shaft.[453] The composite animal-headed evangelist portraits at Halton (Fig. 2.5) can help to elucidate the frames of reference at Ilkley. The Halton figures are half-length, haloed and wings are indicated by a moulding surrounding the figures' bodies and each carries a book.[454] They are disposed frontally beneath arches, though only the head of the symbol on D faces forwards (Fig. 2.6). Unlike Ilkley, they are displayed on separate faces of the shaft, with Matthew's symbol on D, and John's on C. Thus, although the figures on A and B are weathered, hindering identification, it is assumed that they were arranged anti-clockwise in the Vulgate sequence established by Jerome, their placement on four separate faces probably representing the spread of the gospel to the four corners of the earth.[455]

Though geographically removed, the Halton and Ilkley symbols share a half-length composite representation and the attributes of haloes and books, thus attesting to contemporary audiences' recognition of the evangelists as significant within the Anglian sculptural repertoire, although they do not feature prominently in Anglian sculpture overall.[456] Furthermore, the Halton figures' wings and the absence of the *Maiestas* from the shaft indicate that the two monuments do not convey similar iconographic significances. Indeed, the distinct nature of the figures at both sites suggests there were varying iconographic configurations available, without a perceived single convention to determine their display on a cross-shaft.

Thus, at Halton the book-bearing symbols, lacking the associated *Maiestas*, indicate they were intended to illustrate the spreading of the gospels,[457] but their

[452] Michelle P. Brown, "Embodying Exegesis: Depicting the Evangelists in Insular Manuscripts," in *Le Isole Britanniche e Roma in Eta Romanobarbarica*, ed. A.M. Luiselli Fadda and É. Ó Carragáin (Rome: Herder Editrice e Libreria, 1998), 115.
[453] Jane Hawkes, "The Wirksworth Slab: An Iconography of *humilitas*," *Peritia* 9 (1995): 249-52; Hawkes and Sidebottom, *Derbyshire and Staffordshire*, 246-289. Bailey, *Cheshire and Lancashire*, 185. For Halton, see Bailey, *Cheshire and Lancashire*, 183-185; Appendix, I.40.
[454] Ibid.
[455] Ibid., 184.
[456] Jane Hawkes, "Sacraments in Stone: The Mysteries of Christ in Anglo-Saxon Sculpture," in Carver, ed., *The Cross Goes North*, 365-68.
[457] For further discussion, see Bailey, *Cheshire and Lancashire*, 177-83.

placement on the shaft suggests they held additional import; their arrangement around the top of the shaft below the cross-head recalls the four living creatures surrounding Christ's throne in John's vision (Rev. 4:6-7), implying apocalyptic associations.

Likewise, the Ilkley figures' arrangement up the length of the shaft on C may carry significance independent of their associations with the *Maiestas* on A. In Insular gospel books, Jennifer O'Reilly argued that the placement of evangelist portraits and/or their symbols facing or preceding the opening words of their respective gospels invokes a Hiberno-Latin commentary emphasising descriptions of the gospel authors and their symbolic beasts, and underscoring their individuality and unity through the opening lines of their gospels.[458] Although produced in different media and cultural contexts, these concepts are conveyed at Ilkley by placing the evangelists on one side of the cross-shaft, emphasising their harmony, while their arrangement in distinct panels, delineated by rounded mouldings, accentuates their individuality.

Nicholas Baker further argued the texts and their authors, particularly when represented by their symbols holding books, reflected the authority of the Word of God, something understood by educated, literate audiences.[459] The books held by each of the half-length Ilkley figures clearly signify the gospels written by each evangelist, and implicitly, their intrinsic authority. The *Maiestas*, shown as a divine being at the moment of his return to fulfil the promise of Salvation delivered at the Annunciation, complements these associations. Moreover, Baker observed that when the symbols accompanied Christ in Majesty, they referenced his earthly activities: the subject of the gospels promoted by the Church.[460]

In late ninth-century Northumbria, the symbolic authority of the Word of God may have held increased relevance with Scandinavian incursions and settlement near Ilkley, and any disruptions this may have caused; the Church's power and authority was likely perceived to diminish, particularly given Archbishop Wulfhere's removal to Addingham. The iconographic programme of the cross erected at Ilkley, within the archiepiscopal estates, alludes to the authority of scripture and its divine inspiration, thus suggesting that those responsible for it were interested in publicly presenting the authority of the gospels and potentially their own prestige. Furthermore, representing these figures in stone suggests the intent to permanently reflect divine authority in a

[458] Jennifer O'Reilly, "Patristic and Insular Traditions of the Evangelists: Exegesis and Iconography," in Luiselli Fadda and Ó Carragáin, *Le Isole Brittaniche*, 53.
[459] Nicholas G. Baker, "The Evangelists in Insular Culture: *c.* 600-*c.* 800 AD," (doctoral thesis, University of York, 2011), 78.
[460] Ibid., 164.

large, public and (relatively) immobile monumental form, rather than utilizing portable or perishable media, such as manuscripts, metalwork, wood or ivory. The Ilkley book-bearing symbols are thus perhaps best understood as promoting the Church's earthly authority, acquired from the divine Word of God, and referencing the Church's earthly activities of endorsing and spreading the gospel, particularly at a time when it seemed to be threatened by Scandinavian settlement.

The composite figures at Ilkley, paired with the *Maiestas*, also point to their origins in the books of Ezekiel and Revelation. Ezekiel's four living creatures are described as having "the likeness of man in them"[461] and four wings and faces on each side, with hands beneath their wings.[462] The vision also explicitly names the animals and their positions: "the face of man, and the face of a lion on the right side of all the four: and the face of an ox, on the left side of all the four: and the face of an eagle over all the four".[463] This corresponds to the arrangement of the Ilkley figures, which begin with a man in the lowermost panel and end with an eagle in the uppermost. Furthermore, Ezekiel's living beasts accompany a figure with the likeness of a man seated on a likeness of a throne,[464] a character referenced by the seated *Maiestas* on A, a revelation of the divinity of Yahweh, prefiguring Christ's divinity and majesty in the New Testament Revelation.[465]

In John's revelatory vision, the beasts surround the throne, but the number of their wings differs (six, rather than four), as does the order in which they are named: a lion, a calf, a man and an eagle, flying.[466] Although this diverges from the order in Ezekiel and that on the cross-shaft, the eagle remains in the same position above the other three – as it does at Ilkley. The eagle is also accorded a distinct role in Revelation, where it warns the inhabitants of the earth.[467] Together with its position above the other creatures in Ezekiel's hierarchy, this apparently significant role is perhaps being referenced by its position at Ilkley: at the top, nearest the cross-head, and directly opposite the *Maiestas* on A, where the rod may relate to Revelation's

[461] Ezek. 1:5: "hic aspectus eorum similitude hominis in eis".
[462] Ezek. 1:6-9: "et quattuor facies uni et quattuor pinnae uni. Et pedes eorum pedes recti et planta pedis eorum quasi planta pedis vituli et scintillae quasi aspectus aeris candentis. Et manus hominis sub pinnis eorum in quattuor partibus et facies et pinnas per quattuor partes habebant. Iunctaeque erant pinnae eorum alterius ad alterum non revertebantur cum incederent sed unumquodque ante faciem suam gradiebatur".
[463] Ezek. 1:10: "eorum facies hominis et facies leonis a dextris ipsorum quattuor fácies autem bovis a sinistris ipsorum quattuor et facies aquilae ipsorum quattuor".
[464] Ezek. 1:26.
[465] O'Reilly, "Patristic and Insular Traditions," 54.
[466] Rev. 4:6-9.
[467] Rev. 8:13.

statement that he will rule with a rod of iron.[468] The discrepancies between the Ilkley figures and the living creatures described in Ezekiel and Revelations notwithstanding, their order, arrangement and association with Christ on the shaft suggests an awareness and engagement with biblical texts that reflects a literal reading.

Unsurprisingly, the evangelists were also associated with the four living creatures in patristic exegesis in defences against heretical teachings and in attempts to emphasise biblical harmonies.[469] It is probable that the patrons or designers of the Ilkley cross were familiar with these, particularly those of Jerome and Gregory the Great, which circulated widely throughout Europe, and Anglo-Saxon England. Jerome argued that the four symbols were foretold in Ezekiel's vision, and assigned the symbol of the man to Matthew, because his gospel begins with Christ's genealogy; the lion he assigned to Mark, because his gospel opens with a lion's voice in the desert; the bull-calf is assigned to Luke, whose gospel encompasses Zachariah's sacrifice in the temple; and he assigned the eagle symbol to John, whose gospel tells of the word of God.[470] After establishing these pairings Jerome repeated the symbolic identifications with the winged creatures of John's vision, stating that they share the same form as Ezekiel's creatures and likewise represent the evangelists and their support for Christ at his Second Coming, where they praise him.[471] He repeated these identifications in *Commentariorvm in Hiezechielem* using the same justification, and reiterated that the winged creatures identified by Ezekiel correspond to those in John's vision and reference the evangelists.[472]

Jerome's primary focus was the animals' actions and positions during the Apocalypse. He explicitly referenced details of John 4:4-6, indicating the winged animals' positions with the 24 elders surrounding the throne, and quoted their praise of the one seated on the throne in John 4:8.[473] These passages imply that the association between the evangelists and the apocalyptic figures may be more significant than their association with the creatures in the Old Testament vision. In this context, the

[468] Rev. 19:15.
[469] O'Reilly, "Patristic and Insular Traditions," 54.
[470] Jerome, *Commentariorvm in Mathevm Libri IV*, CCSL 77 (Turnholt: Brepols, 1969), 3.
[471] Ibid., 4.
[472] Jerome, *Commentariorvm in Hiezechielem Libri XIV,* CCSL 75 (Turnholt: Brepols, 1964), 10-11.
[473] Jerome, *Commentariorvm in Mathevm,* 4: "Vnde et Apocalypsis Iohannis post expositionem uiginti quattuor seniorum qui tenentes citharas et fialas adorant agnum Dei, introducit fulgora et tonitrua et septem spiritus discurrentes et mare uitreum et quattuor animalia plena oculis dicens: *Animali primum simile leoni et secundum simile uitulo et tertium simile homini et quartum simile aquilae uolanti;* et post paululum: *Plena,* inquit, *errant oculis et requiem non habebant die ac nocte dicentia: Sanctus sanctus sanctus Dominus Deus omnipotens qui erat et qui est et qui uenturus est*."

selection carved on the Ilkley cross-shaft can be seen to reflect Jerome's emphasis on the moment where the winged creatures appear with Christ enthroned, further emphasising its intended eschatological associations.

The plant-scroll ornament on B at Ilkley can also be associated with John's vision,[474] where its tree-shape may reflect a conscious choice to reference Revelation 22:14, where the saved are granted a right to the Tree of Life and entrance to (the heavenly) Jerusalem. Within an eschatological reading, this would complement the figures on A and C, establishing Christ's arrival with the four living creatures as signifiers of the beginning of the Apocalypse, with the tree representing the reward for the elect.

The evangelists' affiliation with the winged creatures in the biblical visions is also expressed in Gregory's homilies on Ezekiel, where, in addition to affirming that the living creatures in Ezekiel's vision can be associated with the four evangelists,[475] he suggested that they represent the evangelists who accompany Christ and appear as judges with him.[476] Echoing Jerome, his account incorporates John's vision, where the living creatures surround an enthroned figure, explaining the representations at Ilkley. Gregory further claimed that the evangelist symbols' faces represent Christ's humanity, while their wings represent his divinity, [477] and, repeating Jerome, he assigned each creature to one of the evangelists based on the opening lines of their gospels.[478] Here, Gregory expounded further on the creatures as references to Christ's human and divine natures, arguing that the symbol of the man reflected Christ becoming man; the ox represented his sacrifice for humanity's salvation; the lion, a symbol of his Resurrection; and the eagle a symbol of his Ascension.[479] Again, the Ilkley symbols resonate with these texts, with the image of the Man carved at the shaft's base and the eagle at the top.

Bede expanded on these associations, describing the ark of the covenant with the four golden rings on its corners as signifying the evangelists and, by extension, the four gospels, preached to the four corners of the world.[480] He further argued that the

[474] See: Appendix, I.43.
[475] Gregory the Great, *Homilies on the Book of the Prophet Ezekiel*, ed./trans. Theodosia Tomkinson (Etna, CA: Center for Traditionalist Orthodox Studies, 2008), I:2.15, 51.
[476] Gregory the Great, *Homilies on Ezekiel*, I:2.18, 53.
[477] Ibid., I:3.2, 59-60.
[478] Ibid., I:4.1, 73.
[479] Ibid., I:4.1, 73-74.
[480] Bede, *De tabernaculo*, ed. David Hurst, CCSL 119A (Turnhout: Brepols, 1969), 15-16; *On the Tabernacle*, ed./trans. Arthur G. Holder (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1994), I.16, 14.

two pairs of rings on the ark correspond to the four living creatures, with the man and calf representing Christ's passion and death, the lion and eagle his victory over death. Here, repeating Gregory, Bede articulated the symbolic significance of each creature: the man representing Christ's Incarnation; the calf, his sacrifice on the Cross; the lion, his victory over death; and the eagle, his Ascension.[481] Finally, he argued that while two evangelists suggest the frailty of Christ's human nature at the Incarnation and Passion, the other two represent his triumph over death in the Resurrection and Ascension and anticipate the glory of eternal life.[482] The zooanthropomorphic evangelist portraits at Ilkley can be understood to represent these concepts; they suggest that the designers of the cross were aware of the associations between the creatures' symbolic attributes and Christ's lifecycle. Although the portraits, read from the bottom of the shaft, do not precisely correspond to Bede's pairings, their arrangement begins with the man symbol at the base and culminates with the eagle at the top, enabling them to be understood as Christ's Incarnation and Ascension: the beginning and end of his divine lifecycle. Taking into consideration the *Maiestas* on A, the unity of the evangelist symbols on C implies the fulfilment of each event in Christ's life necessary to initiate his Second Coming, as suggested by Bede.

Reading the Ilkley cross within these exegetical traditions demonstrates the multivalent nature of its iconographic programme. The four evangelist symbols on the cross-shaft simultaneously represent Christ's Incarnation, sacrifice, Resurrection and Ascension, the events whose completion was necessary to ensure his Second Coming and humanity's subsequent salvation. Moreover, the depiction of the four symbols with the *Maiestas* on the same monument explicitly references the moment of his Second Coming, and implicitly, the completion of the salvific cycle – associations supported by the ecclesiastical context of the Ilkley cross. The patrons' choice to depict this figural group, rather than carving only Christ in Majesty or the evangelists' symbols, imbues them with greater significance. The commission of a monument displaying these figures further implies an interest in expressing eschatological themes; the iconography may indicate their anticipation of, or hope for, Christ's Second Coming, and their own potential eternal Salvation, which could only be achieved at this event.

[481] Bede, *De Tabernaculo*, ed. Hurst, 16; trans. Holder, *On the Tabernacle*, I.16, 14-15.
[482] Ibid., I.16, 15.

2.3 The Leeds Cross: An Introduction

It is against this background that the tenth-century Leeds cross (Fig. 2.7) can be assessed.[483] Its programme involves six figures in four separate panels, distributed across the cross-shaft's two broad faces. Its specific date is unclear, there being little documentation to facilitate the reconstruction of its potential context, which further obscures its precise origins and the circumstances of its patronage. Moreover, its iconography is far less explicit than that at Ilkley, with the exception of one figural panel, which has enjoyed considerable scholarly attention – independent of the accompanying figural and decorative imagery, which has minimised the complexity and impact of the overall programme despite its fragmentation, and disproportionately emphasised its supposedly 'pagan' nature.[484]

Although its figural reliefs are somewhat ambiguous, the cross maintains stylistic links with earlier Anglian carving traditions, while incorporating material originating from Scandinavia, which, potentially imported by the settlers, may have been considered innovative in an Anglo-Scandinavian ecclesiastical context. The apparently secular panels of this cross must therefore be considered alongside the non-secular figures they supplement, within their immediate visual context: on a *cross*-shaft combining Anglian figural carvings with a newly imported motif. Together, these elements suggest that the selection of figures at Leeds was carefully calculated to produce a complex iconographic programme offering theological commentary, rather than one professing a patron's secular or 'pagan' identity through the depiction of a legendary heroic figure.

2.3a Weland the smith: *Deor* and *Vǫlundarkviða*

Given the scholarly attention vested in the Weland panel at the base of the Leeds cross, it is worth rehearsing the legend's narrative, which is preserved in written form in the poems *Deor* and *Vǫlundarkviða*. The earlier, *Deor,* was produced in Anglo-Saxon England and written down in the *c.* 1000 Exeter Book,[485] rendering it temporally close to the Leeds cross, and suggesting that the subject of Weland

[483] Coatsworth, *Western Yorkshire,* 202; Appendix, I.64.
[484] Ibid.; Lang, "Sigurd and Weland," 90.
[485] Janet B.T. Christie, "Reflections on the Legend of Wayland the Smith," *Folklore* 80, no. 4 (Winter 1969): 288.

remained popular among the Anglo-Saxon population; this may well imply Anglian cultural connections at Leeds. Conversely, the later, twelfth- or thirteenth-century Old Norse *Vǫlundarkviða* was produced in Iceland.[486] Despite this provenance and production two to three centuries after the Leeds cross, *Vǫlundarkviða* supplies a more complete narrative of the legend, and its text is consequently invoked in attempts to identify the Leeds scheme.

In *Deor*, the speaker does not explicitly describe the situations faced by the heroic characters, but rather offers oblique references to their various experiences,[487] which assumes audience familiarity with the circumstances invoked, and suggests that the tales were well-known. The first stanza of *Deor* refers to the Weland legend, the injustice he suffered at Niðhad's hands and the sorrow he experienced in captivity.[488] The second recalls Beadohild's miserable circumstances, suggesting that the murder of her brothers caused her less suffering than her pregnancy and the insecurities it engendered.[489] Although the speaker acknowledges her pregnancy, Weland's rape is not alluded to as its cause; nor does he recount the punishments inflicted on Weland by Niðhad. It is assumed that the listener knows the backstories and recollects the details, denying any ambiguity surrounding the characters' suffering, and how it was overcome. That Weland and Beadohild do surmount their miseries is indicated by the poem's refrain, "that passed, so too will this".[490]

Vǫlundarkviða, on the other hand, supplies the reader or listener with a detailed account of the legend, in which three brothers meet and marry swan maidens, with whom they live for seven winters before the wives depart in search of battles and do not return.[491] Weland remains behind, and is captured and imprisoned by Niðhad and his wife.[492]

Weland subsequently bribes Niðhad's two sons to visit him alone; Weland beheads them,[493] creating treasures from their heads for Niðhad, his wife and his daughter, Beadohild. Later, Beadohild's stolen ring breaks and she visits Weland to have it repaired. He plies her with beer, rapes her and escapes, lifting himself to the

[486] Christie, "Reflections," 288.
[487] *Deor*, ed. Kemp Malone (London: Methuen, 1933), 1.
[488] *Deor*, ed./trans. S.A.J. Bradley, *Anglo-Saxon Poetry* (London: Everyman, 1982), 364.
[489] Ibid.
[490] Ibid.: "Þæs ofereode, þisses swa mæg".
[491] *Vǫlundarkviða,* ed./trans. Ursula Dronke, *The Poetic Edda* 2 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997): 2:243-244.
[492] Ibid., 2:246-8.
[493] Ibid.: 2:246-50.

sky.[494] As he ascends, Niðhad asks Weland about his sons, and Weland tells him to visit the smithy, where he will find their corpses beneath the forge,[495] and describes each treasure created from their remains, before telling Niðhad of Beadohild's pregnancy. Niðhad laments that no one is tall enough to pull Weland from the sky nor strong enough to shoot him down. Laughing, Weland lifts himself into the sky (*Hlæiandi Völundr hófz at lopti*) and the poem concludes with Beadohild lamenting her pregnancy.[496]

Applying these details to sculptured scenes that long pre-date them is problematic, given potential influences from other sources and possible regional variations of the tale. Evidence for the legend's circulation in an Anglian context, however, goes some way towards mitigating this discrepancy, particularly as episodes from the story were depicted on the *c.* 700 Franks Casket, providing further evidence that the narrative was known in Anglo-Saxon England well before its twelfth- or thirteenth-century recension, and still had currency in the region at the time of the Scandinavian arrival and settlement.

2.3b The Franks Casket

As with the Leeds cross, the presentation of this legendary subject on the Franks Casket has enjoyed considerable scholarly attention, which has demonstrated its Northumbrian provenance, the varied nature of its visual sources and its juxtaposition of Christian and 'Germanic', 'pagan' subject-matter: the Adoration of the Magi is paired with episodes from the Weland legend on the front panel (Fig. 2.8).[497] Leslie Webster's study of the subject convincingly establishes the Christian message of the panel, emphasising its production in a learned environment, perhaps for a royal recipient. She demonstrated the designer's awareness of the potential inherent in manipulating diverse narratives and the ability to construct images to achieve their ends.[498] The pairing of apparently disparate scenes would be understood by viewers as

[494] Ibid., 2:250-51.
[495] Ibid., 2:251-52.
[496] Ibid., 2:252-54.
[497] Leslie Webster, "Iconographic Programme," 227-30; Leslie Webster and Janet Backhouse, *The Making of England: Anglo-Saxon Art and Culture, AD 600-900* (London: British Museum Press, 1991), 103.
[498] Webster, "Iconographic Programme," 232-33.

a means of inspiring contemplation, by drawing complex thematic parallels between them.

Not everyone has agreed with Webster, of course: Lang stressed revenge and judgement in addition to redemption, exile or types of rulership, while Richard Abels highlighted revenge, gift-giving and the ideals of divine rulership.[499] Although they reached different (or complementary) conclusions, both agreed with Webster that the scenes and motifs were deliberately selected to encourage the viewer to consider potential correlations between them. They further agreed that the heroic subject-matter was intended to resonate with the Christian moralities being signified, and allow for multivalent readings – which could only be accessed by contemplating the casket's overall iconography. Lang thus considered the carvings through the lens of patristic commentaries on the Psalms, emphasising that the themes of judgement, revenge, redemption and rulership were common to both Christian and traditional ethical codes, and that the account of ascent and judgement referred to in Psalm 68 finds parallels with Weland's revenge and the airborne escape described in *Vǫlundarkviða* – it is highly artificial and described in metalworking terms.[500] The means of Weland's escape is never specified in the poem, but the depiction of a figure strangling birds on the Casket led Lang to consider that it, too, was contrived. More importantly, perhaps, he observed that Cassiodorus' treatment of the Psalm dealt with themes of future judgement and vengeance against those disloyal to the Lord, or disbelieving of his power – concerns that speak to the divine retribution to be distributed at the Last Judgment.[501] Further reference to divine judgement may be supported by Christ's portrayal as *rex regum* in the adjacent scene.[502] Regardless of the details highlighted in scholarly engagements with the Casket, it is clearly accepted that the Weland legend could be manipulated to fit desired contexts and adapted to remark on significant Christian theological concepts. Of these, its relationship to the ascension and divine judgement is particularly compelling, but seems better suited to the iconography of the Leeds cross, whose abbreviated imagery focusses on different incidents from the Weland legend and the life of Christ.

[499] Lang, "Imagery of the Franks Casket," 251-252; Abels, "What Has Weland," 550-51, 565.
[500] Lang, "Imagery of the Franks Casket," 252; *Vǫlundarkviða*, ed./ trans. Dronke, 2:251, 253.
[501] Lang, "Imagery of the Franks Casket," 254.
[502] Webster, "Iconographic Programme," 232.

2.3c The Leeds Cross: The Iconographic Programme

Turning, therefore, to consider the overall iconographic programme of the Leeds cross, the placement of the figures on the shaft should be noted.[503] The lowermost figure on A (Fig. 2.9) is badly damaged, faces left and holds a short sword in his right hand; a bird with a curved beak and a long tail perches on his left shoulder. Before the figure is a symbol that has been identified as an Odinic valknut (Fig. 2.10);[504] yet, it does not resemble the three interlocked triangles forming a valknut (Fig. 2.11), and its successful identification is further complicated by the fact that its upper portion is broken away. Two panels above is a partially restored, frontally-facing figure, whose arms are folded across his torso before a wing-like cloak and whose hair terminates in curls (Fig. 2.12).

The lowermost panel of C contains the much-discussed Weland scene (Fig. 2.13).[505] Above the smith in his 'flying machine' is a horizontal female figure holding a drinking horn and wearing a long trailing dress, which is grasped in Weland's left hand; her long hair is grasped in his right (Fig. 2.14). In the panel above are two more frontally-facing figures. The first is cloaked, has elaborately curling hair and a possible nimbus (Fig. 2.15), suggested by a curvilinear form rising upwards over its head and extending beyond the curled hair. The second holds a small rectangular object, identified as a book, in his right.[506] Above, another frontal figure faces forwards, wearing a long garment (Fig. 2.16). The head is surrounded by a deeply dished halo, crowning a slightly curled hairstyle. The uppermost figure's clearly defined nimbus and the book held by that below suggest that they can be identified as saintly and ecclesiastical or clerical figures, respectively. In addition to its nimbus, the (saintly) figure's position at the top of the cross-shaft implies that it carries greater significance than the others. The book held by the figure below further suggests the wealth or status related to ownership or use of this attribute, and associations with literacy, two factors which may demonstrate this figure's ecclesiastical status. The wider context of the monument's cross-form and the overall iconographic scheme should be considered in relation to these two figures on C and the ecclesiastical figure on A, which have been placed either at eye-level or the top of the cross-shaft.

---

[503] See Appendix, I.64.
[504] Kopár, *Gods and Settlers*, 113.
[505] Coatsworth, *Western Yorkshire*, 201-202.
[506] Ibid., 201.

Of these figures, only Weland is clearly identifiable by the flying contrivance and smiths' tools in the bottom of the panel. After his initial identification, later discussions turned to the female figure held above him. Bailey explored two possible options, arguing that she may represent the swan-maiden wife, or Beadohild in a scene merging her visit to Weland's forge with his subsequent escape, or a version of the tale where she escapes with Weland.[507] The drinking horn may support her identification as Beadohild, although it should be noted that like the ponytail arrangement of the hair and the trailing hemline of the full-length robe worn by female figures in Scandinavian art, the drinking horn seems to have functioned as a standard gendered (female) signifier. Kopár nevertheless concluded that she most likely represents Beadohild, citing the emphasis on her character in *Deor*, and her prominent position on the front panel of the Franks Casket.[508] She also suggested that the flying machine's wings may have associated the image of the smith with contemporary carvings of angels, arguing that this broad connection may have made the image acceptable in a Christian context.[509] While it is certainly possible, the element of flight in this scene raises the more important questions of what caused contemporary perceptions of the narrative to shift focus to the smith's flight, and apparently precipitated this new iconography?

Unlike the conflated scenes on the Franks Casket that present Weland hamstrung in his smithy with tools, the decapitated bodies of Niðhad's sons and Beadohild with a companion (Fig. 2.17), the Leeds cross shows only one episode, which has been compressed into a conceptual motif filling a single panel. Likewise, the thematic emphasis has shifted from Niðhad and Weland's evil deeds shown on the Casket, to Weland's airborne escape. Ursula Dronke suggested that, in the guise, Weland may be understood as a *figura* of Christ, and his depiction at Leeds implies redemption, with the female figure representing a delivered soul.[510] Expanding on this, Victoria Thompson claimed that overall, the scene may be viewed as a type of Christ's Resurrection or Ascension;[511] unfortunately she supplied no supporting evidence. Likewise, although Lang associated the Casket's narrative scene with the themes of ascent in Psalm 68,[512] he did not consider connections between the Ascension and the

[507] Bailey, *Viking Age Sculpture*, 106.
[508] Kopár, *Gods and Settlers,* 18.
[509] Ibid., 22.
[510] *The Poetic Edda,* 2 *Mythological Poems,* ed./trans. Ursula Dronke (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), 280-281.
[511] Victoria Thompson, *Dying and Death in Later Anglo-Saxon England* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2004), 165.
[512] Lang, "Imagery of the Franks Casket," 252-254.

Leeds figures, leaving the full implications of this potential parallel entirely unexplored.

It is clear that the Leeds Weland scheme was deliberately selected and intentionally placed below the two ecclesiastical or saintly figures.[513] Furthermore, its overall relationship to the shaft's figural programme can be explained through commentaries on the Ascension, including Gregory the Great's Ascension Day Homily, and the ninth-century Anglo-Saxon poem, *Christ*. In the homily, Gregory explained that Christ admonished his apostles at his Ascension to follow his command to spread the Gospel.[514]

Christ, recorded in the tenth-century Exeter Book and attributed to the ninth-century poet Cynewulf, offers an account of the Ascension.[515] Although it draws on various patristic, liturgical and scriptural sources, George Hardin Brown identified the primary source as Gregory's Ascension Day Homily, known to have circulated in Anglo-Saxon England.[516] In *Christ* the protagonist orders his followers to spread the gospel and rises to heaven, attended by angels, who warn his followers of his future return and subsequent judgement.[517] At his Ascension Christ is described as a bird and his divinity is emphasised.[518] The defined wings of Weland's flying machine seem to parallel the poetic reference to Christ as bird, while Weland's placement below the figure with the book and the nimbed figure potentially reference Christ's command to his apostles, recorded biblically, in Gregory's Ascension Day Homily and *Christ.*[519]

This account of the Ascension is compelling because of the Exeter Book's close temporal relationship to the Leeds cross. It expounds on the Ascension's significance as a pivotal moment in the scriptures, marking the turning point between Christ's Advent and Second Coming, established in the preceding and subsequent parts of the poem. It concludes with references to what can be expected at the Second Coming, and the judgements and punishments Christ will distribute.[520] While the

[513] For sculptural analogues where this motif survives in fragmentary form or without additional context, see, Lang, *Northern Yorkshire*, 61-62 (Bedale 6); Lang, *York and East Yorkshire*, 202-203 (Sherburn 3); Coatsworth, *Western Yorkshire*, 202-203 (Leeds 2);.
[514] Gregory the Great, *Homily 29*, ed./trans. Dom David Hurst, *Forty Gospel Homilies: Gregory the Great* (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1990), 227.
[515] Cynewulf, *Christ*, ed./trans. S.A.J. Bradley, *Anglo-Saxon Poetry* (London: Everyman, 1982), 217.
[516] George Hardin Brown, "The Ascent-Descent Motif in 'Christ II' of Cyneuwulf," *JEGP* 73, no. 1 (Jan. 1974): 1.
[517] Cynewulf, *Christ*, ed./trans. Bradley, *Anglo-Saxon Poetry*, 219-220.
[518] Ibid., 223.
[519] Amanda Doviak "What has Sigurd to do with Christ? Reassessing the Nature of Anglo-Scandinavian Sculpture in the North of England," in *Peopling Insular Art: Practice, Performance, Perception*, ed. Cynthia Thickpenny, et al. (Oxford: Oxbow, 2020), 172-76.
[520] Cynewulf, *Christ*, ed./trans. Bradley, *Anglo-Saxon Poetry*, 226-228.

poem generally follows the biblical narratives recounting the Ascension, it further prioritises Christ's forthcoming judgement and the punishments of the unfaithful, contrasting with the scriptural accounts, or indeed Gregory's Ascension Day Homily, its likely source. In Mark 16:16, Christ's future judgment is referenced immediately before his Ascension, when he tells his disciples that those who believe and are baptised will be saved and not condemned; in Acts 1:10-11, men in white garments inform the apostles that Christ will return in the manner in which he has just ascended. The account in Mark focusses on the methods that will enable salvation at Christ's Second Coming; conversely, the Acts narrative concentrates on the mechanism of Christ's return.

The features of Christ's future return and judgment are thus synthesised in *Christ*. Yet, when describing the specific retribution to be endured by the damned, the poem highlights the effects of Christ's judgment, rather than his return,[521] suggesting that themes of judgment and retribution related to the Ascension attained greater significance at the time the poem was written down, with the Ascension's fulfilment necessary to facilitate Christ's Second Coming. Therefore, the Weland motif incorporated into the Leeds figural programme to represent the Ascension also anticipated Christ's impending return and reflected contemporary beliefs surrounding this event as attested in contemporary Old English poetry. Displayed on a public monument, these concepts would encourage viewers to contemplate the Ascension and its aftereffects; namely, Christ's judgment and their own position within Apocalyptic events.

With this understanding, the Leeds figural programme can be seen to express thematic affinities with earlier sculptural iconography, such as that at Ilkley, by referencing Christ's Ascension and anticipated return.[522] Yet, at Leeds, seemingly schematic figures articulate complex theological concerns long familiar in Anglo-Saxon sculpture, and accommodate a new motif, its sources believed to be imported by incoming Scandinavian populations.

Beyond an Insular context, the most convincing parallel for the Weland motif in stone occurs on the Ardre VIII picture-stone from Gotland (Fig. 2.18), initially dated to the eighth century, but now believed to be of ninth- to tenth-century date.[523]

---

[521] Ibid., 227.
[522] See, Hawkes, "Rothbury Cross," 77-94.
[523] Vandersall, "Date and Provenance," 18; Lang, "Sigurd and Weland," 91; Bailey, *Viking Age Sculpture*, 76. For dating, see: Lisbeth Imer, "Gotlandske billedsten-dateringen af Lindqvists Gruppe C og D," *Aarbøger for nordisk oldkyndighed og historie* (2004), 47-111; Imer "Viking Period Gotlandic

Here, the motif occurs in the lower third of the stone (Fig. 2.19) with other iconographic details, which recall a more complete version of the narrative. On the right, two headless bodies are arranged horizontally and shown from an aerial viewpoint, the necks arranged to the left, pointing toward a building, shown from a composite aerial viewpoint. This feature is formed by a horizontal bar above a vertical one on the right, and a broken vertical bar on the left; together these form the entrance to the building. Above, and connecting the two vertical walls is a semi-circular roof with ridges at the top. Inside the building are a series of smiths' tools, arranged in profile and depicted from above. To the left, a winged figure is disposed horizontally, with a vertically disposed profile female figure above his head, identifiable by her long hair and trailing dress. Unlike the Leeds composition, the Ardre carving excludes sufficient details to indicate how the smith obtained his wings, whether by magic or fabrication.

In his discussion of the Ardre carving, Lang noted only its similarity to the Leeds arrangement, but did observe the significance of its (then presumed) eighth-century date, which minimised the temporal gap between the Weland scene on the early eighth-century Franks Casket and that of the tenth-century Leeds cross.[524] Bailey also discussed the carving, recognising that the analogous Ardre and Leeds compositions imply familiarity with that scene's iconography, which may have arrived with Scandinavian settlers on perishable media, such as textiles or wood.[525] He also recognised that the Gotlandic picture-stones represent the only pre-Viking stone sculpture from Scandinavia, but argued that any similarities between their carvings and those of Northern England do not imply a direct connection between the two populations, because the people of Gotland expanded eastwards.[526]

Kopár also engaged with the Ardre scene, but focussed on the version of the legend represented, rather than the scene itself, suggesting that it depicts a pre-Christian variant of the myth, possibly influenced by "Lappish shamanism", which emphasises the smith's supernatural powers. Weland's escape could thus be attributed to supernatural metamorphosis, which she held was unfamiliar to, or rationalised by, Anglo-Saxon audiences.[527] While possible, neither the literary nor visual evidence

Picture Stones," 115-18; Sigmund Oehrl, *Die Bildsteine Gotlands: Probleme und Neue Wege ihrer Dokumentation, Lesung und Deutung* 1 (Friedberg: Likias, 2019), 17-21.
[524] Lang, "Sigurd and Weland," 91.
[525] Bailey, *Viking Age Sculpture*, 106.
[526] Ibid., 76.
[527] Kopár, *Gods and Settlers*, 20-21.

supports such "metamorphosis": the earliest textual variant in *Deor* makes no explicit reference to the method of Weland's escape; descriptions of his flight in *Vǫlundarkviða* (*Hlæiandi Völundr hófz at lopti*) are equally vague; the Ardre carvings lack sufficient details to confirm any such version of the tale existed; and other, more detailed representations of the escape, including that at Leeds, show Weland escaping by means of a manufactured device. There is another fundamental difference between the Leeds and Ardre portrayals: namely, that the Gotlandic carving depicts the figure within a clear narrative context, while the Leeds scheme does not. Thus, although the Ardre composition can (now) confirm the motif's approximately contemporary existence in the same medium, coeval with its introduction into the Anglo-Scandinavian pictorial repertoire, it does not function in the same manner as the conceptual motif presented at Leeds.

Although Bailey acknowledged the potential introduction of the motif into an Anglo-Scandinavian context in perishable media such as textiles and wood, he placed less emphasis on metal. The most convincing metalwork parallel for the figure of the flying Weland, however, is a mid- to late tenth-century gilded copper alloy mount (Fig. 2.20), only discovered in 2011 during excavations at Uppåkra, Sweden,[528] three decades after Bailey's work was published. It was dated stylistically by comparison with similar pieces,[529] and features a human figure attached to a pair of wings and tail by a series of bindings at the shoulders and legs, and a harness on his back. The placement and additional details of the mount's loops and straps differ from those at Leeds, but the two schemes share the same general arrangement of a figure viewed aerially and attached to a pair of wings by a series of bindings. Michaela Helmbrecht compared the mount to a pendant from Tissø, Denmark (Fig. 2.21) and a mid-tenth-century sword scabbard chape from Birka, Sweden (Fig. 2.22).[530] Of the two, the arrangement of the Tissø pendant more closely resembles the Uppåkra mount, and ultimately, the Leeds carving. It differs from the Uppåkra and Leeds compositions, however, by replacing the human head with that of a stylised bird, rotated 180º to be seen frontally. The chape from Birka likewise shows a winged figure with out-spread limbs, apparently holding a horizontal object (now unidentifiable) over his head. The variations of these three objects notwithstanding, it is clear that the image of a figure

[528] Michaela Helmbrecht, "A Winged Figure from Uppåkra," *Fornvännen* 107 (2012): 171.
[529] Ibid., 175.
[530] Ibid., 174.

attached to a flying apparatus was circulating on portable media in Scandinavia at a time contemporary with the erection of the Leeds cross.

Kopár briefly discussed the Uppåkra mount, noting the woman's absence, leading her to argue that it is uncertain whether the mount's solitary figure represents a different version of the myth, or a different character in a bird-suit.[531] Helmbrecht contested this, interpreting the Uppåkra figure as Weland based on an unobtrusive row of droplets present on the figure's left wing, which she suggested may reference the version of the tale in *Þiðrekssaga af Bern*, where Niðhad commands Egill to shoot Weland down.[532] Although potentially conforming to the *Þiðrekssaga* variant, it is important to note that the earlier versions recorded in *Deor* and *Vǫlundarkviða* do not include or otherwise refer to this episode. Additionally, the row of droplets is found in the same area as two horizontal lines crossing the figure's right wing, which could indicate that they result from the casting process. Nevertheless, Helmbrecht acknowledged the proliferation of bird disguises and transformations in Old Norse literature, arguing that this enables the Uppåkra figure to be viewed within a wider range of Viking-age perceptions of avian metamorphoses.[533]

The metalwork figures' imprecise identities notwithstanding, the proliferation of this image in various Scandinavian regions suggests that the iconography of a winged figure in a manufactured flying device was widespread and accepted. This is further supported by the Ardre scheme, suggesting that the motif was well-established in the visual repertoire and produced in multiple media across several centuries. Its production in metal provides a possible mechanism for its introduction to the northern Danelaw and its reproduction in stone sculpture. Most importantly, its translation from metal to stone has significant implications for how it would be viewed and understood. Metalwork objects would have been personal items, likely mounted on items worn or carried by their owners, and generally familiar. Their relatively small size would render minute details visible only upon close inspection, something usually limited to the object's owner or carrier, unless another was invited to admire it. Transferring such an image to a large-scale, public monument, such as a stone cross, would increase its size and accessibility, thus widening its potential audience. It would instil the scene with additional meanings, which could vary between individual viewers, as opposed to the personal beliefs limited to the wearer or carrier of a small metal object.

[531] Kopar, *Gods and Settlers*, 16-17.
[532] Helmbrecht, "Winged Figure," 176-177.
[533] Ibid., 176.

The Scandinavian metalwork figures' identities may be ambiguous, but they provide explicit examples in a perishable medium of how the scheme may have been transmitted to sculpture produced in the Northern Danelaw. Such portable objects allowed the designers of the Leeds cross an opportunity to adapt a new (familiar) iconographic model to express (in unconventional terms) complex ideas surrounding the Ascension and its relationship to the Last Judgment.

Although analyses of the Leeds cross primarily focus on the two panels representing secular images and rarely extend beyond these, most of its figural imagery appears to emerge from the earlier Anglian tradition of representing frontal ecclesiastical or clerical figures within clearly defined panels. Stylistic links between the Leeds and Ilkley crosses have been observed; however, their implications have not yet been fully explored. For example, Lang situated the Leeds cross within a series of models that include Collingham, Ilkley and Otley, arguing that these sculptures encompass the transition to a Scandinavian phase of carving in Yorkshire, most evident in the vine-scrolls and dished haloes of the figural imagery.[534] Bailey also noted these features, likewise tracing the evolution back to Otley.[535] Together, they suggest there may have been a transmission of designs, or possibly even craftsmen, between the sites. This is further supported by the sites' close proximity to each other; the relatively short distances (less than 20 miles) between any of them would enable travel along the River Wharfe from one site to another, facilitating the movement of craftsmen, templates or equipment. Moreover, Bailey claimed that the figures' organisation into separate panels originated in Anglian sculpture,[536] and the unity of the carved vine-scrolls at these sites may have been further facilitated by Roman roads running through the Wharfe valley.[537]

The relationship between these sites of sculptural production is most clearly demonstrated by the figure on Ilkley 3, a cross-shaft fragment (Fig. 2.23),[538] whose curled halo is common on the Ilkley and Leeds monuments. At Leeds, it is found on the ecclesiastical figure on A, and the nimbed and book-bearing figures on C. In this context, the curled halo, perhaps developed at Ilkley, invests the three Leeds figures with a sense of unity, differentiating them from the two secular figures in the lowermost panels of A and C. Significantly, the uppermost figure on C combines the

[534] Lang, "Continuity and Innovation," 146.
[535] Bailey, *Viking Age Sculpture*, 77.
[536] Ibid., 78-79.
[537] Ibid., 189.
[538] See Appendix, I.44.

curling halo with a dished nimbus, suggesting familiarity with earlier Anglian iconographic traditions. While it would be unreasonable to claim that the Leeds figures descend directly from the Ilkley figure, their stylistic similarities nevertheless imply connections between the two sites. This is also supported by the stylistic parallels between the vine-scrolls at Ilkley and Leeds and some of their interlace ornament.

Bailey proposed that sculptors used templates, and explained how evidence for this may be uncovered by using rubbings and illuminated tracing tables.[539] For the Leeds cross, the interlace panel on A is considered to correspond to works at Ilkley and Collingham and originate from Anglian designs, with distortions to its pattern indicating templates for its design and layout.[540] Overall, the corresponding vine-scrolls, figural imagery and interlace patterns at Leeds and Ilkley strongly suggest a link between the sites, which would facilitate the transmission of designs, iconographic models, theological concepts and possibly even sculptors themselves.

Bailey's suggestion that Roman roads enabled stylistic transfers between Wharfe valley sites may also explain the formal relationships of the Ilkley and Leeds designs. The archiepiscopal estate at Otley, which included Ilkley, encompassed the area on both sides of Roman road 72 (numbered by Ivan Margary) and along the Wharfe.[541] This road also connected Ilkley with York and Addingham,[542] and divided into 729, leading south (Fig. 2.24).[543] Roman road 712, beginning in Manchester and passing through Leeds, likely continued northeast to join roads 72 or 729.[544] It is apparent that road 712 would nevertheless reach Ilkley, implying these sites may have been accessible to one another via a Roman road network. Such connections are significant when considering the visual links between the Ilkley monuments and those later carved at Leeds. They would, for instance, establish an overland route between the two sites that facilitated the transmission of physical items (such as templates) and/or theological ideas or concerns, which complemented those already offered by the riverine routes.

[539] Bailey, "Chronology of Viking-Age," 180.
[540] Coatsworth, *Western Yorkshire*, 201.
[541] Ivan D. Margary, *North of the Foss Way-Bristol Channel*, vol. 2, *Roman Roads in Britain* (London: Phoenix House, 1955), 19.
[542] Ibid., 104-106.
[543] Ibid., 134.
[544] Ibid., 99.

The figural iconography at Leeds can thus be considered to have emerged within a context reliant on earlier Anglian traditions that also incorporated motifs apparently (more recently) imported from Scandinavia. When combined, the visual languages produced an iconographic programme that functioned like those of earlier Anglian works, such as the Franks Casket, enabling correlations between seemingly dissimilar narratives. The Leeds cross achieves this by deploying a new iconographic model, comprising a schematic conceptual motif rather than a condensed narrative scene. This expresses a wider narrative, encompassing complex theological concerns that recall the analogous eschatological display of Christ in Majesty and evangelist portraits at Ilkley. Like those responsible for the Franks Casket and Ilkley cross, the patrons or designers of the Leeds cross assumed viewer familiarity with certain narratives that could be expressed through truncated motifs, and relied on their ability to contemplate connections between these narratives, and the wider concerns they invoked – in a manner analogous to that employed by the *Deor* poet.

2.4 The Whalley Cross

Alongside integrating new, potentially imported, motifs into a Christian context, other crosses produced during the period of Scandinavian settlement maintained thematic and visual links with earlier Anglian Christian traditions; among these is the tenth-century Whalley cross (Fig. 2.25),[545] which, according to Harold Taylor, may stand in its original setting.[546] While the cross is geographically distant from those at Leeds and Ilkley, its tenth-century date is contemporary with the Leeds and Halton crosses,[547] and the themes and arrangement of its figural iconography appear to be consistent with these three crosses in emphasising eschatological subjects.

Despite sharing this common interest, the figural carving of the Whalley cross is limited to only four figures distributed across the four faces of the shaft: the nimbed, frontally-facing *orans* flanked by serpents on A (Fig. 2.26); the single frontal *orans* figures on B and D (Fig. 2.27a-b); and the nimbed frontally-facing *orans* on C (Fig. 2.28), none of which are aligned with each other.

[545] Bailey, *Cheshire and Lancashire,* 244. See Appendix, I.101. Stylistic continuity with earlier Anglian sculpture is evident in the panelled layout, back-turned quadrupeds and birds.
[546] H.M. Taylor, "The Whalley Crosses," *Archaeological Journal* 127 (1970): 281.
[547] See Ch.5, 237-54; Appendix, I.39, I.64.

Orans figures are well attested in pre-Christian and non-Christian art,[548] but it is evident that those at Whalley are intended to be viewed and understood within Christian frames of reference, given their display on a monumental cross, while the haloes of those on A and C clearly indicate their saintly or divine status. The *orans* pose also carries eschatological connotations, being a signifier of the soul in paradise or the Church in prayer anticipating the next life, particularly when portrayed in funerary contexts.[549] Two such nimbed figures of this type portrayed on a monumental cross, with one flanked by serpents, certainly suggest these associations. They would, moreover, not be inconsistent in their setting at Whalley, which Benjamin Edwards demonstrated was a site of ecclesiastical importance in the late pre-Conquest period, as evidenced by its possession of the entire vill at Domesday.[550] This suggests that the Church may well have been involved in selecting the monument type, the figures to be carved on it, and influenced perceptions of the figures within a wider iconographic programme relating to the Apocalypse.

The monumental cross and its likely ecclesiastical patronage, however, have inspired various identifications of the figures carved on it. For instance, H.W. Butterworth identified the figure on A as Christ in Glory, accompanied by saints on B, C, and D.[551] In his discussion, Bailey alternatively identified that on A as Daniel in the lion's den, citing a group of Merovingian buckles with a similar arrangement (and inscription) in support.[552] Edwards refuted this, arguing that, despite the narrow panel's spatial restrictions, the sculptor would not render snakes instead of lions, given the competently articulated quadrupeds elsewhere on the shaft; rather, he argued, the figure resembles depictions of Christ conquering evil.[553] Given the geographic and temporal distance between the two iconographic models proposed by Bailey, and Edwards' convincing observation about the putative lions, the figure's identification as Christ in Majesty or Christ conquering evil seems more plausible. Indeed, the CASSS suggests that a *Maiestas* identification is possible, invoking both Psalm 90:13 (which states "Thou shalt walk upon the asp and basilisk: and thou shalt trample underfoot the

[548] A.M. Giuntella, "Orans," in *Encyclopaedia of the Early Church* 2, ed. Angelo di Berardino, trans. Adrian Walford (Cambridge: James Clarke, 1997), 615.
[549] Paul Corby Finney, "Orant," in *Encyclopaedia of Early Christianity* 2, ed. Everett Ferguson, 2nd ed. (New York: Garland Publishing, 1997), 831.
[550] B.J.N. Edwards, *Vikings in North West England: The Artefacts* (Lancaster: Carnegie Publishing Ltd, 1998), 87.
[551] H.W. Butterworth, *Whalley Church: A Description* (Blackburn: Standard Press, 1934), 8.
[552] Bailey, *Viking Age Sculpture*, 158-159.
[553] Edwards, *Vikings in North West England*, 85.

lion and the dragon") and the scholarship on Christ recognised between two beasts, with its basis in the Canticle of Habbukkuk, as support.[554]

Although the figure on A does not trample the beasts, numerous iconographic variations of the scheme exist,[555] and *Maiestas* images share many (eschatological) associations with them, which could be enhanced by the *orans* pose. The link was made early on at Ruthwell, with Christ over the Beasts (Fig. 2.29),[556] and in this respect, the Whalley figure can be viewed as maintaining the Anglian tradition of depicting Christ in his eschatological role. Here, his pose denotes prayer, as well as the Crucifixion, while the serpents reference Christ overcoming evil by that death, thus enabling the Second Coming, judgement and eternal salvation.

Unlike the Ilkley *Maiestas*, that at Whalley is accompanied by only three figures, and of these, only that on C, has an identifiable attribute (a nimbus), making it unlikely that they represent the evangelists. Nevertheless, they may depict other figures present during the Apocalypse, which seems the most likely frame of reference for the figure of Christ in Majesty. This is supported by the proclivity of this theme in the sermons, homiletic and poetic texts that circulated during the period of the monument's production. Catherine Cubitt, for instance, argued that Anglo-Saxon charters, sermons and homilies produced near the year 1000 addressed the question of sin and the need for the faithful to make amends before Judgement Day, when they would receive their individual salvation or damnation.[557] She observed these themes in the vernacular sermons recorded in the late tenth-century Blickling manuscript and Vercelli Book,[558] whose texts were compiled from various sources in circulation, before being written down in these manuscripts.[559] Viewed overall, the sermons are "exhortatory and moralising", and exploit the fear of Judgement Day to stimulate penance and reform, on an individual level.[560] The sermons, and their late tenth-century transmission to written form in Old English, imply their prevalence during that century and their appeal to a wide audience, being available in the vernacular. Their moralising component also suggests that individual salvation and an emphasis on the

[554] Bailey, *Cheshire and Lancashire*, 244; "super apsidem et basiliscum ambulabis: et conculabis leonem et draconem".
[555] Ibid.
[556] Cramp, "Evangelist Symbols," 128.
[557] Catherine Cubitt, "Apocalyptic and Eschatological Thought in England Around the Year 1000," *TRHS* 25 (2015): 30.
[558] Princeton, Scheide Library, MS 71; Vercelli, Biblioteca Capitolare, MS CXVII.
[559] Cubitt, "Apocalyptic and Eschatological," 35-36.
[560] Ibid., 36-37.

means of achieving it were paramount concerns at the time; as Cubitt noted, Ælfric's sermons, contemporary with those in the Blickling and Vercelli manuscripts, also emphasised individual vigilance and actions to avoid damnation at the Last Judgement.[561] Taken together, it can be assumed that individual penance and absolution of sin as the means of achieving salvation at the Last Judgement were a priority of the Church.

The poem *Christ* expresses the same concerns in its third part, prioritising Christ's judgement and the contrasting experiences of sinners and the blessed following the judgement, rather than the portents preceding it.[562] According to the poet, all souls, righteous and sinful, will be resurrected together; all will be terrified with fear as they bemoan the deeds committed during their lifetimes.[563] Christ's subsequent appearance is juxtaposed with the two groups to emphasise that he will appear agreeable to the good, but frightful to sinners, anticipating their forthcoming punishment.[564] The narrative describes the first of these punishments, floridly recounting how they will be inescapable to those who committed wicked deeds, as no-one's former deeds and thoughts will be excluded from exposure.[565] The cross also appears as a symbol of power, shining in the sky, emphasising its distressing, threatening appearance to the wicked.[566] Thomas Hill has further pointed to the considerable emphasis placed on Christ's wounds, with the sinners' judgment and condemnation always alluded to in relation to them. The saved are exempt from such harm.[567] Hill claimed that the distinction between sinners and saved suggests that the damned would view Christ in his humanity, while the blessed would view him in his divinity.[568] As argued by Frederick Biggs, this emphasis derives from the influence of the homiletic tradition on Cynewulf's poem, evident in the passages plainly translated from such material; its hortatory tone and direct asides to the audience; and the reconfiguration of material to introduce explicit themes, rather than following scriptural accounts.[569] *Christ*'s relationship to this wider homiletic tradition thus

[561] Ibid., 45.
[562] Cynewulf, *Christ*, ed./trans *Anglo-Saxon Poetry*, 228.
[563] Ibid., 230.
[564] Ibid., 230-231.
[565] Ibid., 232-234.
[566] Ibid., 234-235.
[567] Thomas D. Hill, "Vision and Judgement in the Old English 'Christ III,'" *Studies in Philology* 70, no. 3 (1973): 235-236.
[568] Ibid., 238.
[569] Frederick Biggs, "The Fourfold Division of Souls: The Old English 'Christ II' and the Insular Homiletic Tradition," *Traditio* 45 (1989-90): 35-36.

further underlines the focus on eschatological themes surrounding the Last Judgement in the Insular world during the ninth and tenth centuries.

At Whalley the figural programme seems to invert this concept, depicting Christ accompanied by a saintly figure and two additional *orans* figures, rather than a wounded Christ and condemned figures. The Crucifixion is nonetheless recalled both by the (bejewelled) bossed cross-head set over the monument and the *orans* figures' raised and extended arms, invoking Christ's position on the cross, his humanity and death on the cross, and his divinity, by mimetically evoking his triumph over evil. The accompanying figures can thus probably be understood as souls of the blessed who achieve salvation at the Last Judgement, having performed good deeds, prayer and penance – Christologically inspired actions, their emulation implied by their pose. In this context, the monumental cross-form chosen for the figures' display further recalls the eschatological sign of the cross appearing in the sky at the end of time – a visual analogue apparent in the cross-head that would have originally surmounted the cross-shaft and been viewed against the sky by contemporary audiences.

Thus, although they initially appear simplified and schematic, the figural carvings of the Whalley cross convey complex eschatological theological concerns when considered alongside contemporary texts that present these subjects. This iconographic programme invokes Christ's dual nature in the figures' *orans* poses that recall his humanity and sacrifice at the Crucifixion, with his divinity and triumph over evil implied by his depiction as *Maiestas*. Overall, it encourages the viewer's spiritual introspection and potentially mimetic response, in emulating the *orans* pose, and by extension, Christ's attitudes. It also suggests ecclesiastical patronage or influence at play – a factor indicated by the monumental cross-form selected, and supported by its setting at Whalley, an ecclesiastical land-holding by Domesday. The eschatological associations of Christ in Majesty and the accompanying *orans* figures express the importance of individual penance and the subsequent hope for salvation at the Last Judgement, all primary concerns of the tenth-century Church. Though its figures' identities are much less explicit, the Anglian design principles and Church doctrine concerning the Apocalypse and Last Judgement reiterated in new forms here further imply that local Christian designs and theological concerns prevailed.

2.5 Summary

Consideration of these three monuments in the light of their contemporary socio-political and ecclesiastic contexts has raised many important issues involving the processes of transition and transmission evident in their carved decoration. The Ilkley cross, erected during the earliest stages of Scandinavian settlement, presents an undoubtedly Christian iconographic programme with deliberately selected figures, clearly identifiable by their attributes, which together comment on Christ's human and divine natures and the Apocalypse. This was achieved by arranging zooanthropomorphic evangelist symbols on a single face of the cross, enabling them to signify Christ's Incarnation, Passion, Resurrection and Ascension. When considered holistically with the *Maiestas* depicted on the opposing face, the symbols can be understood to explicitly reference Christ's Second Coming. The decision to depict them zooanthropomorphically (as opposed to individual human portraits) demonstrates awareness of patristic traditions associating the evangelists with the four living creatures of the Apocalypse, and potentially reflects the Church's theological concerns during a time of regional political and religious instability.

Rather than indicating the complete erosion of Anglian religious and artistic networks and their associated traditions, the Leeds and Whalley crosses, produced later during Scandinavian settlement, express continuity with earlier iconographic, exegetical and homiletic traditions, while re-interpreting and adapting them. At Leeds this was achieved by incorporating a new iconographic model, most likely imported from Scandinavia, among Anglian stylistic elements derived from earlier carvings found at other Wharfe valley sites, most notably Ilkley. The new iconographic scheme, invoked to portray Weland the smith, was likely adapted from portable media imported by Scandinavian settlers and translated to a new, public and monumental form, imparting it with new meaning(s) and increasing the scope of its audience. Moreover, this figure's (re-)introduction into a Christian context enhances its symbolic significance, and that of the ecclesiastical and saintly figures it accompanies. A reading of the entire iconographic programme demonstrates that it was integrated into a Christian context to express theological concerns that the viewer would understand to represent Christ's Ascension. Here, earlier Anglian iconographic traditions related to the events preceding Christ's Second Coming also appear to be maintained. As the final major event in Christ's life presented on a public monument, the Ascension (which in itself foretells the Second Coming) would allow the viewer to contemplate

the moment's theological significance, and that of the eschatological events it precedes. The various visual languages on the Leeds cross, thus combined, present Anglian theological concerns in a new manner involving an unconventional motif, which had emerged from the recently established artistic networks generated by the late ninth-century Scandinavian arrival and settlement in the region.

Likewise, the iconographic programme of the Whalley cross offers a new visual expression of older theological concerns. Here, the patrons or designers also employed conceptual motifs to articulate the rewards obtained by the blessed after Christ's Second Coming. Unlike the figural motifs at Leeds, those at Whalley would be entirely familiar in a Christian context, particularly when nimbed and carved on a monumental cross. Yet, the figures' multivalent frames of reference are analogous to those at Ilkley, namely in their references to Christ's dual nature, indicated by their *orans* pose, which recalls his humanity at the Crucifixion, and his divinity, denoted by his portrayal in Majesty conquering evil. Overall, the figural programme can be understood as intended to inspire introspective contemplation, a penitential attitude and potentially a mimetic response among the viewers. This suggests that the schematic figures carved on the Whalley cross functioned in a manner analogous to the more readily identifiable Ilkley figures, with each monument evoking responses that would entreat the viewers to consider the eternal fate of their own souls.

The figural iconography of these three monuments can therefore be said to have been deliberately selected to fulfil the objectives of those responsible for their production: to publicly present subject-matter concerned with Christ's Second Coming and the Last Judgement, in ways that complemented these themes as frequently presented in contemporary exegetical and homiletic texts. The programmes of these three monuments thus indicate that ecclesiastical concerns coinciding with Scandinavian arrival and settlement facilitated the reinvention of Anglian methods for signifying long-established and complex theological commentaries.

CHAPTER 3

Monumentality

3.1 Introduction

Compared with the relatively complete Ilkley, Leeds and Whalley crosses, the fragmentary nature of many Anglo-Scandinavian monuments appears to prevent full engagement with their iconographic programmes – a factor that might be deemed to apply to the sculptures once erected at Alnmouth, Middleton and Dacre. Nevertheless, while their fragmentation may obscure their iconographic programmes, the concept of monumentality remains,[570] and this phenomenon, intrinsically interconnected with that of materiality, affects the ways that stone crosses erected in the Northern Danelaw were viewed and understood by contemporary audiences. First and foremost, it remains the case that the monuments' format – the cross – was deliberately selected when other monumental forms, such as recumbent grave-slabs or hogbacks, were available.[571] Secondly, the monumental cross-form imbues the images carved upon it with inherently Christian significance(s), and its erection in outdoor environments – including (but not limited to) churchyards – can thus be perceived as an attempt to Christianise the landscape.

Although such a landscape arguably existed prior to Scandinavian settlement, the late ninth- and tenth-century proliferation of stone sculpture – and especially stone crosses – attributed to the settlement is a factor well established in the scholarship.[572] It implies that the settlers intended to expand previous attempts to project Christian ideologies into/onto their surroundings through monumental sculptural forms. By extension, it may indicate that (among other factors) earlier monuments extant in the landscape were already worn or damaged, and/or that the Anglo-Scandinavian patrons deemed them and/or their iconographies insufficient or unintelligible, prompting the production of new monuments. Of the three sites under consideration here, Anglian monuments had been produced at Middleton and Dacre when stone sculpture was a

[570] See Introduction, 74-78.
[571] See, James Lang, "The Hogback: A Viking Colonial Monument," *ASSAH* 3 (1984): 86-172; Bailey, *Viking Age Sculpture*, 85-100; Bailey, *England's Earliest Sculptors*, 83; Stocker, "Monuments and Merchants," 187, 198-99; Howard Williams, "Hogbacks: The Materiality of Solid Spaces," in Williams, et al., *Early Medieval Stone*, 241-268.
[572] Bailey, *England's Earliest Sculptors*, 79-80; Hadley, *Northern Danelaw*, 312; Stocker, "Monuments and Merchants," 182.

medium predominantly employed by the Church.[573] The continuity of stone carving into the Viking period may thus suggest the Church's continued influence: a supposition supported by both the crosses' form and extant iconographies, which derive from Christian visual repertoires. Indeed, the new Anglo-Scandinavian commissions suggest that their patrons (secular and/or ecclesiastical) wished to express particular Christian themes through their iconographic selections.

The process of transmitting visual languages and theological ideas is relevant here,[574] being discernible on each fragment, with the surviving iconography, inscriptions and monumental cross-head emerging from Irish or Scandinavian contacts.[575] This prompts numerous questions: namely, whether such imported images are attributable to Ingimund's *c*. 902 arrival in Chester from Dublin;[576] or indeed whether it is appropriate to suggest that such influences resulted from a single settlement event. The fragmentary typological and iconographic features also raise the issue of whether Scandinavian settlers had previous, prolonged exposure to Insular and/or continental European Christianity, and how this might manifest itself textually, iconographically and/or materially in the monuments they erected.

The materiality of the stone used for the monuments also raises questions about the Church's influence, having been a material employed by this institution for specific purposes. At a practical level, it enables sculptural production on a monumental scale, in turn facilitating the visibility of the images carved on these works. Although this can be accomplished in wood, stone's weight renders completed works largely immobile, while its durability ensures that its carved imagery will outlast that of wood and, of course, more portable media. Concomitant to such considerations and Scandinavian settlers' adoption of Anglian stone carving traditions, are the questions raised about their exposure to earlier stone monuments still extant in the landscape, and whether the material continuity suggests a deliberate expression of Christianity or political and economic primacy. The scholarly tendency to emphasise apparently secular iconography would seem to suggest the latter. Yet, the appropriation of a material and monumental form so visibly associated with the

[573] Bailey, *Viking Age Sculpture*, 81-82.
[574] See Ch.2, 116-46.
[575] Cramp, *County Durham and Northumberland*, 161-162 (Alnmouth 1); Bailey and Cramp, *Cumberland, Westmorland*, 91-92 (Dacre 2); Lang, *York and East Yorkshire*, 181-182 (Middleton 1).
[576] Collingwood, "Dispersion," 322-31; Bailey, *Viking Age Sculpture*, 70-71; 212-13. Richard N. Bailey, "The Hammer and the Cross," in *The Vikings in England and in their Danish Homeland,* ed. Else Roesdahl, et al. (London: The Anglo-Danish Viking Project, 1981), 84.

Church renders this debatable, implying that Viking-age patrons may have intended the concepts expressed by their iconographic selections to be read in dialogue with their existing (ecclesiastical) material and monumental counterparts.

3.2 Dacre

The Dacre fragment provides one such example of an Anglo-Scandinavian sculpted monument produced alongside Anglian precedents. The tenth- to eleventh-century piece (Fig. 3.1) is almost complete, with only the cross-head missing.[577] Its figural imagery survives on only one of its broad faces, A; the opposite, C, has been recut; and the two narrow faces contain non-figural decoration.[578] Despite its fragmentary nature and the obvious Christian connotations of at least one of its images, its carvings were once assigned meanings associated with Norse mythology.[579] Yet when its original monumental form is taken into account, such identifications become questionable, and it is evident that alternative explanations for the symbolic significance(s) of its iconographic programme should be pursued.

Face A is divided into two panels, the lower containing at its centre a stylised tree with bare branches and round fruits, and a partially coiled serpent beneath the branches (Fig. 3.2). This is flanked by two human figures, each facing it. Originally interpreted as the ash tree Yggdrasil, the serpent Niddhog and Thor,[580] the scheme has since been re-identified as depicting the Fall.[581] The left-hand figure apparently represents Eve wearing a short, flared garment;[582] she reaches toward the tree and clutches a fruit in her left hand. The right-hand figure likewise reaches toward the tree, but does not grasp the fruit. The only feature that distinguishes the two is the short kirtle worn by Eve. The length and arrangement of her skirt is a somewhat unusual signifier for a female figure during this period, given the tendency to portray women in profile with a long trailing dress, as at Leeds or Gosforth,[583] but analogous garments

[577] At the top of the shaft are remains for the transition into a ring-headed cross-head: Bailey and Cramp, *Cumberland, Westmorland*, 91-92.
[578] Ibid., 92. See Appendix, I.27.
[579] Mathews, "Dacre Stone," 226.
[580] Ibid., 227.
[581] Collingwood, "Sculpture…North Riding," 279; Richard N. Bailey, "The Meaning of the Viking-age Shaft at Dacre," *TCWAAS* ser. 2, 77 (1977): 61; Bailey, *Viking Age Sculpture*, 172; Bailey and Cramp, *Cumberland, Westmorland*, 92.
[582] W.S. Calverley, "Note," *TCWAAS* ser. 1, 11 (1891): 228; Bailey, "Meaning of the Viking-age Shaft," 61.
[583] See Ch.2, 126-39; Ch.4, 209-22.

feature in Scandinavian art: the right-hand side-panel of the Oseberg cart (Fig. 3.3), for instance, depicts a profile female figure (identifiable by the ponytail arrangement of her hair) in an elaborate, flared tunic. Its origins notwithstanding, the garment is clearly intended, at the very least, to reference Genesis 3:6-7, which describes the couple's attempts to cover themselves after consuming the fruit plucked from the tree.[584]

Dacre has been identified as one of only two Anglian minsters in the northwest,[585] which was an ecclesiastical settlement that could contain a variety of ecclesiastical and lay audiences, and facilitate the performance or supervision of pastoral care for the laity.[586] Dacre's ecclesiastical status is further supported by Anglian sculptural evidence,[587] and given that stone as a material carried implicit Christian connotations,[588] such monuments would have declared the site's involvement in a Christianised landscape. This is significant when considering the potential Christian nature of the carvings, as these indicate that the site retained or regained its Christian status after Scandinavian settlement in the region. Certainly, the decision to include the Fall suggests some continuity of ecclesiastical presence, or at least influence, in the production of the Dacre cross. It further implies that stone continued to be perceived as an appropriate medium, able to integrate the Anglo-Scandinavian cross into a larger Christian monumental network associated with the liturgical and theological traditions of the Church of Rome. This need not imply, however, that the monument's intended audience was solely or even primarily ecclesiastical; if Dacre had minster status, the church would have had pastoral responsibilities for surrounding (secular) communities, meaning that laypeople are likely to have accessed the cross and perhaps recognised the unambiguous image of the Fall.

It is thus worth observing the scene's distinctive details, which notably include Adam and Eve's profile arrangement, rather than the frontal one typical of Insular depictions of the Fall. Elizabeth Alexander argued that this was employed at Dacre to emphasise the act of sinning, evident in the figures' outstretched arms.[589] She likewise

---

[584] Gen. 3.6-7. See, Elizabeth Alexander, "Visualising the Old Testament in Anglo-Saxon England: From the Seventh to the mid-Eleventh Century" (doctoral thesis, 2 vols, University of York, 2018), 199-200.
[585] Blair, *Church in Anglo-Saxon Society*, 152.
[586] Ibid., 3.
[587] See, Bailey and Cramp, *Cumberland, Westmorland*, 90-91, 92-93.
[588] See Introduction, 73-74.
[589] Alexander, "Visualising the Old Testament," 199-200.

argued that the square, stepped base of the tree was deliberately included to simultaneously reference the Cross of Christ's Crucifixion and the act that led to the Fall, which required their salvation at Golgotha.[590] These associations, of course, would have been reiterated by the selected monument type: a cross, which supplies an appropriate support for the public display of this episode and its complex Christian frames of reference. Given the scheme's location at the base of the shaft, parallels between the monumental cross-form and the stepped-base of the stylised tree carved upon it may have been anticipated by those responsible for the monument, especially if its base was visible above ground.

Furthermore, it may be significant that only Eve is clothed. While it is possible that this indicates an attempt to convey the full narrative sequence in a single panel, it is a feature emphasised in contemporary poetry. The tenth-century poem *Genesis B*, preserved in the *c.* 1000 Junius II manuscript,[591] prioritises Eve's role as the one persuaded by Satan's agent (disguised as an angel) to eat the fruit, following his failure to entice Adam.[592] After Eve succumbs, the serpent convinces her to persuade Adam to follow suit, to mitigate his wrongdoing in refusing to obey an angel; she accomplishes this with a lengthy speech.[593] These features of the poetic narrative reflect numerous details at Dacre, the most obvious being Eve's clothing, which distinguishes her from the nude Adam. Likewise, her proximity to the serpent, positioned between figure and tree, may be intended to visually reference her role as the first to be deceived. Eve's role as the initial sinner is further emphasised here by her grasp of one of the tree's fruits. This is not mirrored by Adam, who reaches towards an empty branch, failing to clutch its fruit, perhaps signifying his hesitation.

Genesis B also enhances Eve's lament for the consequences of their actions,[594] while in the biblical account she simply admits them.[595] The biblical account further suggests that the pair consume the fruit and simultaneously become aware of their nakedness.[596] Both the poem and carving thus depart significantly from the biblical narrative, suggesting that those responsible for its design may have been aware of the interpretation articulated in the contemporary Old English poem, and chose to reiterate

[590] Ibid., 200-01.
[591] Oxford, Bodleian Library, Junius 11.
[592] *Genesis*, in *Anglo-Saxon Poetry* trans. S.A.J. Bradley, (London: Everyman, 1995), XII, 28-29.
[593] Ibid., XII-XII, 30-32: ll. 655-725.
[594] Ibid., XIII, 33: ll. 765-77.
[595] Gen. 3:13.
[596] Gen. 3:6-7.

it. Certainly, its arrangement highlights the act of the Fall, emphasising the first sin and its consequences, which form an appropriate scheme for public display within an ecclesiastical environment. The themes encompassed here would be recognisable to clerical and lay audiences encountering the monument in this setting, and would be understood to signify the moment that humanity was condemned, only to be subsequently redeemed through Christ's sacrifice on the cross. Consequently, it could be understood to warn against sinful behaviour by underscoring its ramifications, while the shape of the tree and the monumental cross-form selected for its display indicate the possibility of redemption. Given the tenth-century Hiberno-Scandinavian incursions into the northwest contemporary with the monument's erection, its public nature accrues further significance: it would suggest to incoming audiences that redemption is only possible through the Church, a theme underlined in the imagery above.

The upper panel (Fig. 3.4) contains a stag in profile, with its head thrown back, being pursued by a hound whose tail is curled up over its back. Such hart-and-hound motifs appear frequently in art from the Northern Danelaw, with Lang describing this iteration as typical,[597] and Collingwood early pointed to the motif as signifying the persecution of the faithful Christian.[598] Set above is another pair of human figures, possibly nude, surrounded by curled, foliate elements. While it is possible that the figures' garments were distinguished by paint or other applied media, this seems unlikely, given that the sculptor explicitly carved Eve's garments in the panel below. The pair flank a square feature mounted on two discs, over which their hands are clasped; this has been identified as a font standing on two supports, with Calverley arguing that, overall, the scene depicts redemption acquired through baptism.[599] Above the figures is another back-turned beast, which has received little attention, but has nonetheless been interpreted as a horse, or, alternatively, the *Agnus Dei*.[600] Given its extremely stylised nature, these identifications are far from secure. The pair of (naked) figures have, however, attracted considerable interest. *Contra* Calverley, Bailey identified them as depicting the Sacrifice of Isaac, arguing that it formed a counterpart to the Fall, which simultaneously commented on attaining redemption through

[597] Lang, "Sigurd and Weland," 87.
[598] Collingwood, "Sculpture…North Riding," 282; W.G. Collingwood, "Anglian Cross-shafts at Dacre and Kirkby Stephen," *TCWAAS* ser. 2, 12 (1912): 160. See below, 148-49, 153-56.
[599] Calverley, "Note," 229.
[600] Mathews, "Dacre Stone," 226; cf. W.S. Calverley, "Note," 228; Collingwood, "Sculpture…East Riding," 290.

sacrifice and prefigured Christ's sacrifice.[601] Although initially convincing, Alexander rejected this explanation because the iconographic attributes typically included in Isaac's sacrifice are absent, such as the ram, Abraham's sword, the angel or Hand of God preventing the sacrifice.[602] Rather, she argued that the scene may depict Adam and Eve in Paradise before the Fall to emphasise the consequences of Original Sin, indicating that Anglian perceptions of the expulsion from Eden and its significance as the event constituting humanity's Fall persisted in the tenth century.[603] This is supported by the scene's position near the top of the cross-shaft, below the (now missing) cross-head, a location that emphasises the sacred nature of Paradise, and the couple's pre-lapsarian innocence. Her identification also explains the apparent nakedness of the figures, which would be entirely appropriate in such a setting. Furthermore, the panelled arrangement seems to support this identification, with the moulding partitioning the spaces and emulating the barrier to re-entering Paradise after the Fall.

While Alexander's suggestion is compelling, the left-hand figure's unusual pose indicates that an alternative explanation is worth considering. Mathews and Calverley both suggested that it represented baptism: of Constantine's son at the meeting of Athelstan, Owain and Constantine in 926, with the object between the figures representing the font.[604] Although evidence for such an explicit historical reference is circumstantial, it is nevertheless possible that this scene was intended to illustrate baptism, generally, despite the vessel between the two figures having been an implausible choice for the performance of baptism during the tenth century. The feature below the left-hand figure is, however, more convincingly explained as a tub or basin, given its rectangular base and the two vertical protrusions terminating in inwardly-turned spirals, suggesting handles. It certainly 'contains' the figure standing within it, as indicated by the central cut-out, a common means of manipulating planar space in early medieval Insular and Scandinavian art, as attested on the lid of the Franks Casket, the Weland scene on the front (Fig. 3.5a-b) and the lowermost register of the Ardre VIII picture-stone (Fig. 3.6).

A mid-eleventh-century wooden casket also offers a visual parallel in its portrayal of Christ's baptism; it shows Christ in a font whose upper edges terminate in

[601] Bailey, "Meaning of the Viking-age Shaft," 64-67; Bailey, *Viking Age Sculpture*, 173-74.
[602] Alexander, "Visualising the Old Testament," 436.
[603] Ibid., 201.
[604] Mathews, "The Dacre Stone," 227-28; Calverley, "Note," 229.

outward-turning spiral-form handles (Fig. 3.7).[605] Other depictions of baptisms using a font for the performance of this rite feature in the tenth-century miniatures accompanying the text of the Life of St Kilian, which portray the saint performing baptisms in what appears to be a wooden barrel (Fig. 3.8).[606] These two examples appear to be in keeping with the ninth- to twelfth-century tradition of baptismal images that portray partially submerged adults in a range of diverse vessels, including cauldrons, buckets and giant tubs,[607] which may explain both the unusual appearance of the Dacre vessel and why it does not fully contain the figure standing within. The spirals on the Dacre object find an additional analogue in the carved decoration of the early ninth-century stone font from St Mary's, Deerhurst (Gloucs.) (Fig. 3.9).[608] Bailey noted the relative scarcity of this motif – and stone fonts – in Anglo-Saxon England, but argued that its inclusion at Deerhurst was deliberate;[609] its arrangement into eight panels was intended to reference Christ's resurrection and the general resurrection at the eschaton, where redemption would be possible for the baptised.[610] As there are only two spirals at the top of the Dacre vessel, rather than eight, it seems unlikely that it was intended to reference either Christ's or the general resurrection; they are probably better understood as handles on a tub- or basin-font.

No early medieval font (of any type) survives at Dacre, but this does not preclude the possibility that baptisms could have been performed here during the tenth century, given its probable minster status. Carolyn Twomey has further demonstrated that diverse secular and ecclesiastical objects could be used to perform the rite including spoons, bowls, lead tanks and wooden barrels.[611] Of these, the latter two provide the closest analogue to the object depicted on the cross-shaft. Unsurprisingly, no Anglo-Saxon wooden fonts survive in England, though their existence has been inferred by skeuomorphic features found on eleventh- to twelfth-century stone fonts

---

[605] Cleveland Museum of Art, "Wooden Casket: Scenes from the Life of Christ," Cleveland Museum of Art, last modified 2019, accessed February 12, 2019, http://clevelandart.org/art/1953.362#.
[606] Cynthia Hahn, "Picturing the Text: Narrative in the *Life* of the Saints," *Art History* 13, no. 1 (March 1990): 10-12.
[607] John Blair, "The Prehistory of English Fonts," in *Intersections: The Archaeology and History of Christianity in England, 400-1200: Papers in Honour of Martin Biddle and Birthe Kjølbye-Biddle*, ed. Martin Henig and Nigel Ramsay, BAR British Series 505 (Oxford: BAR Publishing, 2010), 155.
[608] Richard N. Bailey, *Anglo-Saxon Sculptures at Deerhurst*, Deerhurst Lecture 2002 (Deerhurst: Friends of Deerhurst Church, 2005), 20-21.
[609] Ibid.
[610] Ibid., 21-23.
[611] Carolyn Twomey, "Living Water, Living Stone: The History and Material Culture of Baptism in Early Medieval England, *c*. 600-1200" (PhD diss., Boston College, 2017), 176. See also: Paul Barnwell, *The Place of Baptism in Anglo-Saxon and Norman Churches*, Deerhurst Lecture 2013 (Deerhurst: Friends of Deerhurst Church, 2014), 2-3.

and in tenth-century manuscript illustrations, such as that of St Kilian.[612] Such skeuomorphic features are also evident on earlier stone fonts, as evidenced by the Deerhurst font, whose splayed drum-shape, flat bottom and slightly tapered thickness reference analogous forms found on wooden tubs or buckets.[613] The skeuomorphic nature of this and other plain stone tub-fonts that featured straight sides and upward tapering forms raise the possibility that wooden tubs were used in this rite, though the shallow inner recess of this type of stone tub-font suggests the possible use of an additional bowl.[614]

Although no lead tanks can be definitively associated with use as vessels for performing baptism, the ritual deposition of some lead tanks suggests that they were potentially used ceremonially, indicating the possibility that they may have been deemed appropriate vessels for baptismal water.[615] These tanks were typically of a moderate size, ranging from 40 to 60 centimetres in diameter and had a drum-shape with vertical ribs or lugs surmounted by iron staples, used for attaching lifting-rings to the top.[616] The arrangement of the handles on such vessels provides a potential analogue to the inwardly-turned spirals depicted at Dacre. Other Anglo-Saxon tanks surviving from the eighth to tenth centuries were large enough to contain a standing individual, however, and the eight triangular panels decorating a ninth-century tank from Cottingham suggest baptismal associations; this number, as Bailey noted, is traditionally associated with the rite.[617]

The cylindrical or drum-shape of lead tanks appears to repudiate the shape of the object represented at Dacre, but this discrepancy does not preclude the possibility that this object may have represented a font, for quadrangular fonts were likely used in Anglo-Saxon England. One potential example is represented by a tenth- to eleventh-century stone font from Bingley (West Yorkshire), which features an outer trapezoidal shape that likely represents a skeuomorph of other trough-shaped objects, and finds a convincing parallel for its shape in a lead tank from Willingdon (Sussex).[618] While almost square, the profile of the Willingdon tank splays outwards to produce a shallow trapezoid and includes remnants of iron staples attached to lead cones on each short

[612] Twomey, "Living Water," 198-99; Barnwell, *Place of Baptism*, 2-3. For further skeuomorphic features of Anglo-Saxon fonts, see Blair, "The Prehistory," 151-57, 160-68.
[613] Blair, "The Prehistory," 155-57.
[614] Ibid., 157.
[615] Ibid., 161.
[616] Ibid., 160.
[617] Twomey, "Living Water," 193-95.
[618] Blair, "The Prehistory," 171-73; Coatsworth, *Western Yorkshire*, 101-02 (Bingley 2).

face, as well as cast decoration that includes explicitly Christian imagery in the form of small crosses.[619] Blair has argued that the iron staples on the Willingdon tank were unlikely to be attachments for ring-handles, but may have been used as handles themselves, or as a fixture for securing a lid using a draw-bar, a feature that would have been used to limit or prevent access to the substance contained inside the tank.[620] The protection of baptismal water was a primary concern of ecclesiastics during the tenth to eleventh centuries,[621] providing a potential explanation for the iron staples on the Willingdon tank as a fixture for securing a lid, if the vessel was in fact used in the performance of baptism. Regardless of its actual function, the trapezoidal shape and placement of the iron staples on this tank and its skeuomorphic relationship to the Bingley font suggest significant visual analogues with baptismal associations for the object depicted at Dacre. Although this object finds no precise visual analogue, the various fonts that could be encountered in the early Middle Ages, including tanks and barrels large enough to accommodate a standing adult, suggest that a baptismal explanation for the Dacre scheme has some merit.

If accepted, the scheme can be understood in the light of baptismal liturgy, the earliest extant procedures for which, in Anglo-Saxon England, are recorded in four eleventh-century manuscripts, whose contents derive from earlier sacramentaries that circulated widely across early medieval Europe.[622] These records are not uniform; they demonstrate that several rituals formed the core of the baptismal rite in the region including instruction, exorcism and anointing of the catechumens; three-fold immersion in water with anointings; re-clothing in white garments; and a final episcopal unction, also known as the confirmation.[623] At Dacre the apparent nudity of the figures in the upper panel was most likely intended to recall the condition of the newly baptised upon emerging from the baptismal waters.[624] The object between them may still be interpreted as an altar, as previously suggested,[625] but its presence here would be intended to reference the mass concluding the baptismal liturgy.[626] The gestures of the two figures reaching toward each other may further reference this

[619] Blair, "The Prehistory," 173.
[620] Ibid.
[621] Ibid., 150.
[622] Twomey, "Living Water," 29-30.
[623] Ibid., 60; Sarah Foot, "'By Water in the Spirit': The Administration of Baptism in Early Anglo-Saxon England," in *Pastoral Care Before the Parish*, ed. John Blair and Richard Sharpe (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1992), 175-79.
[624] Foot, "'By Water,'", 178; Twomey, "Living Water," 47.
[625] Mathews, "The Dacre Stone," 227; Bailey, "Meaning of the Viking-Age Shaft," 64-66.
[626] Foot, "'By Water,'" 178-79; Twomey, "Living Water," 51.

liturgy, where the baptised was handed a lit candle upon emerging from the water.[627] The depiction of these features on a stone monument could encourage the viewer to recall participation in the mass immediately following baptism, while also enabling general contemplation of participating in the Eucharist, which was understood to celebrate Christ's sacrifice as the means by which Salvation could be achieved.[628]

If the Dacre scheme is accepted as depicting a baptism, it would have been pertinent to display it publicly on a monumental cross, as liturgical performances related to baptism were of considerable interest to ninth- and tenth-century Christians. Peter Cramer, for example, demonstrated that ninth- and tenth-century attempts to standardise baptism are evinced in handbooks written and circulating at the time, which recorded the correct processes for performing the rite. He suggested that here, the liturgical performance was emphasised, rather than enabling those participating in baptism to ascribe their own symbolic meanings to the actions and words used in the ceremony.[629] Such emphasis on the symbolism inherent in enacting the liturgy is significant when considering the potential minster context of the Dacre cross, and its role in this monumental landscape. Lay viewers confronted with the scene carved on its upper panel would have been presented with the central elements of the ceremony: the immersion in water and the concluding mass, which would recall their own initiation into the Church. Likewise, encounters may have enabled clerical audiences to recall their own baptism, or depending on their (episcopal) status, those that they may have performed.[630] Moreover, the apparent contemporary emphasis on the performative actions of the baptismal liturgy, supplemented by the public display of its central elements on a Christian monument, might enable those unfamiliar with the rite's lengthy process to better understand it. Given the Scandinavian incursions and settlement coeval with the erection of the Dacre cross, it is possible that lay audiences accessing the monument included Scandinavians who were potentially unfamiliar with the language and actions of the initiation rite; depicting these would make its most significant components explicit, while simultaneously reminding clerical audiences of their mission to convert the new laity.

---

[627] Barnwell, *Place of Baptism*, 10; Twomey, "Living Water," 47.
[628] See, e.g., Hawkes, "Sacraments in Stone," 364-365.
[629] Peter Cramer, *Baptism and Change in the Early Middle Ages, c. 200-c. 1150* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 218.
[630] Alan Thacker, "Monks, Preaching and Pastoral Care in England," in Blair and Sharpe, *Pastoral Care*, 137-38; Foot, "Baptism," 184-85.

If the scheme was thus intended to portray baptism, then the hart-and-hound depicted below may appear unusual. Yet, Bailey identified several potential Christian interpretations for the motif, suggesting that it may represent the Christian pursuit of the sinner within the phenomenon of conversion, and in an interpretation based on Psalms 41 and 90, it may represent the soul attacked by the forces of evil.[631] Either explanation enables it to appropriately complement the baptismal scene above, and both are particularly relevant, given the historical context of the cross. Here, baptism facilitated conversion and initiation into the Church, and the ability to participate in the mass, the two sacraments necessary for Salvation and eternal life.

Bailey, however, offered a third explanation of the hart-and-hound motif, based on Psalm 21, suggesting that the hound's attack may reference Christ's Passion and the redemption to be gained by his sacrifice.[632] If this was the case, the motif's significance may have been reinforced by selecting the monumental cross-form for its display, as the cross-head would unambiguously reference the Crucifixion. Furthermore, placing a potential baptismal scene between the hart-and-hound motif and the cross-head above would have suggested that Salvation could only be achieved through initiation into the Church and subsequent participation in the mass. The Fall, understood as the event that condemned humanity, gave cause for Christ's Incarnation and Passion as the means of their redemption; in turn, baptism could provide a temporary return to Adam and Eve's pre-lapsarian state, by joining the baptised to Christ, the new Adam.[633]

These ideas had long been promulgated in patristic writings, such as Ambrose's *De sacramentis*, which described the transformation achieved through baptism, understood as participation in Christ's resurrection, and which signified a new beginning for all creation.[634] In the baptism scheme, the figures' apparent nudity repeats that of Adam below, offering a clear visual link and suggesting that the upper figures were intended to allude to paradisiacal innocence restored through baptism, or the potential to return to paradise in the afterlife.[635] Given that the sacrament of

[631] Bailey, "Meaning of the Viking-Age Shaft," 68.
[632] Ibid., 69.
[633] Robin M. Jensen, *Baptismal Imagery in Early Christianity: Ritual, Visual and Theological Dimensions* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2012), 177-78.
[634] Ibid. 180. Ambrose, *De Sacramentis*, ed. Otto Faller, LLT (Turnhout: Brepols, 2020), II, 6.16-19. For circulation of this text in the region, see Helmut Gneuss and Michael Lapidge, *Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts: A Bibliographical Handlist of Manuscripts and Manuscript Fragments Written or Owned in England up to 1100* (Toronto: Toronto University Press, 2014), 348-49, 357, 463, 635-36.
[635] Jensen, *Baptismal Imagery*, 181-83.

baptism was early understood as the means to participate in Christ's passion,[636] it is plausible that clerical audiences and laypeople initiated into the Church would have made such connections between the motif, the figural scene above and their display on a monumental cross, which references Christ's Crucifixion, and by extension, his Resurrection: the two events in Christ's life necessary to ensure his Second Coming, and which would ultimately precede the resurrection and judgement at the eschaton. The decision to depict a scheme referencing humanity's condemnation and potential for redemption on a stone cross emphasises the events' significance in a public forum. Furthermore, given that stone is closely associated with the Church of Rome and Christianity, generally, selecting it as the medium to display images of these events underscores their centrality within Christian theology, and their relevance to contemporary Anglo-Scandinavian audiences in the vicinity.

Although fragmentary, the carved remains of the Dacre cross-shaft demonstrate that those responsible for its production belonged to a Christian community, which was probably involved in catering to the needs of those settling, or already settled, in the region – perhaps including those from Ireland.[637] While the settlers may not have required conversion, they may have been perceived to benefit from reminders to participate in the sacraments to achieve redemption. The community at Dacre nonetheless elected to Christianise their landscape by erecting a monument whose form and carvings promoted Christian understandings of condemnation and redemption.

3.3 Middleton 1

The tenth-century Middleton cross (Middleton 1), extracted from the church tower in 1948,[638] is ring-headed, a form apparently introduced from the west after *c.* 920 following the arrival of the Hiberno-Norse.[639] Face A (Fig. 3.10) contains a single panel with the shaft's solitary figural scene: a huntsman carrying a spear, two

[636] Ibid., 138-43.
[637] See, Fiona Edmonds, *Gaelic Influence in the Northumbrian Kingdom: The Golden Age and the Viking Age* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2019), 132-34; Clare Downham, "Religious and Cultural Boundaries Between Vikings and Irish: the Evidence of Conversion," in *The March of the Islands in the Medieval West*, ed. Jennifer Ní Ghradaigh and Emmet O'Byrne (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 15-34; Lesley Abrams, "The Conversion of the Scandinavians of Dublin," *Anglo-Norman Studies* 20 (1997): 1-30.
[638] R.W. Crosland and R.H. Hayes, "Bound Dragon Crosses at Middleton, Pickering," *YAJ* 38 (1955): 453. See Appendix, I.68.
[639] Lang, *York and East Yorkshire*, 182.

vertically arranged profile hounds and a profile stag. The opposing broad face, C, also single panelled, contains a Jellinge-style ribbon beast (Fig. 3.11) shown in composite view: its head in profile and its body shown aerially, segmented by horizontal bindings.

Crosland and Hayes argued that the cross was likely a grave marker, but noted that the slight weathering to its surfaces indicate it probably spent little time outdoors.[640] Yet, this arguably suggests the cross originally stood within the confines of the church, rather than in the graveyard, potentially contradicting their claim that it was a funerary monument. It would certainly affect the potential number of encounters, restricting the audience to those with access to the church interior, further indicating that its iconography may have been intentionally selected and arranged to produce meanings specific to such viewers. If, for the sake of argument, this was the case, the apparently secular carvings of Middleton 1 might be considered unusual within an ecclesiastical context.

Although the cross has been free-standing since 1948, discussions of its imagery have rarely extended beyond stylistic analyses of the beast on C.[641] Indeed, only three attempts have been made to analyse its figural iconography, each focussing on its potential secular or 'pagan' associations. Alan Binns, for instance, claimed that the hunt scene was associated with the stag inhabiting Yggdrasil, described in the Old Norse *Gylfaginning* 16 and *Grímnismál* 33, and possibly held additional cultic significance, though he did not provide any evidence, written or archaeological, to support this hypothesis.[642] Indeed, his claim cannot be substantiated either visually or textually, with only one stag present, compared to the four described in *Gylfaginning* and *Grímnismál*, and it does not stand within a tree.[643]

In his analysis, Lang suggested the stag was likely intended as a death symbol, being considered the noblest of beasts within northern contexts.[644] He further argued for its association with the Sigurd legend, and so heroic significance, rather than

[640] Crosland and Hayes, "Bound Dragon Crosses," 455.
[641] See Collingwood, "Sculpture…East Riding," 299; Kendrick, *Late Saxon*, 94-95; Alan Binns, "Tenth Century Carvings from Yorkshire and the Jelling Style," Universitetet I Bergen Årbok Historisk Antikvarisk Rekke 2 (Bergen: Universitetet i Bergen, 1956): 17-18; James Lang, "Some Late Pre-Conquest Crosses in Ryedale, Yorkshire: A Reappraisal," *JBAA* 36 (1972): 22-23; Bailey, "Hammer and the Cross," 84.
[642] Binns, "Tenth Century Carvings," 22-24.
[643] *Grímnismál*, ed./trans. Ursula Dronke, *The Poetic Edda* 3 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2011): 3:120; *Gylfaginning*, ed. Anthony Faulkes, *Snorri Sturuluson: Edda: Prologue and Gylfaginning* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988), 18-19.
[644] Lang, "Some Late Pre-Conquest Crosses," 20.

religious.[645] Yet, no visual or literary evidence supports this association and, moreover, of all the potential episodes from this lengthy tale, only three – Sigurd slaying the dragon, Sigurd and Reginn roasting the dragon's heart and Gunnar in the Snake pit – have been represented on nine sculptures from Yorkshire.[646] As the Middleton hunt lacks any attributes corresponding to these visual representations, it seems unlikely that any heroic significance associated with this legend was intended. Nevertheless, Lang also observed that as the scheme displays a full hunting scene (rather than the abbreviated hart-and-hound motif), it may have amalgamated Christian symbolism with the stag's death to represent the death of the noblest, here complementing the status of the monument's patron.[647] While this explanation does not extend beyond the scheme's potential representation of contemporary secular or heroic ideals, it does acknowledge that the monument's form could invoke Christian frames of reference and inform understandings of its iconography, concepts entirely absent from the third, most recent iconographic study by Ronald Murphy.

In this analysis, Murphy, maintaining the absence of biblical or monastic pictorial traditions, suggested that the scheme on A must be interpreted as a simple hunting scene,[648] although he went on to argue that it actually represents Odin defending himself from Fenrir at Ragnarök, with another wolf, Garm, also running loose.[649] This interpretation is unsupported by the carvings themselves; it is clear from the hounds' downward-facing arrangement on the shaft, depicted as if on different planes, that they pursue the stag. When the spatial arrangement of the hunter is also considered, he thus stands behind the stag. The larger scale and central placement of the hunter and stag further suggest that the hunt's objective is the stag's capture, rather than an attack on the two diminutive and peripheral hounds. Comparable carved hunting scenes further demonstrate that the stag forms the focus of the hunt, rather than the hounds.[650]

Nevertheless, Murphy went on to explain the cross in treelike terms, its arms representing branches intended to recall Yggdrasil and its redemptive function as a shelter for the last man and woman during Ragnarök.[651] Expanding on this, he

[645] Ibid., 20-21.
[646] Doviak, "What has Sigurd," 168.
[647] Lang, "Some Late Pre-Conquest Crosses," 21.
[648] G. Ronald Murphy, *Tree of Salvation: Yggdrasil and the Cross in the North* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 104.
[649] Ibid., 108-110.
[650] See above, 148-49.
[651] Murphy, *Tree of Salvation*, 110.

determined that at Ragnarök, Yggdrasil presents an analogue to the cross of the Crucifixion, prefiguring the Christian event, further explaining and commenting upon its mysteries.[652] In the absence of trees carved anywhere on the shaft, this association depends solely on the cross-head signifying Christ's Crucifixion. Conflation of the Middleton cross with Yggdrasil is problematic for numerous reasons, not least of which is the omission of any foliate motifs. Furthermore, it suggests that its imagery should be understood exclusively within 'pagan' frames of reference. The (over)emphasis on such associations disregards the monumental format chosen by the patrons or designers: that of the cross. Considered alongside the possibility that it may have stood within a church interior, the deliberate selection of the cross-form suggests that the carvings not only *can* be understood within Christian frames of reference, but that perhaps its patrons intended that they *should* be.

Murphy's affiliation of the monument with Yggdrasil also neglects consideration of its medium (stone) and its symbolic associations. There is an Anglian sculptural fragment at Middleton,[653] which its Viking-age occupants would probably have encountered, possibly in its complete form, suggesting that they elected to adopt the previously established tradition of erecting stone monuments with carved decoration. As noted, stone was understood as a material associated with Christian ecclesiastical environments, and so was instilled with Christian meanings and would have been particularly resonant within a built environment that largely consisted of timber structures.[654] Furthermore, its associations with the Church of Rome, and the enduring nature of Christianity,[655] suggest that stone – selected, dressed and carved into the cross-form – was intended to integrate the Middleton cross into a larger network of Christian monuments, and more specifically, the Church (of Rome) and its liturgical and theological traditions. If the Middleton patrons had intended their monument to encourage viewers to recall Yggdrasil and its associations with Ragnarök, wood might have been deemed a more suitable medium for facilitating this analogue. The selection of stone was unlikely to have been an impulsive, spontaneous choice, but rather, one made deliberately to situate this monument within a particular (Christian) monumental network and its associated religious milieu, despite the apparently secular nature of its carvings.

---

[652] Ibid., 107-109.
[653] Middleton 9: Lang, *York and East Yorkshire*, 187.
[654] See Introduction, 68-69, 73-78.
[655] See Introduction, 73-74.

The secular associations of the hunt scene have been noted,[656] along with its apparent similarity to a scheme preserved on Stonegrave 7, a fragmentary tenth-century recumbent grave cover, now badly weathered and installed in the church floor (Fig. 3.12).[657] Here, the action is depicted on a single horizontal plane, rather than the multi-planar arrangement of the vertical panel at Middleton, and its iconography has thus been associated with the 'hart-and-hound motif' characteristic of northern English contexts, which Lang assumed implied a Norse-Irish cultural milieu.[658] Unlike the Middleton scheme, however, no hounds accompany the Stonegrave hunter. Furthermore, although both scenes appear to represent similar activities, the hunters use different weapons to achieve their aims; Crosland and Hayes observed that the spear held by the Middleton figure is of a winged type, presenting ninth- and tenth-century Scandinavian parallels and affinities with those depicted in the later Bayeux tapestry, perhaps implying more localised Anglo-Scandinavian influences.[659]

The distinctive multi-planar arrangement at Middleton has also received comment, with the observation that many Anglo-Scandinavian carvings organise features on different planes for no apparent reason.[660] The Middleton arrangement, however, demonstrates that the scene was adapted to fit the vertical constraints of a cross-shaft, with the human figure and stag arranged on horizontal planes, and the pursuing hounds on a vertical one. Here, planar manipulation emphasises the activity and movement of the figure and beasts, which would be impossible if they were arranged on separate horizontal registers. It may have been further enhanced by applying additional media to the surface. For instance, although each of the figures appear on a separate plane, colour could have been applied to indicate ground lines and unify the scene by presenting the huntsman and animals on the same plane(s). Traces of red paint preserved on Middleton 3 (Fig. 3.13), another fragmentary cross, demonstrate that sculpture at this site was painted, while analyses of the Lichfield angel and Fishergate fragments illustrate how it could be used to achieve subtle effects or emphasise particular elements of a carving.[661] Moreover, the Stonegrave hunt indicates that the subject could be portrayed on a single horizontal plane, when used to

[656] Lang, *York and East Yorkshire*, 37.
[657] Ibid., 219-20.
[658] Ibid., 219.
[659] Crosland and Hayes, "Bound Dragon Crosses," 453.
[660] Bailey, *Cheshire and Lancashire*, 86.
[661] See Introduction, 69-70.

decorate a different (recumbent) monumental form, further implying that the cross-form was deliberately chosen for displaying the Middleton scheme.

As noted, Bailey analysed the hart-and-hound at Dacre,[662] which, like that at Middleton, depicts a short-legged hound with a curled tail, standing above a highly stylised stag with wedge-shaped limbs. The hunter and second hound at Middleton are absent from Dacre, where the beasts lack the more naturalistic modelling of the Middleton animals. At Dacre, however, the hart and hound occur within a clear Christian context rendering the hart a recognisable Christian symbol, known to Christian audiences as an enemy of the snake, which enabled it to signify Christ, and Christians more generally.[663] This aspect of the hart may have further implications for understanding the iconographic programme of Middleton 1. It may, for instance, explain the juxtaposition of the hunt scene on A with the serpentine-dragon creature on C.

The segments crossing this creature's body suggest that it is bound, a notion already accepted in interpretations of the analogous creature on C of Middleton 2 (Fig. 3.14).[664] While the beast on Middleton 1 may have been purely decorative, as is usually intimated in the scholarship, it fills an entire broad face of the cross-shaft, suggesting that it may well have carried some symbolic significance: perhaps as a representation of a bound creature with evil associations. Several accounts reference the binding of just such a being, the devil, with that in 2 Peter 2:4 warning against false prophets by recalling the punishment of the fallen angels, who were drawn into hell by ropes to await judgement. Similarly, Jude 1:6 advises against denying Christ, and references the angels' punishment of being kept in darkness and bound by everlasting chains, until Judgement Day. These accounts articulate the fate of those who denied Christ and the Word of God, something that is further referenced in Revelation 20:2, where Satan, described as a dragon and a serpent, is bound for a millennium. This passage resonates with the serpentine form and body – crossed by bands that potentially represent bindings – of the Middleton creature.

Bailey's analysis of the Dacre hart-and-hound motif, which drew upon an illustration for Psalm 41 in the early ninth-century Utrecht Psalter (Fig. 3.15) and early Christian exegesis on Psalm 90,[665] also prompts other possible explanations of the

[662] See above, 148-49; Appendix, I.27; Bailey and Cramp, *Cumberland, Westmorland*, 92.
[663] See above, 148-49; Bailey, "Meaning of the Viking-Age Shaft," 68.
[664] Thompson, *Dying and Death*, 149.
[665] Bailey, "Meaning of the Viking-Age Shaft," 68.

Middleton iconographic programme. The Utrecht Psalter illustration shows the hart seeking a spring, pursued by two hounds not featured in the text of the psalm, leading Bailey to claim that the hounds were intended to symbolise evil,[666] perhaps explaining the presence of the two hounds at Middleton. This depiction, however, lacks the spring, and the psalm does not fully explain the hunter's presence. Although the psalm cannot fully illuminate the Middleton scene, it nonetheless suggests that the hunter and two hounds pursuing the stag might signify pursuit of the soul.

Bailey also argued that the Utrecht illustration accompanying the plea for freedom from the huntsman's snare in Psalm 90 depicted a hart pursued by a horseman with two hounds, while a commentary attributed to Bede described the hunter and his hounds as devils.[667] In the Dacre scheme he thus suggested that the hart and hound represent the soul attacked by forces of evil.[668] The psalter arrangement of a horseman with two hounds pursuing a stag might resonate more closely with the Middleton depiction, although here the horseman has been replaced by an unmounted huntsman. The attribution of the commentary expounding on the psalm to Bede explains how the concept of the soul pursued by evil circulated in Anglo-Saxon England prior to Scandinavian settlement, while the psalms' apparent popularity imply that they remained a familiar element of ecclesiastical thinking post-settlement.[669] The Middleton scene, although initially ambiguous, might therefore be best understood (from a Christian point of view) as a conflation of these two Psalms, which encompass similar themes of the wicked in pursuit of the soul. Illustrations of these concepts would be appropriate on a public monument, particularly one taking the form of a cross, its head enabling a viewer to recall the Crucifixion, the sacrificial event on which humankind's salvation is predicated. With this in mind, a depiction of the soul pursued by evil could suggest to the viewer that salvation, or deliverance from the hunter and his hounds, was made possible by Christ's Crucifixion. Furthermore, if the fettered, serpentine dragon on C is intended to portray evil/the devil bound, awaiting judgement and eternal binding at Christ's Second Coming, it would present a relevant juxtaposition to the Christian soul saved from evil by Christ's sacrifice. In this reading, the bound devil is depicted as a serpentine creature that may reference the hart's snake adversary, potentially suggesting to the viewer the punishment awaiting

[666] Ibid.
[667] Ibid.; Bede (attr.), "In Psalmum XC. Laus cantici David," *PL* 93, ed. J-P. Migne (Paris: Prope Portam Vulgo *D'Enfer* Nominatum Seu Petit-Montrouge, 1850), 971.
[668] Bailey, "Meaning of the Viking-Age Shaft," 68.
[669] Ibid.

those who deny Christ. The conflated image of Psalms 41 and 90 on A would imply an alternative fate to that of the serpentine dragon: salvation from evil, made possible by Christ's Crucifixion and acceptance of the significance of his sacrifice.

Overall, the Middleton cross combines Scandinavian stylistic tastes and secular pastimes with a Christian monumental form, and a medium carrying ecclesiastical associations. Any potential Christian significance accrued by its carvings is mediated by the cross-form selected for their display, its cross-head uniting the apparently disparate carvings of its two broad faces. This enables its images to be understood within multivalent frames of reference, facilitated by their ambiguous appearance. For instance, that carved on A represents a hunt, a secular activity potentially associated with the Middleton patron's status, but which can be simultaneously perceived as a commentary on accepting Christ as the means to salvation. When viewed in relation to the bound beast on C, the potential symbolic significance(s) of the scene on A are supplemented by the concept of salvation from evil, made possible by Christ's Crucifixion. Presented within multivalent frames of reference, the Middleton carvings denote a central tenet of Christianity, that of salvation through Christ, which would have accrued relevance within the contemporary context of conversion and Christianisation. Here, the images' multivalent potential is only accessible by simultaneously engaging with the monumental cross-form, its medium and carved images – and their collective effect on, or response to, the monument's surrounding environs, in this case, perhaps a church interior, but would not be inappropriate on a grave-marker denoting the expectations of, or hopes for, the deceased.

3.4 The Alnmouth Cross

Of the monuments discussed here, the fragmentary Alnmouth cross has received the most scholarly attention, although the studies tend to focus on its runic inscriptions.[670] These are consequently emphasised in its current display in the Great North Museum (Newcastle), where the cross-shaft's solitary figural scene (on A) receives limited lighting (Fig. 3.16), contrasting with the brightly lit condition of the opposite broad

[670] Bruce Dickins and Alan S.C. Ross, "The Alnmouth Cross," *JEGP* 39, no. 2 (1940); R.I. Page, "Runes and Non-Runes," in *Medieval Literature and Civilisation: Studies in Memory of G.N. Garmonsway*, ed. D.A. Pearsall and R.A. Waldron (London: Athlone Press, 1969), 34; Elizabeth Okasha, *Hand-List of Anglo-Saxon Non-Runic Inscriptions* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971), 47-48; See Appendix, I.2.

face (C) (Fig. 3.17), which contains the most complete inscription. The cross dates to the late ninth to early tenth century, and continues the Anglian tradition of organising carvings into panels.[671] The figural decoration comprises a single panel depicting a Crucifixion, with the sun and moon shown above each arm of the cross, whose base is decorated with five registers of interlace. This feature is significant, finding only one Anglo-Saxon analogue on a ninth-century crucifixion panel from Romsey (Hants.) (Fig. 3.18).[672] In the Alnmouth scheme, Christ is supported by a *suppedaneum*, with two attendant figures below the cross-arms, and Stephaton and Longinus standing beneath them. Above the Crucifixion panel is a (fragmentary) horizontal inscription in Anglo-Saxon capitals which only retains [-V-], leaving the language uncertain.[673]

Face B contains two further fragmentary inscriptions of uncertain language, rendered in Anglo-Saxon capitals and interspersed between runs of interlace. The uppermost reads [S]AV, and probably had a second line.[674] The upper line of the second inscription below reads [. A]DV, and the lower LFESD. Elizabeth Okasha suggested that these were possibly a memorial inscription that might be translated as "the soul of Eadvlf-".[675] The inscription on C, also set between registers of interlace, is arranged horizontally and reads M[Y]REDaH·mEH·wO in Anglo-Saxon capitals and Old English runes; it is assumed to read "Myredah made me".[676] Following earlier work by Bruce Dickins and Alan Ross, Okasha argued that the name Myredah likely derives from the Old Irish "Muiredach",[677] while Raymond Page noted that it is not otherwise found in Old English sources, implying a late tenth-century date for the Alnmouth cross.[678] In other words, the inscribed name has been used as a diagnostic dating feature, much like the wheel- and ring-heads of other Anglo-Scandinavian crosses.

Yet, this rests on the assumption that those with Irish personal names can only have arrived in Anglo-Saxon England after the Hiberno-Norse expulsion from Dublin, and fails to account for potentially itinerant sculptors. Moving away from such

---

[671] Cramp, *County Durham and Northumberland*, 161-62; Kendrick, "Late Saxon Sculpture," 4; Kendrick, *Late Saxon*, 58.
[672] Elizabeth Coatsworth, "The Crucifixion of the Alnmouth Cross," *Archaeologia Aeliana*, ser. 5, 5 (1977): 200.
[673] Cramp, *County Durham and Northumberland*, 161.
[674] Ibid.
[675] Okasha, *Hand-List*, 47-48. The other narrow face (D) displays a key pattern, succeeded by two panels containing two registers of interlace.
[676] Cramp, *County Durham and Northumberland*, 161.
[677] Dickins and Ross, "The Alnmouth Cross," 170-173; Okasha, *Hand-List*, 48.
[678] R.I. Page, *An Introduction to English Runes* (London: Methuen & Co., 1973), 153; Bailey, *Viking Age Sculpture*, 52.

concerns, Page recognised that the Alnmouth inscriptions use only occasional runes and otherwise employ the Roman alphabet, in a manner analogous to that of the Franks Casket inscriptions.[679] Furthermore, the Alnmouth inscriptions utilize word divisions, but their lines end when space has run out, leading Page to argue that those responsible for them did not apply careful planning.[680] However, it provides a fractured reading experience analogous to that engendered by the Franks Casket inscriptions; the arrangement induces the viewer to seek the next portion of a word, which might not be located on the same horizontal band. In turn, this causes the viewer's eye to move over the carved surface of the cross, enabling them to fully engage with the monument and its textual and iconographic programmes. Here, applied media, such as paint or metal, could have been used to highlight the incised inscriptions, making them more prominent and facilitating a smoother reading experience. Different pigments could also have been used to distinguish or separate words, facilitating the search for the remaining portion of a word split across bands.

It nevertheless remains the case that that while the inscriptions have enjoyed considerable attention, very little has been paid to the Crucifixion.[681] The scholarly preoccupation with the inscriptions and their potential reconstructions is somewhat puzzling, given that their fragmentary nature offers little insight to the overall iconographic programme of the cross. The lack of connection between text and image contrasts with the function of inscriptions on earlier monuments or objects, such as the Ruthwell cross or Franks Casket, which worked in tandem with the images. Rather, the Alnmouth inscriptions seem to perform a dedicatory, memorial function, rather than an intertextual one. This assumes audience familiarity with the Crucifixion and its associated symbolic significance.

Thus, the Alnmouth inscriptions' potential memorial function might be significant for recovering the meaning of the figural iconography. One reason for the veneration of the cross, as Barbara Raw argued, was the desire for protection at the moment of death.[682] If the text on B was commemorative, it may suggest the patron's motive for selecting the Crucifixion: it functions as a request for protection in the afterlife, through veneration of the cross. This would further imply that the patron(s)

[679] Page, *An Introduction*, 35
[680] Ibid., 157-58.
[681] See Elizabeth Coatsworth, "The Iconography of the Crucifixion in pre-Conquest sculpture in England" (doctoral thesis, Durham University, 1979), 11.
[682] Barbara Raw, *Anglo-Saxon Crucifixion Iconography and the Art of the Monastic Revival* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 62.

deemed the scene significant enough to be the sole figural depiction on the cross, and consciously considered its placement within the overall programme to encourage a response among its anticipated viewers. Coatsworth also argued that it was intended to face West, on the assumption that the monument stood at the head of an East-West oriented grave,[683] which would affect the way potential viewers would encounter the monument. It implies that, depending on their approach, the Crucifixion scene, when viewed first, would be more likely to inspire contemplation than the decoration of the other faces. If the shaft was aligned East-West, the viewer's experience of its carvings would be affected by the sun's movement, with the shaft's eastern face brightly illuminated earlier in the day, and its western face (containing the Crucifixion scene) receiving more sunlight during the afternoon and evening. This does not, however, imply that the Crucifixion scene was illegible at other times of day; rather, it suggests that certain features would have been variably visible, particularly if additional media were applied to the stone's surface. For instance, the carved interlace decoration of Christ's cross-base could have been enhanced with applied materials, such as metal or gemstones. If applied here, these materials would be greatly enhanced by direct sunlight, and could enable the viewer to simultaneously contemplate Christ's Crucifixion and the jewelled cross of his Second Coming.

Such considerations remain hypothetical; however, it is evident that the Alnmouth Crucifixion contains several unconventional features. Collingwood, for instance, identified the spear and sponge bearers, but failed to identify the two figures beneath the cross.[684] In late Anglo-Saxon manuscripts depicting Crucifixions the main figures are usually limited to three, with a preference for Mary and John accompanying the Crucified,[685] indicating that the four figures surrounding the cross at Alnmouth present an unusual arrangement. In John's gospel Christ's conversation with Mary is recounted along with the post-mortem wounds.[686] As this conversation is recorded only in John's gospel, and the pair of figures depicted above Stephaton and Longinus wear short tunics, rather than the long garments used to portray Mary in this period, they may not depict Mary and John. Moreover, one of them seems to be turning away, an improbable action for a figure supposed to be conversing with, witnessing or attendant on the crucified Christ, further making Mary and John's

[683] Coatsworth, "Iconography of the Crucifixion," 99.
[684] Collingwood, *Northumbrian Crosses*, 62.
[685] Raw, *Anglo-Saxon Crucifixion Iconography*, 91.
[686] Ibid., 92-3.

presence unconvincing. Neither figure is nimbed to suggest divine or saintly status, as is the case at Romsey, further rendering their identification as John and Mary questionable. The tenth-century cross-shaft from Kirkby Wharfe (W. Yorks.) shows Mary and John flanking a cross; both are nimbed and Mary is distinguished by her long garment, suggesting that this was an accepted iconographic means of depicting these figures in the Northern Danelaw.[687]

Alternative explanations for the Alnmouth pair include a (doubtful) identification of the two thieves, or Ecclesia and Synagogue.[688] It is reasonable to assume that they do not represent the thieves, as neither is suspended from a cross. Although it is possible that breaks in the stone have obscured the arms of their crosses, the figures stand in profile and lack a vertical rectilinear outline surrounding their legs. Given this, Coatsworth argued that, if intended to represent Ecclesia and Synagogue, the sculptor misunderstood how they are typically represented: as robed females carrying identifying attributes. Apart from their attributes, these allegorical figures, which began to be depicted as early as *c.* 830, are also identifiable by their typical arrangement to either side of the cross, with Ecclesia standing on Christ's right, facing him, and Synagogue on the left, turning away from the cross.[689] While the Alnmouth pair generally conform to this arrangement, neither figure seems to carry an attribute and nor are they depicted wearing long garments.

Despite this, Coatsworth compared the Alnmouth scheme to a group of ninth- and tenth-century ivories from the Metz school, arguing that they share the same general arrangement, with the sun and moon above Christ's cross and two registers of figures beneath it, with the upper pair typically being Ecclesia and Synagogue.[690] One panel, dated to *c.* 1000, depicts an arrangement analogous to that at Alnmouth. Here, Christ stands on a *suppedaneum*, while the cross rests upon a column decorated with vines (Fig. 3.19). At Alnmouth, a similar feature may well have been re-imagined and expressed in a vernacular visual language, as a cross-shaft decorated with interlace to remind potential viewers of Christ's Crucifixion, as well as the monumental cross before which they stood, and the individual it commemorated. The Alnmouth and

[687] Coatsworth, *Western Yorkshire*, 185-187. See Appendix, I.55.
[688] Coatsworth, "Iconography of the Crucifixion," 88.
[689] Ibid., 210; Gertrude Schiller, *Iconography of Christian Art* 2, trans. Janet Seligman (London: Lund Humphries, 1972), 110-113.
[690] Coatsworth, "Crucifixion of the Alnmouth Cross," 200-201. Coatsworth, "Iconography of the Crucifixion," 212-13; Rosemary Cramp and Roger Miket, *Catalogue of the Anglo-Saxon and Viking Antiquities in the Museum of Antiquities, Newcastle upon Tyne* (Newcastle: University of Newcastle upon Tyne, 1982), 14.

Metz schemes share further features: roundels surrounding the sun and moon, and two registers of figures below the cross-arms. On the ivory, however, the upper register contains four figures, rather than the lower. Ecclesia and Synagogue flank Christ,[691] with the figure on Christ's left turned away and holding a staff with a pennant, and that on the right holding a chalice. Although breaks in the Alnmouth panel have obscured any potential attributes the figures may have carried, their general arrangement aligns with the Metz figures, and other depictions of Ecclesia and Synagogue. Yet, the short tunics of the Alnmouth figures may imply that they were not intended to represent these personifications explicitly, suggesting deliberate ambiguity was intended.

It is thus worth considering the potential implications of such continental borrowings. If the Alnmouth scheme was adapted from earlier Carolingian models, it suggests that those responsible for it intended to publicly present associations with the Holy Roman empire, and by extension, the Church of Rome. Furthermore, its presentation on a monumental cross suggests that explicit aspects of its arrangement appealed to its patron, indicating the possibility that they intended it to invoke specific liturgical and theological concepts associated with these institutions: namely, the veneration of the cross. It suggests that the patron or sculptor, conscious of the symbolic significance of the scene, selected a group of figures that, of all those potentially available to them, could achieve a particular response from their intended audience. When viewed in the context of mid- to late ninth-century liturgical and theological developments, and contemporary, analogous Anglo-Scandinavian figural schemes, the combination of figures depicted at Alnmouth belongs to a wider iconographic and theological tradition associated with the veneration of the cross.

Contemporary Crucifixion schemes with ambiguous profile attendant figures, shown facing and sometimes grasping the cross, occur on other late ninth- to tenth-century Anglo-Saxon cross-shafts, such as Nunburnholme, Halton, Bakewell and possibly at Kirklevington and Lindisfarne.[692] Those at Alnmouth are unique amongst this group, with one of the figures facing *away* from the cross, suggesting its

[691] Musee de la Cour D'Or, "Medieval Binding Testimony of the work on ivory in Metz," *Metz Metropole*, last modified 2018, accessed June 28, 2018, http://musee.metzmetropole.fr/en/mediaeval-collections/medieval-binding-testimony-of-the-work-on-ivory-in-metz_-r.html#.WzTJe9JKjD4.
[692] Lang, *York and East Yorkshire,* 189-93 (Nunburnholme); Ch.4, 190-208; Appendix, I.75. Bailey, *Cheshire and Lancashire*, 177-83 (Halton); Ch.5, 237-54; Appendix, I.39. Hawkes and Sidebottom, *Derbyshire and Staffordshire*, 105-13 (Bakewell). Lang, *Northern Yorkshire*, 143-44 (Kirklevington 4); Appendix, I.59. Cramp, *County Durham and Northumberland*, 197-98 (Lindisfarne 8); Appendix, I.66.

iconographic significance may hinge on this apparent anomaly. The importance of this figure is further underlined by its position within the overall scheme.

The sun and moon also occur in late eighth to mid-eleventh century Anglo-Saxon and continental Crucifixion schemes in various media,[693] indicating that they circulated widely. In the iconographic tradition exemplified by the continental ivories and a late ninth-century example from Lindisfarne, the moon is depicted above the left cross-arm.[694] It seems reasonable to assume that the moon occupies the same position at Alnmouth, given its late ninth- to tenth-century date and the features it shares with the continental examples: meaning it was placed above the figure turned away from the cross.

This presence of the sun and moon strongly suggests the intention to reference the liturgical ceremonies celebrated during Holy Week, and the eclipse that occurred at Christ's death and/or the role of the sun and moon as cosmic witnesses to the death of the creator.[695] While the eclipse is recorded in Mark 15:33 and Luke 23:44-45, the account provided in Matthew 27:45-54 is the most detailed, and includes apocalyptic portents of saints emerging from their tombs and the recognition of Christ's divinity, revealed at this moment. The sun and moon at Alnmouth thus provide historical detail that references the precise moment of Christ's death, in keeping with contemporary concerns about humanity's redemption.[696] They may, however, have held additional symbolic significance. Matthew's account of the eclipse suggests a connection between the moment of Christ's death and his Second Coming, with the saints emerging from their tombs apparently intended to anticipate the final resurrection. This may suggest that the Alnmouth sun and moon were also understood to look forward to the eschaton – something further underscored by contemporary liturgical rites.

The Anglo-Saxon liturgy of Holy Week was informed by sophisticated understandings of light and darkness, with the expectation that those participating in the ceremonies awaited Christ's light in "sin-inspired darkness", a feature that also

[693] Escomb 7; Lindisfarne 37; Bradbourne 1; Aycliffe; Sandbach 1. See further, Celia Chazelle, *The Crucified God in the Carolingian Era: Theology and Art of Christ's Passion* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 266-292.
[694] Cramp, *County Durham and Northumberland*, 206-207 (Lindisfarne 37). See also: Bailey, *Cheshire and Lancashire*, 99-113 (Sandbach); Cramp, *County Durham and Northumberland*, 79 (Escomb 7); cf. Coatsworth, "Iconography of the Crucifixion," 41-43; Cramp, *County Durham and Northumberland*, 41-43 (Aycliffe 1), 68-69 (Durham 5). For Aycliffe 1, see Appendix, I.3.
[695] Raw, *Anglo-Saxon Crucifixion Iconography*, 135-36; Hawkes, *Sandbach Crosses*, 45-46.
[696] Chazelle, *Crucified God*, 142.

dominated Carolingian celebrations, particularly the *Tenebrae, Adoratio crucis* and Easter Vigils.[697] *Tenebrae,* practised on the Continent during the ninth century, is recorded in the late tenth-century Anglo-Saxon *Regularis Concordia*. Its liturgical performance involved the ritual extinguishing of lights in the church, understood explicitly to anticipate Christ's light being extinguished at his death on the cross.[698] The church was deliberately left in its darkened state on the Thursday, Friday and Saturday preceding Easter, to instil terror of the darkness within those participating in the ceremony, and consequently, to anticipate and exaggerate the light of Christ's Resurrection.[699]

The complexity of this rite goes some way to explaining why the sun and moon were consciously included in the Alnmouth depiction. They not only refer literally to the eclipse occurring at Christ's death, but also reflect contemporary liturgical ceremonies that exploited the interplay of light and dark to express explicit theological concepts that emphasised the connections between darkness, Christ's humanity and death on the cross. These factors enabled the revelation of his divinity, suggested in Matthew, and the liturgical associations made between light, and Christ's divinity revealed at the Resurrection. At Alnmouth, these associations are further supplemented by the pair of figures below the cross-arms. That facing the cross apparently recognises Christ's divinity, associated with light, and revealed through his sacrifice at the Crucifixion, with its placement below the sun. Conversely, that facing away from the cross, beneath the moon, is associated with Christ's humanity, death and darkness. This arrangement points further to the liturgy of the *Adoratio crucis*, where the interplay of light and dark formed a significant component.

The *Adoratio crucis* was performed from at least the eighth century as part of the Holy Week liturgy, where it followed the *Tenebrae* and was celebrated on Good Friday, its collects explicitly referencing the scriptural accounts that associated Christ's death on the cross with darkness.[700] The collects also established connections between Christ's death and his divinity, and the darkness and light, which associated Christ's light with the Cross, apparently conflating the two to suggest that the light emanated from the Cross itself.[701] The *Adoratio crucis* shared features with earlier

[697] M. Bradford Bedingfield, *The Dramatic Liturgy of Anglo-Saxon England* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2002), 114-15; Chazelle, *Crucified God*, 28-29.
[698] Bedingfield, *Dramatic Liturgy*, 118-120.
[699] Ibid., 119-121.
[700] Ibid., 123.
[701] Ibid.

liturgical ceremonies, the *Exaltatio* and *Inventio crucis*, which were included within Good Friday celebrations in Anglo-Saxon England from at least the early to mid-eighth century, and are referenced in the iconography of the Ruthwell cross.[702] For instance, the *Adoratio* emphasised Christ's divine victory and associated the act of adoration with Christ's humiliation and death as the means of redeeming humanity's sins; in the liturgical performance, those participating imitated Christ by prostrating themselves before the cross.[703] This may explain why ancillary figures wearing short garments – apparently alluding to their secular status – were included in the Alnmouth scheme, with one turned toward the cross. Although the tenth-century rite preserved in the *Regularis Concordia* was produced in a monastic context, it records lay participation in the ritual and includes Old English glosses.[704] These may underscore its significance in the liturgical calendar and suggest vernacular interest,[705] something perhaps reflected by the apparently secular attendant figures at Alnmouth. The *Adoratio*, as performed in Anglo-Saxon England, also included a ritual elevation and unveiling of the cross, accompanied by prayers that drew attention to Christ's presence on the cross.[706] Those responsible for the Alnmouth cross may have consciously arranged the left-hand figure beneath the sun to face the cross, recalling such liturgical acts. This makes Christ present for that figure, and for any viewers that may have encountered the Alnmouth cross.

While the Alnmouth scheme reflects an interest in the veneration of the cross, this does not fully explain why one of the ancillary figures turns away from Christ's crucifixion. Other aspects of the *Adoratio* and exegetical texts may nevertheless elucidate this; Celia Chazelle has demonstrated that the *Adoratio* emphasises celebrating the anniversary of Christ's death, rather than his divinity and victory.[707] Here, Christ's death is the essential condition of his victory, and the subsequent reunification of the faithful with God at the Last Judgment.[708] This may indicate that the Alnmouth scheme was also intended to anticipate the eschaton, on the understanding that it was Christ's death that enabled his Second Coming. In the Anglo-Saxon *Adoratio*, the power of the Cross was often conflated with Christ's

[702] Ó Carragáin, *Ritual and the Rood*, 180.
[703] Chazelle, *Crucified God*, 163.
[704] Bradford Bedingfield, *Dramatic Liturgy*, 126-32.
[705] Ibid., 129-30.
[706] Ibid., 127-28.
[707] Chazelle, *Crucified God*, 152.
[708] Ibid., 164.

power, and expressed in terms of light conquering darkness.[709] At Alnmouth, the sun and moon depicted above the cross reference the moment of Christ's death, simultaneously recalling the light of his divinity revealed at the Resurrection, and so further anticipate his Second Coming. Moreover, from the mid-ninth century, the *Adoratio* emphasised the inner vision of the Crucified, a development derived from scriptural references associated with the witness of Christ's Second Coming and the final resurrection.[710] Together, these features indicate how the figure gazing at Christ's cross may have been understood by contemporary viewers, and by extension, how they may have understood their own action of gazing at the Alnmouth cross.

The figure on the right turning away from the cross, however, may be explained by Hincmar's *Ad simplices*, a ninth-century exegetical text that quotes passages from Gregory the Great and Bede. It argues for a distinction between the corporeal vision of God granted to the damned and that of the blessed, which diverges from bodily sight, being superior to earthly vision.[711] Considered in the light of this, along with the liturgical juxtaposition of darkness and sin with light and redemption, the arrangement of each of the Alnmouth figures beneath the sun and the moon provides further evidence of an eschatological component to the scheme. Indeed, in *Ad simplices* Hincmar explicitly draws comparisons between light and darkness, sight and blindness and the blessed and damned,[712] suggesting that those responsible for the Alnmouth cross intended to publicly display these themes. Such concepts clearly underpinned his arguments, for, as Chazelle has demonstrated, they contain

> the conviction that grace is there for all mortals, but each person must turn to God or Christ in faith, as towards a vision or source of light that anyone may see who desires to do so, and remain turned towards that 'sight' in order to receive this gift. As is asserted in *Ad simplices*, the person obedient to the command of Psalm 33.6 ('Come ye to him and be enlightened') is the 'son of the promise'. Whoever 'averts his eyes from the light', however, 'surely does no harm to the light but will condemn himself to the shadows' and be alienated from salvation.[713]

[709] Bradford Bedingfield, *Dramatic Liturgy*, 128.
[710] Chazelle, *Crucified God*, 296-98.
[711] Ibid., 192.
[712] Ibid., 193.
[713] Ibid.

Overall, the Alnmouth scheme thus seems to represent a literal, visual interpretation of these concepts, with the left-hand figure's arrangement beneath the sun implying that those who receive Christ's light will be blessed and 'see' him in divine glory at the Second Coming. Conversely, the right-hand figure standing beneath the moon faces away from the cross, implying the darkness of sin and eternal damnation.

If this monument was indeed intended to be commemorative with inscriptions requesting prayer, such themes of revelation and redemption would be entirely appropriate. It may additionally suggest that the inscriptions and carved Crucifixion scheme were deliberately paired: its patrons intended for those who encountered it to draw associations between the vernacular Old English inscription, the carved Crucifixion and contemporary liturgical practises. Viewed within the context of a rich liturgical and exegetical tradition that emphasised associations between dark/light, Christ's death/divinity and salvation/damnation, it is clear that the Alnmouth scheme was more than a 'standard' Crucifixion scheme into which two anomalous attendant figures were inserted. Here, the sun and moon at once attest to the Crucifixion's historicity, while Christ's conspicuous nimbus and the arrangement of the figures beneath the sun and moon simultaneously enable a temporal collapse that alludes to Christ's divinity revealed at the Resurrection, contemporary liturgical performances and the anticipated eschaton and final resurrection. It is evident that the components of the Alnmouth Crucifixion were deliberately selected and arranged, enabling it to be viewed within multivalent frames of reference, which reveal a commentary on the veneration of the cross, Christ's dual nature and his Crucifixion as the moment that enabled humanity's eternal salvation. Further, the depiction of these themes on a *monumental cross* facilitates the links between the present, the historical past of the Crucifixion and the potential for future salvation.

3.5 Summary

Although the iconographic programmes of the Dacre and Middleton crosses were initially assumed to visually represent Norse mythological subjects, by re-framing the monumental cross-form as critical to considering their carved images, it is possible to extract the potential Christian meanings inherent in the carvings. In this way, the cross-form can be understood as fundamental in mitigating factors such as fragmentation, and enables a more thorough engagement with a monument's

iconographic programme. For example, the meaning of the carvings arranged on the Dacre cross become visually explicit when viewed alongside the cross-form, rather than as images detached from it. Here, the cross-head would have designated Christ's sacrifice and the potential for humanity's redemption, forming an appropriate analogue to the image of the Fall at the base of the shaft, which represents humanity's damnation. The potential baptism situated between the two suggests the possibility that redemption can be obtained by joining the Church and participating in its sacraments; this is further supplemented by the cross-form, which alludes to Christ's sacrifice, celebrated in the Mass. Such themes would have been entirely appropriate for public display during the tenth century against the ongoing phenomena of conversion and Christianisation, and at Dacre, the cross-form would have been integral to facilitating contemporary perceptions of these themes.

Likewise, although the iconographic programme of the Middleton cross initially appears ambiguous, when its cross-form is reconsidered as predominant, it becomes possible to elicit potential Christian significances from its carvings. Unlike the conspicuous Fall scheme at Dacre, however, the Middleton images have been presented within multivalent frames of reference relevant to both ecclesiastical and secular viewers. Their potential Christian associations are revealed through their monumental form, with the cross-head linking the images carved on the two apparently disparate broad faces. In this way, the scheme on A can be understood as both a hunt scene associated with the patron's secular status, and a commentary on accepting Christ as the means to salvation. In turn, the bound serpent opposite might initially be perceived as decorative, but viewed in relation to the cross-head, it can be understood to represent salvation from evil, enabled by Christ's Crucifixion. Together, the two broad faces are thus unified by the cross-head, which confers Christian significances upon the scenes, reflecting one of the most basic concepts of Christianity – that salvation can be achieved by accepting Christ – which would have been appropriate for public display during a period of conversion and Christianisation.

The situation at Alnmouth, however, differs from those at Middleton and Dacre; here, the figural carvings explicitly depict Christian subject-matter, neglected in favour of its inscriptions. Yet, when each component is considered as part of a cohesive programme, it is apparent that they complement one another and reveal themes of revelation and redemption appropriate for public display on a potentially commemorative monument. The vernacular associations of the Crucifixion and

inscriptions are also evident in the language used for the inscription (Old English), and the rich liturgical and exegetical traditions that informed the arrangement of the carvings. The Alnmouth scheme can thus be understood to emphasise those aspects of the liturgical performance and exegetical tradition associated with the interplay between dark and light, Christ's death and divinity and salvation and damnation. Furthermore, consideration of the Crucifixion alongside its monumental cross-form enables it to invoke a temporal collapse involving the interlace-decorated base of its carved cross and its (now missing) cross-head. Together, these features would facilitate further commentary on the significance of the Crucifixion by simultaneously attesting to the event's historicity; the revelation of Christ's divinity at the Resurrection; contemporary liturgical performances; and the anticipated eschaton and final resurrection. Much in the same way that prioritising sacred or secular images prevents meaningful engagement with the iconographic programmes of Anglo-Scandinavian monuments, it is apparent that the full range of their potential significance(s) can only be revealed by engaging simultaneously with their monumental cross-form, medium and carvings, rather than prioritising one aspect over another.

CHAPTER 4

Audience Encounters

4.1 Introduction

So far, discussion of the Anglo-Scandinavian monuments across the Northern Danelaw has indicated clear expectations among their patrons concerning anticipated viewers and their responses. While scholars have attempted to deduce the ethnic or social identities of the monuments' patrons, using iconographic, stylistic or typological analyses, they have not yet considered the identities of the monuments' intended audiences. Iconographic studies have emphasised the carvings' 'secular' and 'pagan' nature, despite undeniable visual evidence of Christian associations,[714] to suggest secular/'pagan' patronage, and by extension, an expected 'pagan' audience.[715] It is generally accepted that the images indicate "an identifiable pagan cultural tradition and the widespread knowledge of Norse mythology".[716] Despite the paucity of such images, which usually comprise only a single, isolated element within Anglo-Scandinavian iconographic programmes, generalisations about the nature of the monuments' *overall* iconographic significance are nevertheless inferred. Although some imagery certainly presents secular or even 'pagan' subject-matter, this forms only a minute percentage of the overall number of extant Anglo-Scandinavian carvings, and the majority eschew 'pagan' visual traditions – as at Leeds and Middleton.

This study has demonstrated, in keeping with historical and archaeological scholarship, that a more nuanced approach to the carvings is needed when considering any potential Scandinavian influence in their imagery.[717] Investigating the sculptures from a binary perspective that prioritises either the secular or Christian nature of their carvings prevents a meaningful understanding of the monuments, their potential iconographic significance(s) and contemporary audience responses to them. The concept that Anglo-Scandinavian carved monuments could reflect cultural traditions is nonetheless significant, implying that they were intended to be encountered by

[714] E.g., the Fall at Dacre becomes a series of Norse mythological figures: Mathews, "Dacre Stone," 226-27.
[715] Kendrick, "Late Saxon Sculpture," 5-6.
[716] Kopár, *Gods and Settlers*, 145.
[717] Hadley, *Northern Danelaw*, 30; Hadley, "'Hamlet and the Princes'," 117; Abrams, "Conversion and Assimilation," 140.

contemporary Anglo-Scandinavian audiences, and suggesting that their iconographic significance(s) can reveal the potential identities of patrons, and elucidate how the images were received and understood by contemporary audiences.

The dearth of documentary evidence relating to the potential ninth- and tenth-century audiences for stone monuments means any information about this aspect of the sculptures depends on recovering the meanings inherent in the carvings. Two documentary sources do, however, record the Anglo-Saxon cultural tradition of erecting crosses, and offer potential insight on this subject. The eighth-century *Hodoeporicon of St Willibald* recounts how his parents offered their infant son before the foot of a cross on the estate of an Anglo-Saxon nobleman,[718] such crosses commonly being erected – by secular landlords – at prominent locations for the use of daily prayer.[719] This demonstrates that crosses were erected with the deliberate intention of eliciting devotional responses from those who encountered them, whether it was to engage in prayer generally, or specifically, as Willibald's parents did on his behalf. Moreover, it suggests that audience(s) encountering such monuments were expected to do so regularly, implying that they would have sufficient time to engage with the monument(s). The crosses' erection on the estates of noblemen further suggests that their audiences were not exclusively ecclesiastical, indicating that secular audiences possessed at least minimal familiarity with the monument type, and any carvings present.

The second twelfth-century document, *De Obsessione Dunelmi*,[720] records a series of early eleventh-century revenge killings and their aftermath, describing a small stone cross being erected for one of the victims, Ealdred, at the location of his murder.[721] Fletcher, arguing that the likely patrons of the cross were his daughters, demonstrated how this act expressed their piety and familial connections,[722] the cross performing a mnemonic function, physically marking the location of the murder and

[718] Huneberc of Heidenheim, *Hodoeporicon of St Willibald*, ed./trans. C.H. Talbot, *The Anglo-Saxon Missionaries in Germany* (New York: Sheed and Ward: 1954), 154-55; Huneberc of Heidenheim, *Hodoeporicon of St Willibald*, in *Vita Willibaldi episcopi Eichstetensis et vita Wynnebaldi abbatis Heidenheimensis auctore sanctimoniale Heidenheimensis*, ed. Oswald Holder-Egger, MGH, Scriptores 15.1 (1887), 88.
[719] Huneberc, *Hodoeporicon*, ed. Holder-Egger, 88; ed./trans. Talbot, 155.
[720] Christopher J. Morris, *Marriage and Murder in Eleventh-century Northumbria: a study of 'De Obsessione Dunelmi'*, Borthwick Paper no. 82 (York: University of York, 1992), 5.
[721] Anonymous, "De Obsessione Dunelmi," *Symeoni Monachi Opera Omnia*, ed. T. Arnold, Rerum Britannicarum Medii Aevi Scriptores, 219; trans. Morris, *Marriage and Murder*, 3.
[722] Richard Fletcher, *Bloodfeud: Murder and Revenge in Anglo-Saxon England* (London: Penguin Press, 2002), 123-24.

recalling the feud, perhaps keeping its memory alive,[723] especially as the cross was erected on the landholdings of Carl, Ealdred's murderer, implying that Carl and his household additionally formed its intended audience.[724] Like the crosses described in the *Hodoeporicon,* it, too, was erected on a secular estate, by women, identifying both its lay patronage and intended audiences. It also suggests that those audiences were expected to engage with it in a manner that would elicit response(s). While this cross may have had a commemorative rather than devotional function, it nevertheless indicates that it was erected for consideration by the living.

Here, therefore, the hypothetical Anglian audience for the late ninth-century Collingham cross-shaft will be reconstructed based on the meanings inherent in its carvings. The potential perceptions of this audience will then be contrasted with those of an integrated Anglo-Scandinavian audience, who presumably constituted the intended viewers for the late ninth-/tenth-century Nunburnholme and Gosforth crosses, whose carvings involve an apparent interplay between 'pagan'/secular and Christian figures. Recovery of these carvings' iconographic significance(s) will provide a more nuanced understanding of the monuments and insight into Anglo-Scandinavian perceptions of these deliberately combined images.

4.2 Collingham

Observing the late ninth-century date of the two cross-shafts at Collingham, Baldwin Brown suggested that the animal ornament carved on the non-figural shaft (Collingham 2) was derived from either Scandinavian sources, or models introduced by Scandinavians after their conquest of York (Fig. 4.1).[725] For Hadley, however, its significance lay in its demonstration of continued ecclesiastical activity at Collingham following Scandinavian settlement.[726] Its contemporary counterpart, Collingham 1 (Fig. 4.2) is composed of two re-assembled shaft fragments, displaying no such Scandinavian-inspired elements, but its presumed late ninth century date implies that its erection was coeval with the earliest period of Scandinavian settlement in the region.[727] It may thus have been encountered by incoming Scandinavian audience(s), with such encounters potentially influencing the iconographic selections. In fact,

[723] Ibid.
[724] Ibid., 124.
[725] Baldwin Brown, *Anglo-Saxon Sculpture*, 152-57.
[726] Hadley, *Northern Danelaw*, 265.
[727] Coatsworth, *Western Yorkshire*, 119.

analysis of its carvings indicates how a pre-Viking/Anglian, and probably primarily (but not necessarily exclusively) ecclesiastical audience may have understood the monuments, allowing insight into the responses elicited by tenth-century Anglo-Scandinavian audiences encountering the Nunburnholme and Gosforth crosses.

Given the scope of its figural programme, studies devoted to Collingham 1 have primarily involved establishing its typological relationships to other monuments, its figures' stylistic origins and their relationships to other iconographic models. It is therefore worth rehearsing its details.[728] The first broad face, A (Fig. 4.3), comprises three panels containing single (male) figures standing frontally within arches or niches. The upper two have dished haloes and appear to hold tubular objects. The lowermost stands beneath a double arch, his head, turned slightly to the left, likewise surmounted by a dished halo.

The arrangement on the narrow face, B (Fig. 4.4), generally follows that of A; three full-length, frontal (male) figures are disposed beneath arches, each nimbed and holding an attribute. That held by the uppermost figure is a long rectangular object with two perpendicular protrusions on the left, contrasting with the plain tubular objects held by the figures below. The head of the central figure is turned slightly to the left, and although the lowermost figure is arranged like its analogue on A within a double arch, the outer one appears to be decorated with foliate ornament.

As on A, the opposite broad face, C (Fig. 4.5), contains three half-length, nimbed figures standing frontally beneath arches. The uppermost is bearded with an enlarged right hand. That below has received much scholarly attention, given its unusual coiled hairstyle, surmounted by a dished nimbus. Carol Farr compared it to an analogous female figure depicted on a late seventh- to early ninth-century cross-shaft from Hackness (Fig. 4.6), arguing that the figure type was derived from that used to depict evangelist portraits, and implies divine authority.[729] Hawkes, however, pointed to an earlier Romano-British funerary monument as the model for Hackness, which was subsequently adapted to potentially imply female patronage.[730] As on A and B,

[728] See Appendix, I.23.
[729] Carol Farr, "Questioning the Monuments: Approaches to Anglo-Saxon Sculpture Through Gender Studies," in *The Archaeology of Anglo-Saxon England: Basic Readings*, ed. Catherine E. Karkov (London: Garland Publishing, 1999), 385-88; for Hackness 1, see: Lang, *York and Eastern Yorkshire*, 135-140.
[730] Hawkes, "*Iuxta Morem Romanorum*," 84-87. See also: Jane Hawkes, "The Art of the Church in Ninth-Century Anglo-Saxon England: The Case of the Masham Column," *Hortus Artium Medievalium* 8 (2002): 344-45.

the lowermost figure on C is contained within a double arch, but its head appears to be turned slightly left.

On D (Fig. 4.7) the full-length, frontal figures with dished haloes are likewise arranged in arches. Here, the uppermost figure has long, curling hair extending below its nimbus, and clasps a long object in both hands. The middle figure also has long, curling hair, but holds a book in its left hand, to which it gestures with the index finger of its right. The curling hair may have been developed by substituting the hair of a female figure (derived from a Roman model) with a nimbus, which would produce the same profile.[731] Conversely, late antique and early Christian images of youthful male figures with long hair may lie behind the detail. As on A, B and C, the lowermost figure is set beneath a double arch, the inner one apparently decorated with pellets. The looping folds of this figure's drapery seem to be typical of late ninth-century sculpture from Western Yorkshire.[732] Overall, the arches on Collingham 1 are less deeply recessed than those of classical models,[733] further suggesting that the figural scheme was not copied directly from late antique models.

Although the origins of the Collingham figural imagery have occupied recent debates, earlier scholarship prioritised its typological features in order to explain the form, function and chronology of other monuments. Collingwood thus argued that its cable-edging splits to accommodate a cylindrical base, noting apparent similarities with monuments from Dewsbury (Yorks.), Masham (Yorks.) and Gosforth.[734] He established this typological connection to justify his explanation that the Masham column formed the base of a square-section cross-shaft, as at Dewsbury.[735] Yet, the split cable-edging and cylindrical base are absent at Collingham; these apparent typological features result from damage to the cross-shaft where it has been broken (Fig. 4.8).

Nonetheless Baldwin Brown compared its (presumed) chamfered arris and ornamental bosses to those of the fragmentary, tenth- or eleventh-century cross-shaft from Gulval, Cornwall (Fig. 4.9), and likewise favoured a round-shaft form at Collingham to substantiate his preferred date for another monument at Thrybergh

[731] James Lang, "Survival and Revival in Insular Art: Northumbrian Sculpture of the 8th to 10th Centuries," in *Age of Migrating Ideas: Early Medieval Art in Northern Britain and Ireland*, ed. R. Michael Spearman and John Higgitt (Edinburgh: National Museums of Scotland, 1993), 265-66.
[732] Cramp, "The Anglian Tradition," 10.
[733] Lang, "Survival and Revival," 265-66.
[734] Collingwood, *Northumbrian Crosses*, 6-7.
[735] Ibid.

(Yorks.).[736] Yet, as noted, these features are omitted at Collingham, which also lacks the distinctive 'collar' denoting the transition between cylindrical base and squared shaft, evident on monuments such as the tenth-century cross-shaft from Penrith (Cu.) (Fig. 4.10).[737] Furthermore, the relationship between Collingham and Gulval is questionable; the Gulval carvings display clear stylistic connections to Viking-age monuments from Cumbria,[738] implying that it likely emerged from a different socio-political and religious context, which supplied it with its distinct monumental and iconographic significances. Moving away from Insular comparanda, Kendrick nevertheless agreed that Collingham had a rounded base, which in his view derived from Carolingian models.[739] Given that the 'chamfered arris' and 'split cable-edging' are actually the result of damage to the cross-shaft, and the monument lacks the 'collar' associated with round-shaft derivative monuments, there is insufficient evidence to support this typological classification. Thus, although this was accepted as recently as 2008 – on the basis of earlier twentieth-century observations – this is not the case.[740] Moreover, this tendency to typologise Collingham 1 resulted from attempts to establish a chronology for, and explain the function of, other Yorkshire monuments, rather than any attempt to analyse the Collingham monument itself.

Stylistic analyses of its figural carvings, however, have been more successful. Among the first to examine them, Collingwood claimed that while disproportionate, the figures indicate some tendency toward individual character or attitude.[741] The apparent lack of proportion may be explained by attempts to copy, probably indirectly, earlier late antique models,[742] although the Collingham figures closely resemble local models: notably those on the late eighth-century Otley cross (Fig. 4.11);[743] that monastic site's sculptural influence is widely recognised across West Yorkshire.[744] Indeed, Ian Wood argued that schemes representing angels or Evangelists, as at Collingham, are rare, and may have been influenced by the significantly earlier Otley

[736] Baldwin Brown, *Anglo-Saxon Sculpture*, 142-43.
[737] Bailey and Cramp, *Cumberland, Westmorland*, 136-37 (Penrith 4).
[738] Ann Preston-Jones and Elisabeth Okasha, *Early Cornish Sculpture*, CASSS 11 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 146-7.
[739] Kendrick, "Late Saxon Sculpture," 15; Kendrick, *Late Saxon*, 72-73.
[740] Coatsworth, *Western Yorkshire*, 118-19.
[741] Collingwood, *Northumbrian Crosses*, 72.
[742] Farr, "Questioning the Monuments," 355-58; Hawkes, "*Iuxta Morem Romanorum*," 84-87; Hawkes, "Art of the Church," 344-45; Lang, "Survival and Revival," 265-66.
[743] Rosemary Cramp, *Early Northumbrian Sculpture*, Jarrow Lecture (1965), 12; James Lang, *The Anglian Sculpture of Deira: The Classical Tradition*, Jarrow Lecture (1990), 14.
[744] Cramp, *Early Northumbrian Sculpture*, 12; Lang, "Continuity and Innovation," 146; Bailey, *Viking Age Sculpture*, 77.

monuments.[745] Whatever their ultimate origins, the Collingham figures clearly emerged within an Anglian context, and were arranged and presented according to the visual conventions associated with it. Their affiliations with an Anglian *ecclesiastical* context have also been made explicit through the medium in which they are represented, the selection of the cross-form and the haloes denoting the figures' saintly status. The development of figural types derived from late antique, Roman sources is significant here, as it underscores the apparent desire of the ecclesiastical community at Collingham to associate themselves with the Church of Rome, something achieved by using visual and material idioms that would have been understood by local audiences to signify connections with that Church.

Apart from formalist considerations, iconographic analyses, although infrequent, have identified the figures as the 12 apostles based on the scrolls and books they hold, although a number of figures may be missing from the scheme, given the fragmentary nature of the shaft.[746] Lang further argued that the tightly coiled hairstyle of the figure on C (a feature that appears exclusively in Roman depictions of women) might imply that those carved on the broad faces were saintly figures, with the apostles limited to its narrow sides.[747]

Within these general parameters, the figures' attributes have attracted little attention. Yet, these seem to support the identification of the Apostles. The uppermost figure on B holds neither a book nor a scroll, differentiating it from the others; rather, it holds an object resembling a key, which likely identifies him as Peter.[748] The uppermost figure on D does hold a scroll with his right hand covering its ends. Given that Peter seems to be depicted on B, this figure is likely intended to represent Paul holding the law of the Church, forming an appropriate analogue to Peter. In addition to their status as the 'first Apostles' of the Church in early Christian art generally, Valerie Heuchan demonstrated that two ninth-century Old English texts, the Old English Martyrology and Cynewulf's *Fate of the Apostles*, record that the pair were martyred together on the same day.[749] This suggests that at the time the Collingham cross was erected, Anglian ecclesiastics would have accepted that the pair were co-

[745] Wood, "Anglo-Saxon Otley," 35.
[746] Collingwood, "Sculpture…West Riding," 155-56; James Lang, "The Apostles in Anglo-Saxon Sculpture in the Age of Alcuin," *Early Medieval Europe* 8 (1999): 276-78.
[747] Lang, "Apostles in Anglo-Saxon Sculpture," 279.
[748] Matthew 16:19.
[749] Valerie S. Heuchan, "All Things to Men: Representations of the Apostle Paul in Anglo-Saxon Literature" (doctoral thesis, University of Toronto, 2010), 114-16.

martyrs, reinforcing their status as the founders of the Apostolic Church and enhancing their pairing on opposite faces of the shaft. Furthermore, if there were indeed originally additional panels below the extant fragments, it would imply that these two figures may well have been located at the top, below the cross-head.

There is, moreover, an earlier precedent for pairing these two apostles in the Anglo-Saxon carving tradition (albeit in wood): on the late seventh-century Cuthbert Coffin, whose carvings include the 12 apostles on its left side panel with Peter and Paul situated by Cuthbert's head (Fig. 4.12).[750] Although all the apostles are identified by inscriptions,[751] Peter and Paul are distinguished from the others by their hairstyles and Peter's keys.[752] This provides a parallel to the Collingham figures, where Peter is distinguished by his attribute. In his survey of Anglo-Saxon Petrine iconography, John Higgitt observed that Peter is typically represented as clean-shaven, tonsured and beardless.[753] This type differs from those used elsewhere in Western Europe, suggesting that its application here was deliberate and significant.[754] He further argued that while no scriptural account describes Peter and Paul's appearance, they were typically portrayed outside Anglo-Saxon England with beards and short hair, although fourth- to sixth-century Mediterranean examples depict them as beardless, an iconographic model that potentially informed the Anglo-Saxon type.[755] Moreover, this type was invoked in the second half of the seventh century to signify associations with the Church of Rome, with Peter's authority denoting the correct type of clerical tonsure.[756] Although the break at the top of the Collingham shaft makes it difficult to assess whether the figure of Peter fully corresponds to the type Higgitt described, it does seems to conform to the clean-shaven Anglo-Saxon type, as does that of Paul. The selection of this type at Collingham may therefore represent a deliberate attempt to emphasise associations with the Church of Rome – something already implied by the appropriation of late antique funerary sculpture as the model for the figure on C.

---

[750] Jane Hawkes, "The Body in the Box: The Iconography of the Cuthbert Coffin," in *Crossing Boundaries: Interdisciplinary Approaches to the Art, Material Culture, Language and Literature of the Early Medieval World*, ed. Eric Cambridge and Jane Hawkes (Oxford: Oxbow, 2017), 80.
[751] R.I. Page, "Roman and Runic on St Cuthbert's Coffin," in *St Cuthbert, His Cult and His Community to AD 1200*, ed. Gerald Bonner, et al. (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1989), 262.
[752] Jennifer Ní Ghrádaigh and Juliet Mullins, "Apostolically Inscribed: St Cuthbert's Coffin as Sacred Vessel," in *Newcastle and Northumberland: Roman and Medieval Architecture Art*, ed. Jeremy Ashbee and Julian Luxford, BAA Conference Transactions 36 (Leeds: Maney, 2013), 74.
[753] John Higgitt, "The Iconography of St Peter in Anglo-Saxon England, and St Cuthbert's Coffin," in Bonner, et al., *St Cuthbert*, 267-68
[754] Ibid.
[755] Ibid., 270-71.
[756] Ibid., 272-74.

Furthermore, potential use of a figural type intended to emphasise the Petrine/Roman tonsure as the correct form for clerics may be significant: it invokes Peter's sacred authority as the keeper of the keys to heaven and the first pope, as well as the authority of the Church of Rome – his burial place – concepts that seem to be encapsulated by the carvings elsewhere on the shaft.

Additional ninth-century evidence for paired carvings of Peter and Paul in Anglo-Saxon England may explain their placement on opposite faces of the Collingham shaft. Their positions below the cross-head emphasises the pair's significance as the first apostles, and with the attributes of key and scroll it references the '*traditio legis cum clavis*'; such as that found on the North cross at Sandbach (Fig. 4.13), where Christ is shown flanked by Peter and Paul, holding their respective attributes. Here, the iconography of the *traditio legis*, typically featuring Christ, Peter and Paul, has been merged with that of the *traditio clavis*, which generally depicted only Christ and Peter.[757] The iconography of the '*traditio legis cum clavis*' emerged in the early ninth century to express the Church's foundation on earth, the revelation of the Word through Christ's death and resurrection and the apostles' mission to spread the Gospel.[758] At Collingham, Christ's apparent absence from the scheme is notable, although this need not preclude his presence in the original iconographic programme, or his signification by the now-missing cross-head.[759] This would enable the figures of Peter and Paul on the narrow faces to be viewed as 'flanking' Christ, and so could be understood to symbolise the Church founded on Peter and the Law enforced by Paul, enabling faithful Christians to achieve salvation.

Further consideration of the apostles' arrangement on the Cuthbert coffin serves to emphasise Peter and Paul's significance at Collingham. Hawkes argued that the various poses of the apostles on the coffin were intended to direct the viewer among specific paths: notably, Simon and Thaddeus at the foot of the coffin and those of Peter and Paul at the head point the viewer to the images carved on the head- and foot-boards.[760] An analogous phenomenon occurs at Collingham, with the lowermost figures on each face accorded greater emphasis by the double arches surrounding them, particularly the decorated outer arches, while the heads of those on A (Fig. 4.14a) and C (Fig. 4.14b) are turned to the left (the viewer's right). Depending on

[757] Hawkes, *Sandbach Crosses*, 56; Bailey, *Cheshire and Lancashire*, 99-113 (Sandbach 1).
[758] Hawkes, *Sandbach Crosses*, 57-60.
[759] See Chazelle, *The Crucified God*, 114-17.
[760] Hawkes, "Body in the Box," 82.

which face the viewer initially approached (Fig. 4.14c), the arrangement of these figures' heads could encourage movement around the monument, particularly if they were originally set nearer the viewer's eye-level than they are today. Their disposition would certainly enable contemplation of the overall significance of the figural programme from at least two potential perspectives.

Regardless of which path a viewer may have selected, the shaft's narrow faces do seem to have been emphasised, with the heads of the lowermost figures on A and C, turned towards the narrow faces, B and D. These gestures imply that the figures on B were imbued with status, in turn suggesting that they were intended to predominate, on the understanding that they represented the apostles,[761] with Peter and Paul at the top. Such emphasis on Peter would certainly not be anomalous, given the particularly intense devotion to him within the Anglo-Saxon Church.[762]

Additional symbolic references are also possible. Building on Bede's association of the bronze pillars of the Temple with baptism, Lang argued that the architectural settings at Collingham were intended as metaphors for this sacrament.[763] He suggested that crosses with apostolic iconography may have marked baptismal sites, especially when located near rivers.[764] While this series of figures would undoubtedly have been identifiable to contemporary Anglian ecclesiastical audiences as the apostles, they do not support the suggestion that the scheme has baptismal associations;[765] nevertheless, potential connections to the pillars of the Temple are worth pursuing, given the architectural settings. Indeed they could have encouraged ecclesiastical audiences to recall Solomon's Temple and its pillars.

Bede, referencing Galatians 2:9, makes this connection explicit, stating that the purpose of the Temple's pillars (which are associated with the Apostles) is to illuminate the path to salvation for all, by word and example, whether they possess knowledge of Old Testament Law or are heathens.[766] *De Templo* also emphasises learning scripture and preaching the apostolic teachings correctly to truly be a pillar of God's house: the Church,[767] and emphasises Paul as "a most eminent pillar of the

[761] Collingwood, "Sculpture…West Riding," 155-56; Lang, "Apostles in Anglo-Saxon Sculpture," 276-278.
[762] Higgitt, "Iconography of St Peter," 281.
[763] Bede, *De Templo*, ed. David Hurst, CCSL 119A (Turnhout: Brepols, 1969), 198-99; trans. Seán Connolly (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1995), II, 18.4, 74.
[764] Lang, "Apostles in Anglo-Saxon Sculpture," 280.
[765] This is due to the lack of any baptismal attributes associated with the figures.
[766] Bede, *De Templo*, ed. Hurst, 199; trans. Connolly, II, 18.4, 74.
[767] Bede, *De Templo*, ed. Hurst, 200; trans. Connolly, II, 18.7, 76.

house of the Lord",[768] an interpretation that supports his potential position below the cross-head at Collingham. Thus, the apostles would have been an appropriate subject to display on a monument erected within an ecclesiastical environment, to be encountered by ecclesiastical audiences and laypeople visiting or working on the ecclesiastical estate.

This suggests that two potential audiences were anticipated at Collingham: one clerical, with sufficient understanding of the fundamental beliefs underpinning the foundation of the Church and reaffirmed in the Apostles' Creed;[769] the other, secular, but aware of the ecclesiastical activities and setting informing their encounter with the cross. The monument's public nature implies that anyone could encounter it, although its simple or even deliberately ambiguous portrayals of the apostles would enable viewers to access it differently, with the outcome that some could contemplate the figures and their teachings more profoundly than others. Contemplation of the apostles within architectural settings would encourage clerical viewers to recall their associations with the bronze pillars of the Temple, a Type of the Church. In turn, these associations might encourage such viewers to emulate the apostles' actions by learning and preaching the apostolic teachings to the different audiences they might encounter.

Given the late ninth-century date of the shaft and the coeval Scandinavian incursions and settlement, these themes might have acquired particular relevance to the clerics at Collingham and their lay communities. Depictions of the apostles could remind clerics or priests to emulate the apostles' actions by preaching scripture and the apostolic teachings to secular audiences, and so become pillars of the Church. Furthermore, Bede's emphasis on the pillars/apostles as signs of the path to salvation for *everyone,* might have been significant for encouraging incoming Scandinavians to convert during this period. In this context, contemplation of the figures carved on the narrow faces of the shaft could inspire a mimetic response in ecclesiastical audiences through their recollection of the apostles' associations with the Temple, their teachings (among the gentiles), and their responsibility to emulate the apostles by spreading the Word.[770] Such a response might ensure the eventual salvation of the audiences that encountered it, both ecclesiastical and lay.

---

[768] Bede, *De Templo*, ed. Hurst, 199; trans. Connolly, II, 18.5, 75: "Hinc etenim Paulus columna utique domus domini excellentissima *per arma iustitiae* nos *a dextris et a sinistris*…"
[769] For circulation of the Apostles Creed in Anglo-Saxon England, see Gneuss and Lapidge, *Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts*, 317-18, 370-72, 576-77; J.M. Ure, *The Benedictine Office: An Old English Text* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1957), 87-94.
[770] For Christ's mission to the Apostles before the Ascension: Matt. 28:16-20.

With this in mind, it is worth considering Collingham 2, the Viking-age cross-shaft, as an Anglo-Scandinavian response to its Anglian counterpart. The knot patterns on C (Fig. 4.15) find several Anglian parallels in Yorkshire, suggesting that the shaft was erected and decorated in the light of Anglian traditions.[771] Its four faces are likewise divided into panels separated by plain mouldings, suggesting that those who encountered Collingham 1 chose to erect their own monument using the same methods of dressing the stone and arranging the decoration. Furthermore, it implies that they deemed the monumental cross-form appropriate for displaying their ornament. The animals on A and C (Fig. 4.16), however, represent a stylised and flattened reiteration of analogous Anglian motifs (at Ilkley), while the carvings' stylised nature implies that the shaft represents an early mixing of Anglian and Scandinavian styles.[772] In turn, this suggests that those responsible for Collingham 2 were somewhat unfamiliar with the motifs they chose, and/or that the motifs were selected to be re-articulated according to their own visual, aesthetic preferences.

The absence of figural carving on Collingham 2 is also in keeping with Anglian traditions; figural carvings survive at only a small number of pre-Viking sites.[773] Nevertheless, it may be significant that those who encountered Collingham 1 elected *not* to re-produce a shaft with figural carving. It suggests that they deemed such subjects inappropriate for achieving their objectives, and so looked elsewhere for inspiration, as the stylistic connections with Ilkley and other Yorkshire sites suggest, and/or that they wished to display the type of (zoomorphic) motif with which they were more traditionally familiar. Whether this was indeed the case, the shaft also contains a vine-scroll in the single panel of D (Fig. 4.17), which is a stylised representation of those found on the earlier Anglian shafts from Ilkley and Otley.[774]

Overall, the combination of knot, vine-scroll and animal motifs, their stylisation and the omission of figural carving on Collingham 2 imply that those audience(s) who encountered Collingham 1 appropriated only the monumental cross-form and panelled arrangement. It suggests, moreover, that they encountered monuments at other ecclesiastical centres in the region, and selected motifs from these to reproduce on their own cross-shaft. This implies that those responsible for Collingham 2 may have intended for it to demonstrate affiliations with a range of

[771] Coatsworth, *Western Yorkshire*, 121.
[772] Ibid.
[773] Ibid., 59.
[774] Lang, "Continuity and Innovation," 146

locales, rather than Collingham, exclusively. Consequently, this may indicate that the iconographic programme of Collingham 1 was incomprehensible to those encountering it, and so may have been deemed unsuccessful in achieving its designers' intended objectives. Indeed, it would suggest that increasing numbers of those encountering Collingham 1 were incoming Scandinavian populations and, reluctant to replicate the detail of Collingham 1, made a conscious decision to display motifs in a manner more compatible with Scandinavian visual traditions.

4.3 Nunburnholme

The dished halo that links Collingham with other sites influenced by the carvings at Otley also occurs beyond the Wharfe valley; namely, at Nunburnholme (Fig. 4.18).[775] This cross-shaft, dated to the late ninth/tenth century, consists of two wrongly re-assembled fragments:[776] in their correct orientation, the upper portion should be turned 180º (Fig. 4.19).[777] Lang identified three individual sculptors involved in its production: one responsible for the angel friezes and the whole of D, excluding the so-called Sigurd scene superimposed in the lower panel; another, responsible for the whole of A and C, the beast chain in the lower panel of B, and the supposed Sigurd scene on D; and the third, working in the twelfth century, being responsible for the centaur superimposed on A.[778]

Despite its fragmentation, the Nunburnholme cross contains one of the most extensive Viking-age figural programmes, with its non-figural ornament limited to back-turned beasts on B. Its figural imagery has been considered disparate,[779] and its apparent visual presentation of Sigurd the Völsung in the lower panel of D (Fig. 4.20) has resulted in a scholarly pre-occupation with its apparently 'pagan' nature, and by extension, the monument overall.[780] Indeed, the cross has been described as "an

[775] Ibid.; Pattison, "Nunburnholme Cross," 221-23. See Appendix, I.75.
[776] Lang, *York and East Yorkshire*, 193; James Lang, "Sculptors of the Nunburnholme Cross," *Archaeological Journal* 133 (1976): 86-88.
[777] Lang, *York and East Yorkshire*, 189; Pattison, "Nunburnholme Cross," 210.
[778] Lang, "Sculptors," 79. The twelfth-century date assigned to the superimposed centaur carving makes it irrelevant to this discussion.
[779] Baldwin Brown, *Anglo-Saxon Sculpture*, 261.
[780] Pattison, "Nunburnholme Cross," 230-31; Bailey, *Viking Age Sculpture*, 121-22; Lang, "Sculptors," 88; Thompson, *Death and Dying*, 167-68; Kopár, *Gods and Settlers*, 37; Robert Halstead, "The Stone Sculpture of Anglo-Scandinavian Yorkshire in its Landscape Context" (doctoral thesis, University of Leeds, 2016), 101-04.

historical record of Christian conversion of pagan cultures".[781] The Christian significance of the so-called Sigurd scene can nevertheless be substantiated, particularly as most of the figural programme maintains distinct Christian associations and expresses continuity with earlier Anglian carving traditions. Lang, for instance, recognised the late antique origins of depicting seated, robed figures beneath arches, and identified ninth- and tenth-century precursors of the figural types.[782] It will be argued here, therefore, that rather than displaying 'disparate' images with secular connotations, the iconography reveals a complex, coherent programme that presents Christian theological concepts that would have resonated with contemporary audiences.

When originally erected, the upper panel of A (Fig. 4.21) was surmounted by a pair of winged angels, each gesturing toward the centre of an arch, within which is a seated profile human figure, facing left and holding a large sword in his left hand, to which he gestures with the right. His hair curls at the forehead and nape of the neck. He has been identified as "a Viking Chief", "hold" or "jarl", to support claims that the image represents the patron of the apparently funerary monument.[783] Kopár took these identifications further, suggesting that the curling feature over the figure's head represents a helmet.[784] The numerous frontally disposed figures with curling hairstyles found on ninth- and tenth-century cross-shafts from Yorkshire,[785] however, suggest that this feature can be explained as an adaptation of the same curled hairstyle, or a headdress, rendered in profile.[786] Indeed, Cramp argued that although the seated secular figure may represent a Scandinavian patron, it should be viewed as an early Anglo-Scandinavian type derived directly from ninth-century carvings of saintly or ecclesiastical figures and those in Christian scenes.[787] Furthermore, details of the figure's clothing are unprecedented in northern English sculpture, the garments themselves being atypical; they do not correspond to the short tunic and trousers worn in the Scandinavian homelands.[788] Such tunics are described as traditional costume for 'Germanic' people, generally, and although they could be worn amongst all social

[781] Martin K. Foys, "New Media and the Nunburnholme Cross," in *Cross and Cruciform in the Anglo-Saxon World*, ed. Sarah Larratt Keefer, Karen Louise Jolly and Catherine E. Karkov (Morgantown, WV: West Virginia University Press, 2010), 347.
[782] Lang, "Sculptors," 83-4.
[783] Baldwin Brown, *Anglo-Saxon Sculpture*, 260-61; Pattison, "Nunburnholme Cross," 225-26.
[784] Kopár, *Gods and Settlers*, 12.
[785] See, e.g., Collingham, Ilkley and Leeds.
[786] See, Hawkes, *Sandbach Crosses*, 33-34.
[787] Cramp, "The Viking Image," 15.
[788] Ibid.

strata in tenth-century England, this does not appear to have been the favoured costume of the social elite, who preferred long garments.[789] The figure should thus be interpreted as a member of the Anglo-Scandinavian elite, depicted according to the visual conventions appropriate to this status within Anglo-Saxon England, which would have been understood by contemporary audiences encountering the portrait.

Below (Fig. 4.22) was (originally) a second figure seated on a stool, also facing left, though its head has been obscured by a break in the panel. His garment is shorter than that worn by the figure above, but appears to be incised with a cross and exposes the figure's lower legs. Baldwin Brown suggested that the rectangular object held in his outstretched hands is a harp, identifying him as David, despite insufficient details to confirm this explanation of the object.[790] It was thus rejected, with Lang, following Pattison, identifying it as a book, with its raised border paralleled in Mercian depictions of books.[791] Lang further ascribed the profile arrangement of the two Nunburnholme figures to the second sculptor's deficient skill in foreshortening frontally disposed, seated figures.[792] The St Alkmund's figure (Fig. 4.23), originally identified as the Virgin and Child, has been re-identified as a seated regal figure, facing right and holding a sword in his right hand, while balancing a sub-rectangular object on his knee,[793] identified as a harp (rather than a book or child),[794] suggesting that the St Alkmund's figure was intentionally associated with the Old Testament king, David, understood to prefigure Christ, as prophesised at the Annunciation in Luke 1:30-33. By the ninth century, David had become an archetypal ideal for early medieval secular rulership.[795] Although this combination of objects finds no precise analogue in Anglo-Saxon art, similarly enthroned, lordly figures do occur in ninth-century manuscripts, which may suggest a conflation of iconographic models.[796]

Moreover, the St Alkmund's figure finds analogues at Nunburnholme in the seated figures of the upper and lower panels of A, but these figures face left rather

[789] Gale Owen-Crocker, *Dress in Anglo-Saxon England* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2004), 234. For detailed discussions of long garments and tunics see: Owen-Crocker, *Dress*, 240-55.
[790] Baldwin Brown, *Anglo-Saxon Sculpture*, 263.
[791] Pattison, "Nunburnholme Cross," 226; Lang, "Sculptors," 84-85; Hawkes and Sidebottom, *Derbyshire and Staffordshire*, 165-68.
[792] Lang, "Sculptors," 78. For a critique of such assessments of skill, see Catherine Karkov, "Postcolonial," in *Handbook of Anglo-Saxon Studies*, ed. Jacqueline Stodnick and Renee Trilling (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012), 158-60.
[793] Heidi Stoner, "The Fiercest of Kings: Warriors at the Edge of Empire," in *Islands in a Global Context: Proceedings of the Seventh International Conference on Insular Art*, ed. Conor Newman, et al. (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2017), 212. Hawkes and Sidebottom, *Derbyshire and Staffordshire*, 167.
[794] For Derby St Alkmund's: Hawkes and Sidebottom, *Derbyshire and Staffordshire*, 165-68.
[795] Ibid., 167.
[796] Stoner, "Fiercest of Kings," 212.

than right, producing an almost mirror-image of the St Alkmund's figure, though they are more stylised and each hold only one attribute: that in the upper panel holds the sword, and that in the lower holds the rectangular object. Thus, it appears that the Nunburnholme sculptor may have encountered a scheme analogous to that at St Alkmund's, but separated the image into two. Although the object held by the lower figure at Nunburnholme appears to lack the emphatic sub-rectangular shape of the harp at St Alkmund's, this discrepancy may be explained by the stylised nature of the scene or the sculptor's apparent lack of skill.[797] Further, the lower edge of the Nunburnholme object is slightly bowed, with the lower right corner extended, suggesting it was indeed intended to represent a harp. If so, then the lower figure, whose garment appears to be lightly incised with a cross, may be understood to portray David.

Together, the pair of figures on A can be read as a commentary on fulfilling ideal secular lordship, suggested by the sword held by the figure in the upper panel, while the figure below represents the features of such lordship, exemplified by David. Rather than interpreting the figure with the sword within singular secular (and therefore, 'pagan') frames of reference, it more convincingly evinces complex and multivalent meanings that are only discernible when viewed alongside the figure below. Given the monument's public nature and predominantly Christian repertoire, the viewer was likely intended to perceive the two figures as expressions of lordly ideals appropriate for a secular Christian ruler, as established by David.

As on A, Face B (Fig. 4.24) was divided into two panels, the upper likewise surmounted by winged angels who gesture to the centre of the arch. Beneath this a full-length frontal figure, wearing a long, hooded garment, stands on a platform or dais. A rectangular feature filled with pellets is suspended from his neck to cover his chest. Bailey, following Collingwood and Baldwin Brown, suggested that this may represent a book-satchel or reliquary worn about the neck, as at Stonegrave (Fig. 4.25), although he also posited that it may represent a rectangular brooch.[798] This explanation seems unlikely, however, given the predominantly round or oval shape of Viking-age brooches in the Northern Danelaw, and its size relative to the torso of the standing figure.[799] Nevertheless, Lang proposed that the object may represent the

[797] Lang, "Sculptors," 78.
[798] Collingwood, *Northumbrian Crosses*, 134; Baldwin Brown, *Anglo-Saxon Sculpture*, 262; Bailey, *Viking Age Sculpture*, 232. For Stonegrave 1, see Appendix, I.93.
[799] See Jane Kershaw, *Viking Identities: Scandinavian Jewellery in England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013) and Webster and Backhouse, *Making of England* (1991) for examples.

rational, a wooden brooch plated with enamelled metal, worn by early medieval bishops.[800] This is also questionable, however, given that this vestment appears in images that both pre- and post-date the Nunburnholme carvings, and these depictions of the object differ from that at Nunburnholme. For instance, the nimbed Christ carved on the Bewcastle cross (Cu.), dated to the first half of the eighth century,[801] wears a *rational* (Fig. 4.26), indicated by the round brooches on his shoulders. A similar arrangement occurs in depictions of Bishop Sigebert of Minden on an eleventh-century ivory book-cover and a manuscript page;[802] the bishop is shown frontally in both images and wears the *rational*, secured by round brooches. Round brooches are absent from the object at Nunburnholme, and it is thus unlikely that the Nunburnholme figure was intended to be understood as wearing this particular episcopal attribute.

Rather, the object probably represents the priestly breastplate worn by Hebrew priests, understood to denote a *rational*. This is described in Exodus 28:15-21 as a square object bearing four rows of three stones, each carved with the name of one of the 12 tribes of Israel.[803] An Anglian depiction of this vestment survives in the eighth-century Codex Amiatinus portrait of Ezra (Fig. 4.27).[804] If the Nunburnholme object was intended to represent this, its inclusion in the scheme would be appropriate, given the vestment's associations with the Christian Church; Bede explained that the stones, representing the 12 tribes, were understood to "signify the doctrine and faith of the apostles".[805] Given that Lang tentatively identified this as the work of the first sculptor,[806] likely carved in the late ninth century, the figure would be contemporary with those at Collingham, suggesting that those who designed the monument understood the significance of this particular Old Testament vestment, and deliberately included it here to reference the apostles. The attribute may well have functioned as a visual aid for those encountering the monument, prompting them to explicitly recall the apostles' teaching and preaching, albeit in a more condensed form.

---

[800] Lang, "Sculptors," 85; Foys, "New Media," 344-45.
[801] Bailey and Cramp, *Cumberland, Westmorland*, 71.
[802] I am grateful to Jo Story for pointing this out. Joanne M. Pierce, "Sigebert 'the Beloved': A Liturgical Perspective on Episcopal Image from Eleventh-Century Minden," in *Envisioning the Bishop: Images and the Episcopacy in the Middle Ages*, ed. Sigrid Danielson and Evan A. Gatti (Turnhout: Brepols, 2014), 251-255.
[803] Exodus 28.15-21.
[804] Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, MS Amiatino 1, fol. 5v.
[805] Bede, *De Tabernaculo*, ed. David Hurst, CCSL 119A (Turnhout: Brepols, 1969), 108-09; trans. Arthur G Holder, III, 119-121: "Item doctrina et ueritas erant in rationali positae ut aperte figuraretur quia uestis illa non solum legalem induebat pontificem sed uangelicum praenuntiabat uel ipsum uidelicet dominum de quo scriptum est, *Quia lex per Moysen data est, gratia et ueritas per Iesum Christum facta est*, uel certe apostolos eius immo omnes eiusdem gratiae et ueritatis praecones."
[806] Lang, "Sculptors," 79.

The upper panel of C (Fig. 4.28) is surmounted by two confronting wyverns, distinguishing it from the others. Within the arch below, a seated frontal figure holds a profile figure seated in its lap; the pair has therefore been universally identified as the Virgin and Child, with analogous compositions found on the late tenth- to mid-eleventh-century cross-shaft fragment from Sutton-upon-Derwent (E. Yorks.) (Fig. 4.29a), and the early tenth-century fragmentary cross-shaft from Shelford (Notts.) (Fig. 4.29b).[807] The Nunburnholme Child holds a book and looks toward the viewer; although nimbed, his halo does not terminate in curled volutes, while that of the Virgin is curled, like those elsewhere on the shaft.

The lower panel (Fig. 4.30) is damaged, but contains a central full-length figure flanked by two diminutive profile figures. The central figure is (now) headless, but birds with trailing tails perch on both shoulders and it 'stands' against a cross, the feet placed over a rectangular object. Cupped hands are held over the heads of both flanking figures, who gaze at the figure on the cross and grasp its sides with one hand. Baldwin Brown identified this as a blessing scheme, but also claimed that the two birds could represent attributes of an Asgardian hero,[808] again indicating the scholarly inclination to assign non-Christian meanings to scenes or attributes carved on Viking-age crosses, despite the accompanying Christian visual repertoire. Avoiding this tendency, Pattison and Bailey suggested that the scheme should be identified as Christ blessing the two flanking figures, arguing that Christ's feet are set over a globe.[809]

When considering other details from the carving, the central figure's identification as Christ is supported by the presence of the birds perched on his shoulders (potentially representing peacocks, associated with the Resurrection and everlasting life),[810] and the hierarchy of scale between the central and flanking figures. Although Christ stands over a globe in blessing scenes, as on fragments from Barwick-in-Elmet (W. Yorks.) (Fig. 4.31a) and York (Fig. 4.31b),[811] it is clear that the

[807] Pattison, "Nunburnholme Cross," 227; Lang, *York and East Yorkshire*, 192-3; James Lang, *Anglo-Saxon Sculpture* (Aylesbury: Shire Publications, 1988), 23. For the cross at Sutton-on-Derwent, see: Lang, *York and East Yorkshire*, 220-21; Appendix, I.94; for Shelford, see: Paul Everson and David Stocker, *Nottinghamshire*, CASSS 12 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), 152-65.
[808] Baldwin Brown, *Anglo-Saxon Sculpture*, 263. It appears Baldwin Brown was referencing Odin's ravens, Huginn and Muninn.
[809] Pattison, "Nunburnholme Cross," 228-29; Bailey, *Viking Age Sculpture*, 156.
[810] Shannon M. Lewis-Simpson, "Strangers in Strange Lands: Colonisation and Multiculturalism in the Age of Scandinavian Expansion" (doctoral thesis, University of York, 2005), 166; Hawkes, "Art of the Church," 343; Jane Hawkes, "The Church Triumphant: The Figural Columns of Early Ninth-century Anglo-Saxon England," in *Form and Order in the Anglo-Saxon World, AD 600-1000*, ed. Sally Crawford and Helena Hamerow, ASSAH 16 (Oxford: Oxbow, 2009), 34.
[811] For Barwick-in-Elmet, see: Coatsworth, *Western Yorkshire*, 94-95; Appendix, I.8. For York Minster, see: Lang, *York and Eastern Yorkshire*, 54-55; Appendix, I.104.

Nunburnholme figure stands on a rectangular (not spherical) base. As a *suppedaneum*, analogous to that in the Alnmouth Crucifixion,[812] this further supports the figure's identification as Christ on the cross. A Crucifixion identification is also indicated by comparison with Irish carvings, as on the south crosses at Kells (Meath) (Fig. 4.32a) and Clonmacnoise (Offaly) (Fig. 4.32b), where Christ's hands are lowered over the heads of Stephaton and Longinus,[813] although the diminutive figures at Nunburnholme do not hold the attributes associated with these figures.

Although the Nunburnholme scheme finds its closest analogue on the York fragment, the diminutive figures in each scheme are distinctly arranged, for the ancillary figures at Nunburnholme do not grasp Christ; rather, they grasp the edge of the cross framing him, so that they appear to present him to the viewer. This instils the image with a sense of immediacy, intended to elicit a response from a viewer confronted by the image of Christ on the cross. It also supplies the scheme with multivalent purpose: it is first understood as the cross supporting the Crucified Christ; secondly, it renders the cross as a frame, with the flanking figures' physical engagement drawing attention to it in an immediate and visceral manner.

Diminutive figures in Byzantine crucifixions perform similar functions and their separation from the historical narrative enables the assimilation of viewer and object, resulting in a permanent devotional relationship intended to elicit mimetic responses.[814] The Nunburnholme pair are likewise detached from the historical narrative of Christ's Crucifixion, lacking, as they do, the attributes necessary to identify them as Stephaton and Longinus, Mary and John or Ecclesia and Synagogue. This anonymity facilitates the successful presentation of Christ to the viewer. It further precludes distraction from the image of the Crucifixion, enabling closer engagement between the viewer and Christ's body on the cross. Moreover, the attitude of adoration suggested by the flanking figures' contact with the cross is compounded by their upward gaze at Christ. This might encourage a viewer to engage with the monument by prompting them to recall the events of the Crucifixion. By gazing at the carved images arranged on a monumental cross, the viewer thus becomes a 'living image' of the adoring figures depicted in the panel. In the context of the earliest Scandinavian settlement the flanking figures may have been deliberately included here to encourage

[812] For Alnmouth, see: Cramp, *County Durham and Northumberland*, 161-62.
[813] Lang, "Sculptors," 89.
[814] Glenn Peers, *Sacred Shock: Framing Visual Experience in Byzantium* (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2004), 19.

devotional responses from viewers who were newly converted to Christianity. The omission of Stephaton, Longinus and their attributes further encourages the viewer to contemplate the duality of Christ, his humanity alluded to by depicting the moment of his sacrifice on the cross; his divinity made explicit by his blessing of the flanking figures and the peacocks denoting his resurrection.

In the upper panel of D (Fig. 4.33) an ecclesiastical figure stands frontally beneath an arch decorated with pellets, distinguishing it from those in the other three upper panels. It is nevertheless linked to those of A and B by the downward-reaching angels above. The figure sports the same curling nimbus as the Virgin on C, and wears a long garment, with a rectangular object worn across his chest analogous to that worn by the figure on A, although it lacks the pellets. Below, another frontal figure is depicted beneath a pelleted arch (Fig. 4.34), although its head is badly damaged. He likewise wears a long garment and has a rectangular object hanging around his neck, but unlike the other two figures sporting this object, he also holds a chalice in his right hand. Lang, following Pattison, thus identified him as participating in the Mass,[815] arguing that he is seated due to the position of the feet still extant beneath the superimposed pair of figures.[816] The confronting wyverns at the top of C, the pelleted arches surrounding both figures on D and the additional arch in the upper panel of D suggest that these features were intended to distinguish these two faces from the others. Furthermore, they contain the most overtly Christian imagery, which has been emphasized by these supplementary features.

The pair of seated, confronting figures that were subsequently superimposed over the ecclesiastical figure's legs (Fig. 4.35) also distinguish Face D,[817] having been identified as Sigurd and Reginn roasting the dragon's heart.[818] That on the left holds a round object in its right hand and gestures upward with its left. It is difficult to discern specific features of the right-hand figure, due to the modelled garments of the underlying ecclesiastical figure, and the act of over-carving also likely accounts for the apparently "diabolical" character of the left-hand figure with "an animal's head".[819] This feature is unaccounted for in the literary sources,[820] but Kopár nevertheless

[815] Pattison, "Nunburnholme Cross," 229; Lang, *Anglo-Saxon Sculpture*, 23.
[816] Lang, "Sculptors," 78.
[817] Ibid., 79.
[818] Ibid., 88; Pattison, "Nunburnholme Cross," 230-31; Bailey, *Viking Age Sculpture*, 121-22; Kopár, *Gods and Settlers*, 37; Thompson, *Death and Dying*, 167-68.
[819] Baldwin Brown, *Anglo-Saxon Sculpture*, 264.
[820] *Völsunga Saga: The Saga of the Völsungs*, ed./trans. R.G. Finch (London: Nelson, 1965), 33-34; *Lay of Fafnir*, ed./trans. Carolyne Larrington, in *Poetic Edda* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 157-

maintained that the figures should be recognised as Sigurd and Reginn.[821] Bailey suggested that the disc-shaped object held by the left-hand figure could be a slice of the dragon's heart or a treasure ring,[822] and identified the items held by the underlying ecclesiastical figure as the host and chalice of the Eucharist, leading him to argue that the superimposed Sigurd scene reinterprets and comments on the Christian sacrament.[823] Kopár pursued this further, arguing that knowledge obtained by consuming blood secures the link between the Eucharist and the (supposed) Sigurd scene.[824] The association is tenuous, however, as those taking the Eucharist gain the opportunity to participate in their own salvation and everlasting life, rather than divine knowledge or wisdom.

While these identifications are tempting, diagnostic features included in less questionable depictions of the Sigurd myth, as on the tenth-century Halton cross (Fig. 4.36a) and the eleventh-century Ramsund (Södermanland, Sweden) runestone (Fig. 4.36b),[825] are absent. Both feature a figure at a forge surrounded by smiths' tools, a headless figure, a single thumb-sucking figure and birds in a tree, while that at Ramsund also includes a horse. Although separated temporally and geographically, these two monuments thus present images with shared characteristics that are undeniably associated with the most significant episodes in the (literary) Sigurd narratives. The confronting pair of figures at Nunburnholme conversely present only one potential motif, that of Sigurd's meal, but the scheme's ambiguous nature prevents this from being convincingly identified as such.

Further consideration of the Nunburnholme scheme raises additional doubts about the validity of a Sigurd explanation. Unlike Halton and Ramsund, the left-hand Nunburnholme figure does not insert his thumb into his mouth. Given that this is *the* revelatory action in the literary accounts,[826] it seems implausible that the Nunburnholme sculptor would fail to include it if the figures were intended to be Sigurd and Reginn. Moreover, the Halton and Ramsund carvings both show a single

---

61; *Lay of Regin*, ed./trans. Larrington, in *Poetic Edda* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 147-52.

[821] Kopár, *Gods and Settlers*, 37.

[822] Bailey, *Viking Age Sculpture*, 122.

[823] Ibid., 125.

[824] Kopár, *Gods and Settlers*, 53.

[825] For Halton: Bailey, *Cheshire and Lancashire*, 177-83; Appendix, I.39. For Ramsund: Aðalheiður Guðmundsdóttir and Jeffrey Cosser, "Gunnar and the Snake Pit in Medieval Art and Legend," *Speculum* 87, no. 4 (Oct. 2012): 1030; Hilda R.E. Davidson, "Sigurd in the Art of the Viking Age," *Antiquity* 16, no. 63 (Sept. 1942): 221-22.

[826] *Völsunga Saga: The Saga of the Völsungs*, ed./trans. R.G. Finch (London: Nelson, 1965), 33-34; *Lay of Fafnir*, ed./trans. Carolyne Larrington, *Poetic Edda*, 158-61.

thumb-sucking figure and one decapitated figure *in separate scenes*,[827] thus corresponding to the two literary episodes, which record that Sigurd decapitates Reginn immediately *after* receiving wisdom and conversing with the birds.[828] The pair of confronting figures in the Nunburnholme scene, however, eschews both the literary and visual traditions by including a second figure, whose head, although distorted, remains fully attached to his shoulders. Given these disparities, identifying them as Sigurd and Reginn is certainly debatable.

Hilda Davidson seems to have held this view, for she omitted this monument from her survey of Viking-age Sigurd depictions with only an oblique reference to "other works of art in England" that she considered unconvincing.[829] Furthermore, although acknowledging the figures' potential identifications as Sigurd and Reginn, Bailey subsequently suggested that they could be interpreted as the hermit saints, Paul and Anthony.[830] In her survey of medieval depictions of the Völsung legend, Sue Margeson independently proposed the same explanation, arguing that the saints were typically depicted while breaking bread, symbolic of the Mass. This certainly provides a more fitting analogue to the underlying figure with the chalice.[831]

Despite their proposals, neither Bailey nor Margeson fully explored the implications of identifying the figures as Paul and Anthony. The late ninth-/tenth-century date of the cross, its monumental form and the overtly Christian images and ecclesiastical figures included in its repertoire together suggest substantial ecclesiastical influence in compiling its iconographic programme. Indeed, the paired figures' imposition over the figure performing Mass on D suggests both knowledge of Christian liturgy and recognition of the eucharistic significance of the Paul and Anthony episode. Ó Carragáin noted that when depicted on Irish crosses, the saints occur in association with the Crucifixion or Cross,[832] further supporting this identification of the Nunburnholme figures, given their position adjacent to the Crucifixion on C. When these iconographic conventions are considered, the portrayal of these hermit saints at Nunburnholme is thus a far more plausible explanation than

[827] See, Klaus Düwel, "Zur Ikonographie und Ikonologie der Sirgurddarstellungen," in *Zum Problme der Deutung frühmittelalterlicher Bildinhalte: Akten des 1. Internationalen Kolloquiums in Marburg, a.d. Lahn, 15 bis 19 Februar 1983*, ed. Helmut Roth (Sigmaringen: Jan Thorbecke Verlag, 1986), 263.
[828] *Völsunga Saga*, ed./trans. Finch, 34; *Lay of Fafnir*, ed./trans. Larrington, *Poetic Edda*, 159-60.
[829] Davidson, "Sigurd," 232.
[830] Bailey, *Viking Age Sculpture*, 125.
[831] Margeson, "Völsung Legend," 191.
[832] Éamonn Ó Carragáin, "The Meeting of St Paul and St Anthony: Visual and Literary Uses of a Eucharistic Motif," in *Kemeilia: Studies in Medieval Archaeology and History in Memory of Tom Delaney*, ed. Gearóid Mac Niocaill and Patrick F. Wallce (Galway: Galway University Press, 1988), 14.

that positing legendary heroic figures, particularly in the light of the monument's predominantly Christian repertoire, and Anglian precedents for depicting these figures in a monumental context, at Ruthwell (Fig. 4.37),[833] where the scheme bears some similarity to that at Nunburnholme. It contains a confronting pair of (standing) profile figures, with that on the left offering the bread to his counterpart on the right. The raven supplying the loaf is also omitted from both depictions. At Ruthwell this omission facilitates multiple interpretations,[834] suggesting that those responsible for the iconographic programme of the Nunburnholme cross may also have intended the superimposed scene to facilitate multivalent references. Indeed, Jane Geddes argued that variations of the Paul and Anthony motif on Pictish monuments that exclude the raven reflect deliberate choice as the scene still generally refers to the saints' meal, but may not reference explicit narrative moments.[835] This suggests that the raven's absence at Nunburnholme is not unusual, and may indicate that those responsible for the over-carving intended to emphasise the *meal*, rather than other details that might detract from its eucharistic significance. This is significant when considering the Nunburnholme figures' different (seated) disposition, which distinguishes it from the Ruthwell scheme.

There was, however, no fixed iconography for depicting the hermit saints at this date, with multiple figural types circulating in the Insular world, including seated pairs, such as those found at St Vigeans (Angus) (Fig. 4.38a) and Armagh (Armagh) (Fig. 4.38b).[836] Furthermore, in her survey of the various iconographic types, Colleen Thomas observed that amongst medieval examples, the standing type is rare, and in the Insular world it occurs only at Ruthwell, two sites in Ireland and possibly one in Scotland.[837] Consequently, the seated type was more common, implying that its use at Nunburnholme is in keeping with Insular traditions and may represent a variation of the type that is further supported by textual evidence. In Jerome's account of Paul and Anthony's meal, which circulated widely in the Insular world as the authoritative

[833] F. Saxl, "The Ruthwell Cross," *JWCI* 6 (1943): 3; Meyer Schapiro, "The Religious Meaning of the Ruthwell Cross," *The Art Bulletin* 26 no. 4 (1944): 236-37; Ó Carragáin, "Meeting," 3-6; Ó Carragáin, *Ritual and the Rood*, 153-56.
[834] Ó Carragáin, "Meeting," 39-42; Fred Orton, et al., *Fragments of History: Rethinking the Ruthwell and Bewcastle Monuments* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007), 181.
[835] Jane Geddes, *Hunting the Picts* 1 (Edinburgh: Historic Environment Scotland, 2017), 95.
[836] Ó Carragáin, "Meeting," 8; Mike King, "The Downpatrick High Cross – Sharing Bread From Heaven," *Archaeology Ireland* 27, no. 4 (Winter 2013): 15-16; Geddes, *Hunting the Picts* 1, 92-98. For St Vigeans 007, see: Geddes, *Hunting the Picts* 1, 85-106.
[837] Colleen Thomas, "Missing Models: Visual Narrative in the Insular Paul and Antony Panels," in Hawkes, *Making Histories*, 82-83.

version of the tale, they break the bread while seated,[838] a detail that confirms the identification of the Nunburnholme figures as Paul and Anthony and explains the decision to invoke this particular iconographic type.

In the Anglo-Saxon tradition, Paul and Anthony were recognised as the first monks and founders of the first monastery;[839] Ó Carragáin thus argued that the iconographic type depicted at Ruthwell represents monastic welcome and hospitality.[840] Here, specific reference to the figures' actions is established by the accompanying text: "SANCTVS PAVLVS ET A[NTONIVUS] FREGERVNT PANEM IN DESERTO", a reference to the *fractio panis* of the Mass.[841] In this context, the decision to depict these figures at Nunburnholme would have been significant during the Scandinavian settlement of the tenth century, when many monasteries faced decline and abandonment. Additionally, three portrayals of the hermit saints at Kells (Meath), Monasterboice (Louth) and Nigg (Ross and Cromarty) (Fig. 4.39a-c) include a chalice, emphasising the eucharistic associations of their meal.[842] The decision to carve this scene at Nunburnholme over a figure performing Mass therefore represents a conscious choice with implications for understanding the meanings of both the superimposed figures and the ecclesiastical figure underlying them. As Geddes suggested, the St Vigeans scheme references the sacrifice described in John 6:51,[843] which declares "I am the living bread that came down from heaven. If any man eat of this bread he shall live forever, and the bread that I give is my flesh, for the light of the world".[844] These associations are particularly relevant at Nunburnholme, emphasising the eucharistic overtones of the priest performing Mass, Christ's sacrifice on the cross and the superimposed pair of saintly figures, whose bread was received from heaven.

Ó Carragáin further identified the theme of the recognition of Christ shared between the Ruthwell Paul and Anthony and Christ between two Beasts panels.[845] It is possible that recognition was also intended at Nunburnholme in the depictions of the superimposed pair of saints over the priest holding the chalice and Christ on the cross

[838] Ó Carragáin, *Ritual and the Rood*, 154.
[839] Schapiro, "Religious Meaning," 236.
[840] Ó Carragáin, *Ritual and the Rood*, 57; see also Orton, et al., *Fragments of History,* 186.
[841] Ó Carragáin, "Meeting," 3.
[842] Thomas, "Missing Models," 87.
[843] Geddes, *Hunting the Picts* 1, 98.
[844] John 6:51-52: "Ego sum panis vivus, qui de caelo descendi. Si quis manducaverit ex hoc pane, vivet in aeternum: et panis quem ego dabo, caro mea est pro mundi vita".
[845] Ó Carragáin, "Meeting," 4-6.

flanked by two adoring figures on the opposite face. If accepted, this suggests that the recognition of Christ remained relevant after Scandinavian settlement, further implying that those encountering this monument were expected to recognise both Christ on the cross and in the form of the Eucharist, an event emphasised by the two superimposed figures sharing the meal. Such a viewer would understand their own participation in the Mass as the path to salvation made possible by Christ's sacrifice on the cross.

As noted, Christ's divinity is clearly conveyed in the Crucifixion scene and is likewise implied by the nimbed Virgin and Child, who were originally located above the Crucifixion, prompting the viewer to recall the events and promise of Salvation invested in the Incarnation, and fulfilled in Christ's death on the cross.[846] The viewer's contemplation of the carved figures' significance in relation to their own circumstances finds a parallel in the apostolic figures at Collingham, which could result in the perception that learning and spreading the gospel in imitation of the apostles would lead to their own salvation. At Nunburnholme, the emphasis is not on spreading the gospel; rather, it is on recognising that Christ's human sacrifice and divinity are the means by which humanity would achieve salvation. This suggests that the significance of the quartet of images at Nunburnholme lies in the individual recognition of Christ and participation in the Eucharist for personal salvation, as suggested by the actions of the ancillary figures in the Crucifixion scene and those imposed over the priest performing Mass.

The presence and iconographic import of the other accompanying figures can also be explained and understood through the recognition of Christ and the Eucharist. For instance, Ó Carragáin interpreted the saintly figures accompanying the Paul and Anthony scheme on the monument at Nigg (Fig. 4.40) as having eucharistic connections analogous to those at Ruthwell.[847] The significance of these figures, contemplating their books, lies in the implication that the revelation of Christ and the Church was made possible through participating in the Mass and ruminating on the scriptures, in order to understand the connections between Old and New Testament.[848] At Nunburnholme, these concepts are encapsulated by the deliberately ambiguous rectangular objects suspended from the necks of the ecclesiastical figures carved in the

[846] See, Luke 1.26-38.
[847] Ó Carragáin, "Meeting," 9-12; George Henderson and Isabel Henderson, *The Art of the Picts: Sculpture and Metalwork in Early Medieval Scotland* (London: Thames & Hudson, 2004), 139-140.
[848] Ó Carragáin, "Meeting," 12.

upper panels of the cross. Their resemblance to book satchels, used to hold scriptural and liturgical manuscripts, would encourage the viewer to recall the New Testament. Similarly, their pelleted decoration might evoke the breastplate worn by Hebrew priests, which would inspire a viewer to contemplate the connections between the two Testaments. Furthermore, the viewer might count the 12 pellets decorating these objects, understood to prefigure the 12 apostles. Contemplation of the relationship between the Old and New Testaments may also be suggested by the seated figures on A. These would remind secular lords and other secular viewers of their duty to consider and emulate the ideals of Christian lordship exemplified by David, and renewed in Christ. Such associations would have a dual purpose: aiding in recalling and contemplating figurative relationships between the Old and New Testaments, and reminding a viewer to understand the Gospel and participate in the Eucharist to achieve and maintain proper engagement with the Church, which would eventually lead to their Salvation.

The ecclesiastical figures may also have been included in this scheme to emphasise their role in facilitating access to this sacramental rite, whose provision was restricted to particular clerical grades: bishops and priests could say Mass; deacons could not.[849] In the Anglian period, members of the Church were expected to hear Mass and receive communion frequently, but the Eucharist could only be administered after strict requirements (baptism, preliminary fasting, confession and penance) had been met.[850] Emphasis on the Mass and participation in it alludes to its significance for the laity to obtain and maintain good social standing within a predominantly Christian society, factors which probably attained greater relevance during a period when the Church was attempting to convert newly-settled Scandinavian populations. The centrality of baptism and participation in the Eucharist is further demonstrated at Nunburnholme in the Crucifixion, which reflects the significance of Christ's death and its fulfilment of divine prophecy as provisions for salvation. Likewise, the Eucharist, emphasised in the lower panel of D, invokes Christians' ability to participate in Christ's triumph on the Cross, also made explicit by the pair of flanking figures in the Crucifixion scene. Thus, presenting these themes on a monumental cross would convey to a public audience, particularly Anglo-Scandinavian lay audiences, the

[849] Thacker, "Monks, Preaching and Pastoral Care," 138.
[850] Ibid., 154-55.

significance of the sacrament, and by implication, baptism and the everlasting salvation one could expect to gain by participating in these rites.

Such complex frames of reference may have been reinforced by the angel frieze featured in the upper panels of A, B and D (Fig. 4.41a-c), which has hitherto received little scholarly consideration, having been discussed primarily as an analogue to that carved on the Newgate cross-shaft (Fig. 4.42).[851] Nevertheless, these apparently peripheral figures can be reassessed in the light of the predominantly Christian repertoire of the shaft's figural iconography, to demonstrate that, despite their 'relegation' to the fringes, they perform a central role in the overall programme. Indeed, their depiction beyond the arches surrounding the figures below notwithstanding, their arrangement conforms to earlier Anglian sculptural traditions, where angelic figures were dispersed to form an explicit part in the overall figural programme,[852] something implied here by the way the angels reach toward the apex of the arches, grasping them in their hands. This gives the appearance of breaking the frame, apparently bringing them into the space occupied by the figures below.

The angelic figures' arrangement around the corners of the cross-shaft thus unites its upper panels and their figural subjects. This enables the apparently secular figure holding a sword on A to be viewed alongside the ecclesiastical or saintly figures on B and D, while the nimbus of the figure at the top of D links it with the Virgin and Child on C. Given that neither figure on A or B is nimbed, and that on A holds the apparently secular attribute of a sword, the angels may have been intended to provide a devotional or iconic context for them, a phenomenon occurring in earlier manuscript depictions, such as that on folio 7v in the late eighth-century Book of Kells (Fig. 4.43).[853] Significantly, the Nunburnholme Virgin and Child panel is not surmounted by angels, but rather, a pair of confronting wyverns, which may be deliberate: while the angels on A, B and D link and designate the otherwise ambiguous ecclesiastical or saintly status of the figures below, the status of the Virgin and Child would have been readily recognisable.

[851] Pattison, "Nunburnholme Cross," 211, 218-225, 231-232; Lang, "Sculptors," 85-86, 90; Lang, *York and Eastern Yorkshire*, 105-107 (Newgate); Appendix, I.106.
[852] See, e.g., Otley and Halton: Thomas Pickles, "Angel Veneration on Anglo-Saxon Stone Sculpture from Dewsbury (West Yorkshire), Otley (West Yorkshire) and Halton (Lancashire): Contemplative Preachers and Pastoral Care," *JBAA* 162 no. 1 (2009): 18-22; Hawkes, "Gregory the Great," 437.
[853] Carol A. Farr, "*Bis Per Chorum Hinc et Inde:* The 'Virgin and Child with Angels' in the Book of Kells," in Minnis and Roberts, *Text, Image and Interpretation*, 118.

The angels' gestures and arrangement also carry symbolic significances derived from patristic texts and the liturgy, which correspond to Anglian sculptural precedents. For instance, Hawkes observed that a group of ninth-century monuments in Derbyshire share distinctive depictions of angels, which differ from typical sculptural arrangements by deliberately displaying the angels in the cross-head to reference the themes of fellowship between angels and humanity; contemplation of the divine by humanity and the angelic; and the subsequent implications of such contemplation for the pastoral life of the Church, as expressed in Gregory the Great's *Moralia in Job* and homilies on Ezekiel.[854]

Though arranged differently and separated by time and space, these themes are not inappropriate at Nunburnholme. Here, the angels' arrangement beneath the (now absent) cross-head emphasises their connections to the heavenly and divine, indicated by their depiction beyond the architectural frames enclosing the figures below, thus separating them from the realm of the human. Yet, the angels' grasp of the arches perforates the planes of existence separating the human and divine, creating fellowship between angels and humanity. Furthermore, it facilitates the presentation of the figures depicted within, providing an analogue to the Crucifixion on C. It can also be viewed as raising the figures upward to contemplate the divine, as at Eyam (Derbys.) (Fig. 4.44a-d), where the single male figure on the cross-head is displayed among the angels to emphasise his association with them and his relationship to the viewer below, whose contemplation of the carved scheme above physically stretches them upwards.[855] At Nunburnholme, the figures in the upper panels and the viewer are drawn closer to the divine by the actions of the accompanying angels. It is an action also performed by the ancillary figures in the Crucifixion scheme. As Chazelle argued, gazing at the cross underscored the significance of Christ's sacrifice as the source of redemption and sacred wisdom,[856] rendering the flanking figures multivalent, revealing Christ's dual nature through his blessing and, through their adoration of the cross, inspiring the viewer to witness Christ's divinity by contemplating the carved cross before which they stood and participating in the Mass.

The contact with, and contemplation of, divinity alluded to by the angels and Crucifixion are further emphasised elsewhere. As Hawkes and Pickles independently

[854] Hawkes, "Gregory the Great," 437-42; cf. Richard Sowerby, *Angels in Early Medieval England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), 51-53.
[855] Ibid., 443-44.
[856] Chazelle, *The Crucified God*, 116.

observed, Gregory conceived of humans' and angels' shared contemplative abilities as the means to understanding the divine; through contemplation, humans could imitate angels by providing pastoral ministry on earth, in turn enabling access to eternal life in heaven.[857] These concepts were reiterated by Bede, for whom Christ's Incarnation reconciled humankind with God and the angels, who were responsible for instructing humanity on how to achieve salvation.[858] At Nunburnholme, such reconciliation is implicit in the Virgin and Child and Crucifixion on C, which prompt the viewer to recall the events and promise of salvation initiated by the Incarnation, and fulfilled at the Crucifixion. Likewise, the pastoral roles Gregory and Bede emphasised are alluded to by the Eucharistic imagery of the figures in the lower panel of D. Indeed, this panel's eucharistic significance may have further implications for how the Nunburnholme angels were viewed and understood in relation to the performance of the Mass.

The *Gloria* and *Sanctus* of the Mass were drawn from scriptural texts sung by angels, and in the ninth-century Stowe Missal, the *Sanctus* is introduced by a prayer that calls upon the orders of angels worshipping God in heaven to do so alongside the voices of the earthly Church.[859] These concepts were presented visually in the Temptation image on folio 202v in the Book of Kells (Fig. 4.45), which represents the c*ommunio sanctorum*.[860] This theological concept was referred to in the prayers and liturgy of the Mass and divine office throughout the ninth century in the Insular world, and it is attested in the ninth-century Book of Cerne, where it formed a primary theme.[861] It invoked choirs of 'saints' – the living, the saints in heaven, the Virgin, prophets and all the orders of angels – to partake spiritually and liturgically in the mystery of Christ's body.[862] Baptism was a necessary prerequisite for participation in the *communio sanctorum,* and the term 'saint' was understood from an early date to denote those who had been baptised.[863] The c*ommunio sanctorum* was thus intended to unify the faithful (living and dead), and to promote the concept of the Church eternal, with Christ at its head.[864] Michelle Brown demonstrated that it was associated with

[857] Hawkes, "Gregory the Great," 441-42; Pickles, "Angel Veneration," 14-15.
[858] Pickles, "Angel Veneration," 16.
[859] Hawkes, "Gregory the Great," 440; Farr, "*Bis Per Chorum*," 125-26.
[860] Farr, "*Bis Per Chorum*," 128-30. Michelle P. Brown, *The Book of Cerne: Prayer, Patronage and Power in Ninth-Century England* (London: British Library, 1996), 148.
[861] Farr, "*Bis Per Chorum*," 130; Brown, *Book of Cerne*, 109-14.
[862] Farr, "*Bis Per Chorum*," 130; Brown, *Book of Cerne*, 109.
[863] Brown, *Book of Cerne*, 109, 147.
[864] Ibid., 147-48.

Christ's sacrifice, a concept underpinned by extracts from the Gospel concerning Christ's Passion and Resurrection, which emphasised how to achieve communion with the Trinity and the Church, conceived as the body of Christ.[865]

In this context, the iconographic programme at Nunburnholme can be perceived as a visual iteration of the *communio sanctorum*. Here, the Virgin and Child and Crucifixion refer to the fulfilment of divine prophecy that enabled humanity's future salvation. The angels and figures in the upper panels of A and B can be understood to represent the living, the dead and the orders of angels participating in the *communio sanctorum*. Together, these schemes emphasise the centrality of baptism and participation in the Eucharist as provision for salvation. Furthermore, the chalice and bread held by the figures on D invoke liturgical participation in the body of Christ, and Christians' ability to participate in Christ's triumph on the cross. Likewise, the ecclesiastical figure at the top of B emphasises the role of facilitating access to this sacrament. Emphasis on the Mass, participation in it, and by extension, the *communio sanctorum*, probably attained greater relevance in the context of the late ninth- and tenth-century conversion of Scandinavian settlers.

Such connections are also referenced by the pelleted border, which notably links the figures on D, but also points to an understanding of the *communio sanctorum*. Meg Boulton has argued that jewelled borders were included in the apses of early Christian churches to signify the heavenly Jerusalem.[866] She further observed that an early ninth-century Anglo-Saxon ivory performs the same function (Fig. 4.46),[867] its circular details being originally inlaid with glass to enhance architectural elements representing the heavenly Jerusalem. Given such heavenly associations, the pelleted architectural settings at Nunburnholme may have been intended to signify the figures' heavenly surroundings, something reinforced visually by the angels above, particularly if the pellets were originally painted. Together, the angels and their accompanying figures visually invoke the *communio sanctorum*, which emphasises communal participation in the Church made possible by Christ's sacrifice on the cross.

---

[865] Ibid., 149-50.

[866] Meg Boulton, "Bejewelling Jerusalem: Architectural Adornment and Symbolic Significance in the Early Church in the Christian West," in Newman, et al., *Islands in a Global Context*, 17-20; Meg Boulton, "(Re-)Viewing "*Iuxta Morem Romanorum"*: Considering Perception, Phenomenology, and Anglo-Saxon Ecclesiastical Art and Architecture," in *Sensory Perception in the Medieval West*, ed. Simon Thomson and Michael Bintley (Turnhout: Brepols, 2016), 217-224.

[867] Boulton, "'End of the World'," 287; Meg Boulton, "Art History in the Dark Ages: (Re)Considering Space, Stasis and Modern Viewing Practices in Relation to Anglo-Saxon Imagery," in *Stasis in the Medieval West? Questioning Change and Continuity*, ed. Michael D.J. Bintley, et al. (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017), 76.

Therefore, rather than interpreting one panel as portraying an event from Scandinavian legend, viewing it as a scheme that signifies the central rite of Mass complements and contributes to the complex frames of reference alluded to by the monument's overall iconographic programme. Furthermore, these complex frames of reference demonstrate that the images carved on the Nunburnholme cross were chosen deliberately, with the intention of together eliciting particular responses from viewers, and so should not be viewed in isolation. Rather, they should be understood as parts of a coherent and cohesive whole, which implements and maintains earlier Anglian theological traditions that promote contemplation of the divine, in order to facilitate pastoral care. This is revealed in the emphasis on the provision of the Mass, a rite that remained significant, and which invokes the *communio sanctorum*, in turn emphasising the ability of all Christians to participate in the body of Christ and eternal salvation.

While the theological connections between the carved images on this monument may appear too sophisticated to be understood even by contemporary ecclesiastical audiences, the range of references presented by the carvings – from ambiguous to the more explicit – demonstrates that at least two potential audiences were deemed likely to access this monument. Its iconographic programme includes images with recognisable elements that make allowances for the less initiated Christian, such as the Virgin and Child or Crucifixion, while the long garments and vestments worn by some of the figures may have been identifiable with contemporary ecclesiastical figures and the social elite. The carvings also indicate that the monument was encountered by a second group, involving an informed ecclesiastical audience, familiar with the sacraments and their liturgy, who could identify and decipher the relationships between the carvings, resulting in a greater understanding of Christian theological concepts. Moreover, the different levels of visual complexity may reflect the tenth-century shift from closed ecclesiastical and/or monastic communities to the more secularised Church that marked the beginnings of the parochial system. Examination of the complex set of Christian images carved on the Nunburnholme cross reveals how its iconography demonstrates both continuity with Anglian Christian traditions and an innovative approach to facilitating the viewers' recognition of Christ and the Eucharist as the keys to salvation.

4.4 Gosforth

As at Nunburnholme, the figural imagery of the Gosforth cross (Cu.) has long been assumed to derive from the Norse subject-matter, here associated with the mythological Ragnarök.[868] While some of its carvings may be secular, they are also deliberately ambiguous and the conscious choice to include them on a monumental cross suggests the possibility that they could possess other (Christian) connotations. Some scholars have indeed recognised this,[869] but others nevertheless consider them to be purely 'pagan'. Here, it will be argued that reconciling the carvings with their monumental Christian context is critical for understanding how they would have been perceived by contemporary Anglo-Scandinavian audiences, and can thus recover more of the monument's full range of symbolic significance(s). The complete cross-shaft (Fig. 4.47) dates to the first half of the tenth century,[870] and belongs to a group of round-shaft derivative crosses found throughout Lancashire, Cheshire, Western Yorkshire and the Peak District of Derbyshire into Staffordshire, though its proportions and the arrangement of its carvings distinguish it from others in this group.[871] The cylinder's lower portion is undecorated, while the upper is filled by a multiple ring chain around its circumference. All four faces of the shaft's upper, rectangular portion are filled with figural subjects, depicted on different planes. The absence of panel divisions suggests the influence of Scandinavian artistic conventions, finding parallels on Gotlandic picture-stones and objects from the Oseberg ship burial, which depict seried narratives without ornamental elements to divide them.[872] Such influences may also explain the use of multiple planes in some of the figural scenes; this is another common feature of Scandinavian art, although, as seen, it also appears

[868] Calverley, "The Sculptured Cross at Gosforth, West Cumberland," *TCWAAS*, ser. 1, 6 (1883): 378-84; Calverley, *Notes*, 142-48; Collingwood, "Sculpture…West Riding," 242; Kendrick, *Late Saxon*, 68-69; Hilda R.E. Davidson, *Gods and Myths of Northern Europe* (Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1964), 207-08; Bailey, *Viking Age Sculpture*, 125-31; Bailey and Cramp, *Cumberland, Westmorland*, 102-03; Jan Erik Rekdal, "Pagan Myth and Christian Doctrine," in *Celtic-Norse Relationships in the Irish Sea in the Middle Ages 800-1200*, ed. Timothy Bolton and Jón Viðarr Sigurðsson (Leiden: Brill, 2014), 109; Kopár, *Gods and Settlers*, 91-101.

[869] Charles A. Parker and W.G. Collingwood "A Reconsideration of the Gosforth Cross," *TCWAAS* ser. 2, 17 (1917): 110; Knut Berg, "The Gosforth Cross," *JWCI* 21 no. 1/2 (Jan.-Jun. 1958): 33.

[870] Bailey and Cramp, *Cumberland, Westmorland*, 103; Appendix, I.36.

[871] Ibid., 101. For discussion of the round-shaft derivative type, see Cramp, *General Introduction to the Series*, CASSS 2 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988), xiv; Calverley, "Sculptured Cross at Gosforth," 375; Calverley, *Notes*, 140-41; Collingwood, "Sculpture…North Riding," 275; Collingwood, "Sculpture…East Riding," 273; Collingwood, *Northumbrian Crosses*, 6, 155-56; Kendrick, *Late Saxon*, 68-72.

[872] Bailey, *Viking Age Sculpture*, 79.

in Insular contexts on objects such as the early eighth-century Franks Casket produced in Northumbria.

At the base of A (Fig. 4.48) is a figural scheme presented in three registers, likely due to the shaft's narrow proportions, which prevent a horizontal sequential arrangement. The lowermost comprises a supine figure with raised arms chained to a serpent, whose head hangs over the figure. Above is a kneeling female figure, with the ponytail hair arrangement typical for this period, holding out a bowl.[873] The group is 'sheltered' by a roof, enabling the scheme to be identified as depicting the god Loki, bound beneath the serpent and attended by his wife Sigyn, who attempts to collect the snake's acidic venom.[874] Above is an upside-down horseman (Fig. 4.49) wearing a short kirtle and carrying a spear, who has been identified as Odin riding Sleipnir (to consult Mimir).[875] The horseman lacks any attributes associated with Odin, however, such as the single eye or two ravens, and the horse has four legs, rather than the eight always associated with visual presentations of Sleipnir. A human figure in a short kirtle holding a spear stands above on a perpendicular plane (Fig. 4.50). This has been interpreted as Heimdallr with the Gjallarhorn in his left hand (though this attribute is difficult to discern), rousing the gods for the final battle of Ragnarök.[876] Although unable to identify the horseman, Bailey suggested that its pairing with the remaining figures alludes to the enmity between Heimdallr and Loki, with Loki's escape from his bindings the catalyst for Ragnarök.[877]

The arrangement of B (Fig. 4.51) differs slightly, with a profile beast at its base and above, a figural scene featuring a horseman arranged analogously to that on A, but accompanied by a vertically-disposed hound above, whose head faces upwards. A short section of interlace lies below its legs on the same plane. Above a run of ring-chain terminates in a ring-encircled animal head, which Kopár interpreted as Fenrir devouring the sun.[878] Given the discrepancies between the ring-chain zoomorph and the hound below, this explanation is unlikely; rather, it may simply have been

[873] Ibid.
[874] Calverley, "Sculptured Cross at Gosforth," 378-81; Calverley, *Notes*, 142-47; Collingwood, "Sculpture…West Riding," 214; Parker and Collingwood, "Reconsideration," 102; Bailey, *Viking Age Sculpture*, 128; Kopár, *Gods and Settlers*, 82-83.
[875] Calverley, "Sculptured Cross at Gosforth," 383-84; Calverley, *Notes*, 148-49.
[876] Calverley, "Sculptured Cross at Gosforth," 383; Calverley, *Notes*, 148; Davidson, *Gods and Myth*, 173; Bailey, *Viking Age Sculpture*, 128.
[877] Bailey, *Viking Age Sculpture*, 128-29.
[878] Kopár, *Gods and Settlers*, 77.

understood as a beast with bound jaws, generally. Just below the cross-head is a further zoomorph.

The interlace below the hound is not serpentine (Fig. 4.52),[879] and the hound's vertical arrangement is determined by the constraints of the shaft, indicating that it pursues the profile beast above – a hart. The scheme has been explained as Garm attacking the hart, Eikthyrnir, which symbolised the fountain of living waters,[880] but this was later rejected because Eikthyrnir is neither a significant mythological figure, nor possesses any connections to Garm.[881] Thus Kopár, following Calverley, identified the horseman as a Odin pursuing Garm on horseback,[882] despite Knut Berg's previous rejection of this due to the lack of Odinic attributes.[883] Furthermore, she ignored the hart, and the fact that the horse has only four legs, rather than the eight associated with Sleipnir, as on the Alskog, Tjängvide picture-stone (Fig. 4.53). Any identification of the rider as Odin is therefore dubious at best, while the hart-and-hound motif cannot be associated with any extant Norse mythological episodes,[884] and so the possibility that the scheme may have other (Christian) connotations should therefore be considered.

At Dacre and Middleton, the motif was carved on monumental crosses, instilling it with potential Christian significances regardless of its ultimate art-historical origins.[885] As noted, it is understood to symbolise persecuted Christians or Christ's passion, with two additional psalm-based referents, enabling it to be viewed as a symbol of the soul attacked by evil, or as symbolic of Christ's Passion.[886] Bailey demonstrated this using patristic texts, in which the hart and dogs of Psalm 21 were understood to allude to the moment of Christ's Passion, and argued that the Dacre motif should be interpreted likewise.[887] Given the unusual arrangement and placement of the Gosforth Crucifixion, carved on C, it seems plausible that here, the hart-and-hound motif was also intended to signify Christ's Passion and the subsequent potential for redemption, rather than a pair of Norse mythological beasts.

---

[879] Parker and Collingwood, "Reconsideration," 102.
[880] Berg, "The Gosforth Cross," 28-29.
[881] Ibid., 36-37.
[882] Calverley, "Sculptured Cross at Gosforth," 384-87; Calverley, *Notes*, 148-53; Kopár, *Gods and Settlers*, 93.
[883] Berg, "The Gosforth Cross," 37.
[884] Ibid.
[885] See Ch.3, 157-58, 162-65.
[886] Collingwood, "Anglian Cross-shafts at Dacre," 160; Parker and Collingwood, "Reconsideration," 110; Bailey, "Meaning of the Viking-age Shaft," 68-69.
[887] Bailey, "Meaning of the Viking-age Shaft," 69.

Unlike A and B, Face C (Fig. 4.54) contains two figural scenes separated by a run of ring-chain, below which are two intertwined and confronting ribbon beasts with open jaws. The lower figural group (Fig. 4.55) comprises two confronting, profile human figures, beneath a frontal figure wearing a short, belted kirtle, enclosed within a rectangular frame grasped in his outstretched hands, which protrude in front of the frame. This figure was originally identified as Odin, Baldr or Heimdallr crucified, above the Midgard serpent,[888] but has since been re-identified as the only Christian scene on the cross: a rare example of a cross-less Crucifixion, with only two extant tenth-century sculptural analogues at Bothal (Nld.) (Fig. 4.56a) and Penrith (Cu.) (Fig. 4.56b).[889] Bailey observed that the location of this scene low on the shaft, above the transition from the shaft's round to square portions, makes it one of the most visually accessible scenes, being carved just above head-height.[890] This implies that it was intended to be amongst the first scenes encountered and considered by those accessing the monument. The scheme's other unusual features, the paired profile figures below Christ, have contributed further to the debate. For instance, they have been argued to derive from Irish models,[891] because the left-hand figure, identified as Longinus, [892] wears a short kirtle and holds a long spear which pierces Christ's side. Yet Bailey argued that without any explicit features to indicate such particular origins, the scene was likely adapted for representation according to Scandinavian visual conventions.[893]

This is evinced by the right-hand figure, depicted in typical female Scandinavian dress, who extends a curved object towards the figure opposite. She was originally identified as (a Scandinavianised) Ecclesia collecting the blood of Christ, derived from continental models.[894] Berg, however, observed that the omission of Synagoga is unusual, particularly as the pair express the triumph of the New covenant

[888] Calverley, "Sculptured Cross at Gosforth," 389-92; Henry Colley March, "The Pagan-Christian Overlap in the North," *Trans. LCAS* 9 (1891): 86; Calverley, *Notes*, 153-58; Berg, "The Gosforth Cross," 29.
[889] Parker and Collingwood, "Reconsideration," 105; Berg, "The Gosforth Cross," 30; Bailey, *Viking Age Sculpture*, 127; Bailey and Cramp, *Cumberland, Westmorland*, 101-02; Kopár, *Gods and Settlers*, xviii. For Bothal 2: Cramp, *County Durham and Northumberland*, 165-66; Appendix, I.12. For Penrith 11: Bailey and Cramp, *Cumberland, Westmorland*, 140-42.
[890] Richard N. Bailey, "Scandinavian Myth of Viking-period Stone Sculpture in England," in *Old Norse Myths, Literature and Society: The Proceedings of the 11th International Saga Conference, 2-7 July 2000, University of Sydney*, ed. Geraldine Barnes and Margaret Clunies Ross (Sydney: Centre for Medieval Studies, University of Sydney, 2000), 20.
[891] Berg, "The Gosforth Cross," 30.
[892] Ibid., 30-31; Bailey, *Viking Age Sculpture*, 130; Bailey and Cramp, *Cumberland, Westmorland*, 102; Kopár, *Gods and Settlers*, 94-95.
[893] Bailey, *Viking Age Sculpture*, 230.
[894] Berg, "The Gosforth Cross," 30-31.

over the Old.[895] While this may be attributed to the cross-shaft's narrow proportions, if the serpents below these two figures had been excluded, there would have been enough space to include both Stephaton and/or Synagoga. This implies that if the female figure was intended to represent Ecclesia, Synagoga was deliberately omitted. Given the female figure's position on the 'wrong' side of Christ, it nevertheless seems unlikely that she was intended to represent Ecclesia, although this does not preclude the possibility that she was intended to carry Christian associations. For instance, Bailey suggested that due to her placement she should be identified as Mary Magdalene carrying her alabastron, and may thus have been understood to represent the converted heathen.[896] He further argued that Mary Magdalene would be an appropriate counterpart to Longinus, as both figures symbolise converted heathens and the recognition of Christ's divinity.[897]

Kopár, recognising this possibility, nevertheless argued that the figure should be interpreted as a Valkyrie receiving a victorious warrior into Valhalla because this scene apparently shares features with twelfth-century Icelandic texts describing Odin or Odinic sacrifices, though only one of her suggested parallels is relevant: spearing the hero.[898] Furthermore, she argued that the female figure, viewed as a Valkyrie, was a symbol of death and mortality potentially associated with the mythological figure, Hel,[899] despite lacking any relevant attributes. Although the figure's hairstyle, garments and attribute derive from Scandinavian models, these features do not necessarily imply that she carries Norse mythological significance. Indeed, the horn may simply be a female gender signifier, as alcohol production was one of numerous domestic duties undertaken by early medieval women.[900] Moreover, Judith Jesch has suggested that serving food and drink was the only parallel between mythological Valkyries and real Viking-age women,[901] indicating that the vessel the female figure carries may have been understood as any food or drink vessel, rather than one explicitly associated with Valhalla. It thus seems likely that she was deliberately depicted within contemporary Scandinavian visual conventions to differentiate her

[895] Ibid., 31-32.
[896] Bailey, *Viking Age Sculpture*, 130; Bailey, "Scandinavian Myth," 20-21; Calverley, "Sculptured Cross at Gosforth," 397; Parker and Collingwood, "Reconsideration," 105; Collingwood, *Northumbrian Crosses*, 104-05.
[897] Bailey, "Scandinavian Myth," 21.
[898] Kopár, *Gods and Settlers*, 95-101.
[899] Ibid., 132-33.
[900] Helen M. Jewell, *Women in Dark Age and Early Medieval Europe, c. 500-1200* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), 57.
[901] Judith Jesch, *Women in the Viking Age* (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 1991), 127.

from Longinus and Christ, and to ensure that she would be recognised as female by contemporary audiences. It is also significant that only singular female figures have been included in the Gosforth iconographic programme: Scandinavian depictions of 'Valkyries' typically include multiple female figures in individual scenes, or a single female figure confronting a horseman disposed on the same plane within an implied mythological context , as on the ninth- to eleventh-century Gotlandic picture-stones from Tängelgårda (Fig. 4.57a) and Alskog, Tjängvide I (Fig. 4.57b). The female figure on the Tängelgårda picture-stone stands on the left, extending a curved object to the horseman and two to three Odinic valknuts are dispersed between the legs of the horse, while on Alskog, Tjängvide I, the horseman is mounted on an eight-legged horse, clearly intended to represent Sleipnir. Conversely, the Gosforth female figure's inclusion in the shaft's only overtly Christian scene implies that she was intended to be viewed and understood within Christian frames of reference, rather than as a Norse mythological figure inserted into the historical narrative of the Crucifixion. Furthermore, if she was intended to represent a Valkyrie welcoming a slain warrior to Valhalla, it is more likely that she would have been depicted confronting Christ on the same plane, as on the Gotlandic picture-stones. While this may be attributed to the rectangular shaft's narrow proportions, the sculptor was able to include Sigyn on the same spatial planes as Loki and the serpent on A. This indicates that the female figure in the Crucifixion scheme was deliberately depicted on a separate plane from Christ, which neither reinforces the attitudes of assistance or servility that might be suggested by Sigyn's actions, nor does it suggest that she is receiving him into Valhalla.

Although this figural type may have originated in Scandinavia and carried particular (but now lost) symbolic meanings associated with Scandinavian traditional beliefs, its insertion into a critical Christian narrative recontextualises it, potentially instilling it with new symbolic significance(s). Here, therefore, the female figure and her horn-vessel should be viewed alongside other images of horn-bearing figures produced within Insular Christian contexts. Carol Neuman de Vegvar identified several examples of such figures in Old and New Testament scenes, but observed only two accompanying Crucifixion scenes:[902] on Muiredach's Cross, Monasterboice (Louth) (Fig. 4.58a) and the Durrow Cross (Offaly) (Fig. 4.58b), where they portray the denial of Peter with horns intended to symbolise Peter's weakness, although the

[902] Carol Neuman de Vegvar, "A Feast to the Lord: Drinking Horns, the Church and the Liturgy," in *Objects, Images and the Word: Art in the Service of the Liturgy*, ed. Colum Hourihane (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2003), 237-40.

scriptural accounts do not refer explicitly to feasting or drinking.[903] Being female, the Gosforth figure is unlikely to denote the denial of Peter, but the arrangement of other Insular figures carrying analogous attributes adjacent to Crucifixion scenes nevertheless suggests a precedent for the Gosforth figure, while her presentation according to Scandinavian conventions implies that this was more readily recognisable to contemporary audiences.

In late Anglo-Saxon manuscripts, horns are consistently depicted as attributes of figures who appear in negative contexts, as symbols of *vanitas* or to indicate that the figures are pre-Christian sinners.[904] At Gosforth, such associations may be attributed to both the female figure and Longinus, given their exclusion from the Crucifixion by the cabled frame surrounding Christ; indeed, the only indication that they belong to the same scene is Longinus' spear, which crosses behind the frame, piercing Christ's side. It is significant that the pair are presented this way, as Longinus was associated with (Roman) traditional beliefs until his apparent conversion, following the Crucifixion.[905] It appears that the sculptors of the Gosforth cross used the framing device to communicate to contemporary audiences that, although these three figures belong to the same narrative moment, the lower pair are distinct from Christ and, by extension, were to be associated with traditional beliefs, initially excluding them from the salvation facilitated by Christ's sacrifice. The absence of any feature dividing the pair from the serpent-like creature below may have further alluded to the figures' previous associations.

Liturgical uses of horns may also be relevant to understanding how this figure was viewed and understood by contemporary audiences. Although horns were never used as chalices for performing the Mass in the Anglo-Saxon Church, they were used in services for the ordination of minor orders by the late tenth century as recorded in Old English glosses to the late tenth- or eleventh-century Anderson Pontifical.[906] They are likewise mentioned in Anglo-Saxon hagiographies for dispensing consecrated liquids, such as water, among the catechumens, and in later medieval texts, they are recorded as containers for the oil blessed by bishops, and used for various anointings.[907] This range of uses demonstrates how contemporary Christian audiences

[903] Ibid., 240.
[904] Ibid., 241-44.
[905] John 19:34-37; Mark 15:39-40; Matt. 27:54; Luke 23:47.
[906] Neuman de Vegvar, "Feast for the Lord," 249; London, British Library, Add. MS 577337.
[907] Ibid., 249-50.

may have interpreted the object carried by the female figure in the Gosforth Crucifixion scene.

First, it is unlikely she would have been interpreted as Ecclesia, for the chalice carried by this allegorical figure is associated with the Eucharist, thus representing the liturgical ceremony from which horns were apparently excluded. Second, the liturgical use of horns as vessels for consecrated liquids supports the suggestions that the Gosforth figure could have been viewed by contemporary audiences as a depiction of Mary Magdalene with her alabastron, understood to signify the converted non-Christian.[908] This would also explain her depiction alongside Longinus, the other formerly non-Christian figure, beyond the frame enclosing Christ. Viewing the female figure in the light of other Insular figures with horns thus broadens the possible range of Christian meanings associated with her. It suggests, at the very least, that Mary Magdalene and Longinus, as converts, would be appropriate and relevant iconographic choices to include in a Crucifixion scheme, given the ongoing conversion and Christianisation of incoming Scandinavian populations, who likely formed the intended audience for this monument, as indicated by the selection of a traditional Scandinavian female figural-type.

On a vertical plane above the ring-chain separating the figural scenes on C is a human figure wearing a short, flared garment (Fig. 4.59a). He holds a spear and confronts an open-mouthed beast whose body is intertwined with that of another, whose head lies below the cross-head (Fig. 4.59b). This has been interpreted as another Ragnarök scene described in twelfth-century texts as Viðarr's revenge against the wolf that had slain Odin, his father.[909] Bailey suggested that its pairing with the Crucifixion below portrays triumph over evil, an explanation repeated by Kopár,[910] who further suggested that the pairing fuses Christian and Norse eschatological narratives.[911] For Kopár, the spear in the Crucifixion image and those carried by the horsemen refer to the cult of Odin, an argument based on this figure's identification as Viðarr attacking Fenrir.[912] The absence of any Odinic attributes (such as the valknut

[908] Bailey, *Viking Age Sculpture*, 130; Bailey, "Scandinavian Myth," 20-21; Calverley, "Sculptured Cross at Gosforth," 397; Parker and Collingwood, "Reconsideration," 105; Collingwood, *Northumbrian Crosses*, 104-05.
[909] Calverley, "Sculptured Cross at Gosforth," 393-95; Calverley, *Notes*, 158-60; Parker and Collingwood, "Reconsideration," 102-05; Bailey, *Viking Age Sculpture*, 128; Kopár, *Gods and Settlers*, 75-77.
[910] Bailey, *Viking Age Sculpture*, 128; Kopár, *Gods and Settlers*, 91-92.
[911] Kopár, *Gods and Settlers*, 93-94.
[912] Ibid., 110.

symbol, two ravens or Sleipnir) suggests it is unlikely that any of these images were intended to recall Odin or his cult. The fact that the beast does not resemble a wolf when compared to the wolf or hound on B further compounds the complications. On the other hand, alternative identifications for this beast and that at the top of B – as depictions of biblical Leviathans – can be pursued.

While parallels have been drawn between Leviathans and the dragon-like beasts carved on other Viking-age monuments, including the Gosforth 'fishing stone',[913] such associations have yet to be made for this cross. The ring around the jaws of the beast on B, for instance, may be explained as a literal interpretation of Job 40:20-21, which asks whether the Leviathan's tongue can be tied with a cord, a ring can be put through his nose or whether it is possible to bore through his jaw with a buckle. The Borre ring-chain used for the beast's body also finds explanation in Job 41:6-8, which describes the Leviathan's body as appearing like a series of molten shields with inseparable scales. This combination may in fact suggest that the sculptors attempted to 'invent' a Leviathan here, with features reflecting the scriptural accounts of that beast's appearance. Its placement above the hart-and-hound motif may also be significant; if the hart-and-hound was intended to symbolise Christ's Passion, its juxtaposition with the beast above would suggest that redemption could only be attained through Christ's sacrifice, which enabled triumph over the beast, and by extension, all evil, as implied by its bound jaws.

This arrangement is echoed on C, where the beast confronted by the human figure above the Crucifixion may also have been intended to represent Leviathan as invoked in Isaiah 27:1, where, as noted at Middleton, the Lord confronts and slays the Leviathan, described as "bar serpent" and "crooked serpent", with his sword.[914] On C, it appears that the biblical beast has once again been 'invented', combining a beast's head, similar to that on B, with a four-strand plait that comprises the 'crooked' body of the Leviathan. Although the figure holds a spear rather than sword, this does not preclude the possibility that contemporary audiences could interpret the scheme as a battle with the Leviathan. Although Bailey argued that Viðarr's revenge was paired with the Crucifixion to symbolise triumph over evil,[915] the Leviathan's defeat would also signify this, and probably offers a more appropriate analogue to the Crucifixion

[913] Bailey, *Viking Age Sculpture*, 124-32. For Gosforth 6: Bailey and Cramp, *Cumberland, Westmorland*, 108-09.
[914] Isaiah 27:1: "In die illa visitabit Dominus in gladio suo duro, et grandi, et forti, super Leviathan, serpentem vectem, et super Leviathan, serpentem tortuosum, et occidet cetum qui in mari est".
[915] Bailey, *Viking Age Sculpture*, 128.

carved below, given their monumental Christian context. Here, the serpent's defeat may have been recognised as articulating victory over evil, facilitated by Christ's sacrifice on the cross and anticipating the eschaton. These concepts are implied by the account in Rev. 20:1-2, where the angel descends from heaven to bind Satan, described as a dragon and serpent; this goes some way to explaining the ring 'binding' the beast's jaws.

Furthermore, the eschaton is anticipated in the Gosforth Crucifixion, where Christ's hands grasp the frame surrounding him and his right foot steps beyond it. These features recall the Christ in Majesty of the *c.* 800 Last Judgement ivory (Fig. 4.60), whose arms are held aloft and extend beyond the edges of the mandorla surrounding him, his right foot likewise extending past the lower confines of the lozenge. Here, these features combine to reference Christ's sacrifice on the cross, his Resurrection and the moment of Parousia signifying the Second Coming, as well as the temporal and spatial collapse at the Last Judgement.[916] At Gosforth, the frame surrounding Christ potentially indicates that an analogous arrangement was intended. It does not entirely contain him, enabling him to be viewed simultaneously within the human world, implied by the paired figures below and Longinus' spear that intersects the frame, and that of the divine, with the frame separating him from the other figures on C. The frame thus makes explicit to the viewer that the Crucifixion was the event that enabled the Second Coming. In turn, the projection of Christ's limbs suggests that his Crucifixion and Second Coming should be viewed as the events that facilitated the destruction of evil, symbolised by the human figure confronting the serpent above.

At the bottom of D, above a strip of interlace, are two horsemen carrying spears, with the lower one depicted upside-down, perhaps to suggest that they were engaged in combat (Fig. 4.61).[917] This is plausible given the Scandinavian and Insular pictorial conventions of employing multiple planes within the same composition to portray depth. Above the horseman's head, at the top of the panel, a triquetra surmounts a vertical rod that terminates in an open-mouthed, fanged beast's head (Fig. 4.62). Flanking the rod are eight wing-like protrusions, attached by rings. This creature has long been assumed to depict Freyr's apocalyptic enemy, Surt, the fire beast, with

[916] Anna Maria Luiselli Fadda, "The Mysterious Moment of Resurrection in Early Anglo-Saxon and Irish Iconography," in Minnis and Roberts, *Text, Image and Interpretation*, 156-62; Meg Boulton, "'End of the World'," 288-89. For discussions of the lozenge as symbol of Christ's cross and Resurrection, see: Anna Gannon, "Lies, Damned Lies and Iconography," in Hawkes, *Making Histories*, 294-97; O'Reilly, "Patristic and Insular Traditions," 77-94.
[917] Parker and Collingwood, "Reconsideration," 108.

the protrusions representing flames.[918] This explanation, however, overlooks the resemblance of the ringed protrusions to wings, demonstrating the overwhelming scholarly tendency to assign 'pagan' meanings to carvings, contrary to the visual evidence; only Davidson rejected this interpretation, acknowledging the absence of attributes to associate the creature with the mythological Surt.[919]

Although the Gosforth carvings are assumed to be associated with Ragnarök in a manner that elucidates the theological significance of the Crucifixion,[920] this relationship is less certain when the carvings are reconciled with the monumental cross-form selected for their display. This implies at least nominal familiarity with the Crucifixion, if not a thorough understanding of its theological significance, and further points to the carvings' potential Christian meanings. Berg did recognise the Christian origins of this monumental form, but did not fully explore the implications of its connections to the carvings,[921] while Bailey focussed on the significance of the entire group of high-quality carved monuments at Gosforth, suggesting that the site's location at the north-south crossing of a marshy plain may have been of strategic importance.[922] This has significant implications for how the cross might have been accessed and viewed when originally erected. Although once (erroneously) considered to resemble a gigantic Thor's hammer,[923] the great height and slender proportions of the cross render its cross-head highly visible even from great distances. Moreover, the cross-head's form is unmistakably that of a cross; its four arms protrude beyond the wheel encircling them, emulating the architectural profile of contemporary jewellery, and so points, in visually familiar 'language', to the value invested metaphorically and physically/economically in the cross.

Furthermore, use of the ring-head form (rather than the free-armed type) indicates that Scandinavian patrons, generally, were more than familiar with analogous contemporary stone monuments from Scotland and Ireland, implying that they had likely converted to Christianity before arriving in northwest England.[924] Concomitantly, this suggests that the Gosforth patrons either converted to Christianity before settling in the region, or may have descended from individuals that arrived from

[918] Calverley, "Sculptured Cross at Gosforth," 398-99; Calverley, *Notes*, 164; Berg, "The Gosforth Cross," 38; Kopár, *Gods and Settlers*, 92.
[919] Davidson, *Gods and Myths*, 208.
[920] Kopár, *Gods and Settlers*, 154-55.
[921] Berg, "The Gosforth Cross," 32-34.
[922] Bailey, *Viking Age Sculpture*, 215.
[923] Calverley, "Sculptured Cross at Gosforth," 375; Calverley, *Notes*, 141.
[924] McLeod, *Beginning of Scandinavian Settlement*, 264-66.

either Scotland or Ireland, and were familiar with this monument type. It further implies that the Gosforth patrons were aware of the Christian significance of this regional monument type, and assumed that its intended audience(s) would also recognise it. The selection of this cross-head type thus appears deliberate, and implies that the carvings and their symbolic significances were intended to be understood by contemporary audiences within primarily Christian frames of reference.

While the ring-chain filling the upper section of the rounded shaft-base has been argued to recall the bark of Yggdrasil,[925] any foliate echoes may equally have been intended to depict stylised foliage,[926] possibly rendering the ring-chain a stylised adaptation of the vine-scroll found elsewhere on free-standing cross-shafts. A corollary of this would be that the Gosforth patrons encountered such (Anglian) monuments and translated the motif into a Scandinavian visual counterpart more readily understood by the monument's intended audience.

Regardless of such considerations, the Gosforth cross would nevertheless have been visible from great distances by those traversing the marsh, and points of access to the monument must be considered. Approaching from the north or south, the cross-head would have been viewed side-on, rendering its central bosses prominent protrusions to either side, creating the silhouette of a tall-stemmed cross with shallow arms. If approached from the east or west, the cross-head would have been fully visible, enabling its form to be perceived immediately. Notably, an approach from the east would enable the monument's significance to be apprehended, as the carvings on the broad face, C, include the Crucifixion at approximately eye-level. Indeed, this scene's placement on the eastern face of the cross has been recognised as replicating the placement of redemptive scenes placed to the east inside churches.[927]

Furthermore, the monument stands in what is presumed to be its original, stepped base (Fig. 4.63).[928] This form carries additional associations with the Cross of the Crucifixion, and further connections to earlier Irish monuments.[929] When other choices for a cross-base were available, such as a plain rectangular one, that used at Gosforth suggests that the stepped form was incorporated deliberately, in a decision informed either by direct encounters with monuments elsewhere, or through second-hand knowledge gained from those familiar with such monuments. Stepped-bases are

[925] Collingwood, *Northumbrian Crosses*, 157.
[926] W.G. Collingwood, "The Lowther Hogbacks," *TCWAAS*, ser. 2, 7 (1907): 154.
[927] Berg, "The Gosforth Cross," 43.
[928] Bailey and Cramp, *Cumberland, Westmorland*, 100.
[929] See, Helen M. Roe, "Irish High Cross," 220-24; Werner, "On the Origin," 100-06.

considered symbolic of the marble steps leading up to Golgotha,[930] and its use here implies that the monument was intended to recall Golgotha, and by extension, the cross of the Crucifixion.

This further suggests that those designing the monument expected its intended audience to understand the Christian theological significance of Golgotha and the event represented by this distinct base-form. These associations, made explicit through the monumental forms, are reinforced and complemented by the incorporation and position of the Crucifixion scene. Parker and Collingwood early suggested that in order for the Gosforth images to form a consecutive narrative, contemporary viewers would have read the cross following the path of the sun, with the Crucifixion as the final scene encountered.[931] While plausible, this explanation is nevertheless problematic. If the viewer were to follow the path of the sun, the image of the Crucifixion would not be the final encountered image, but rather, the first; it sits at the lowermost point of the eastern face, the direction from which the sun ascends. Considered with the scheme's prominent position above the transition from round to rectangular shafts, this suggests that the Crucifixion was intended to be the first image encountered and contemplated by the monument's intended audiences.

Overall, the immense scale of the Gosforth cross and the selection of its monumental form and stepped base imply that it was intended to be a major Christian feature encountered by contemporary audiences in the surrounding landscape. Re-assessment of its iconographic programme demonstrates that only one carving on the cross-shaft can be associated with Norse mythology with any certainty: that of Loki and Sigyn at the bottom of A. It is undeniable that many of its carvings, such as the riders and beasts, are ambiguous, possibly deliberately so, and this has been enhanced by the omission of panel divisions, in accordance with Scandinavian visual traditions. Likewise, the female figure of the Crucifixion may be deliberately ambiguous, given her representation according to Scandinavian visual conventions, although this does not necessarily mean she was perceived as 'pagan'. The horn she holds could denote liturgical uses, and may elicit associations with Mary Magdalene.

Furthermore, it is clear that the Crucifixion was intended as one of the most significant images in the Gosforth iconographic programme, given its prominent and accessible placement. Christ's Crucifixion may have been particularly recognisable to

[930] Roe, "Irish High Cross," 220.
[931] Parker and Collingwood, "Reconsideration," 108-09; Collingwood, *Northumbrian Crosses*, 156-57.

those who had yet to convert or were not fully Christianised, as it could be easily understood to portray the most crucial moment in Christianity. The image itself certainly emphasises the moment of Christ's sacrifice as that which enables his Second Coming and his ultimate triumph over evil, as alluded to by the sophisticated framing device and the figure confronting the serpent above. The frame also serves to divide Longinus and the woman from Christ, perhaps to emphasise their initial affiliations with traditional beliefs, something which may have been relevant to contemporary audiences at a time when incoming Scandinavian populations were converting. Furthermore, the theological concepts encapsulated in the Crucifixion image appear to be repeated on B, albeit in an abbreviated and more ambiguous manner, in the hart and hound and serpent with bound jaws. The monumental cross-form and its iconographic programme thus appear to have been selected with the objective of communicating to its intended audience(s), through multivalent frames of reference, the significance of Christ's Crucifixion as the catalyst for the Second Coming and the eternal salvation and triumph over evil to be achieved at this event.

4.5 Summary

The monuments analysed here demonstrate how the iconographic significances of their carvings may elucidate the identities of their potential audiences, supplementing documentary accounts, which indicate that these audiences were intended to encounter these monuments and engage with their imagery. The complexity of their programmes suggests that this engagement could facilitate different understandings of their meanings, depending on a viewer's background. Indeed, analysis of the Collingham cross suggests that there were two potential audiences who could have accessed the monument and engaged with it at differing levels of understanding. One, a clerical audience with the ability to contemplate the fundamental beliefs of Christianity, could assess its figural programme and consider the theological concepts underpinning the foundation of the Church, and reaffirmed in the Apostles Creed. The other, a lay audience present on the ecclesiastical estate is implied by the (deliberate) ambiguity of the carved figures. This audience would likely have been aware of the clerics' activities, which may have informed their encounters; as such, they were potentially able to decipher the carved figures' saintly status, suggested by their explicitly ecclesiastical garments and attributes. Any complex understandings of the figures'

significance may have been occluded by the carvings' ambiguity, suggesting that this audience was potentially less informed than the other. These two types of engagement were facilitated by the public nature of the cross, which enabled engagement with its programme – referencing the apostles' mission to spread the gospel – at two distinct levels. Moreover, engagement with the monument potentially encouraged the erection of Collingham 2, which eschews figural decoration in favour of zoomorphic forms influenced by local carvings and Scandinavian art. This indicates that its potential audiences included those of Scandinavian backgrounds, and that those responsible for its production were sufficiently aware of extant monuments to produce a programme influenced by them. It further implies that its carvings were selected deliberately, with the intention of being more accessible to those familiar with Scandinavian visual traditions. These factors, moreover, suggest that programme of Collingham 1 may have been unsuccessful in fulfilling its patrons' intended objectives, being deemed illegible by those responsible for Collingham 2.

Maintaining the Anglian tradition of representing ambiguous figures within architectural settings, the iconographic programme of the Nunburnholme cross likewise indicates access by two potential audiences. Here, however, consideration of the monumental form selected for displaying it – the cross – is crucial to recovering the Christian frames of reference. Viewing the programme as a unified whole demonstrates that its images were deliberately selected and arranged to elicit particular responses from its potential audiences – rather than focussing on one panel that apparently depicts a scene from Scandinavian legend, and so infers only a 'pagan', Scandinavian audience. As at Collingham, the ambiguity of certain figural carvings suggests that this cross was encountered by, on the one hand, an ecclesiastical audience who would have been acutely aware of the central tenets of their faith. Such knowledge would have informed their encounter and enabled them to contemplate the overall iconographic significance(s) of its programme. It would be possible for them to decipher the potential connections between carvings, emphasising the Mass and Christ's sacrifice as the path to salvation. For this audience, these features would have been complemented by the angels and architectural settings denoting the earthly and heavenly realms of the human and divine. Moreover, when viewed alongside the eucharistic and salvific figures, these features would enable them to recall the theological concept of the *communio sanctorum*, which encapsulated the ability of all

Christians to participate in the body of Christ, understood as the Church and celebrated in the Mass, in order to achieve eternal salvation.

Alongside such appreciation, the explicitly Christian and secular images selected for display at Nunburnholme indicate that another, potentially secular audience was also expected to encounter and engage with the cross. To those initiated in Christianity, but less informed in contemporary theological thought, the images of the Virgin and Child and Crucifixion would have been recognisable as the fulfilment of divine prophecy through Christ's sacrifice, engendering their potential salvation. Likewise, the distinctive garments of the ecclesiastical figures may have rendered them recognisable, though the identification and function of certain vestments may have remained obscure. Conversely, the inclusion of secular figures would have appealed to such audiences, encouraging them to recall the ideals appropriate to secular lordship. Overall, the complex programme of the Nunburnholme cross unifies angelic, ecclesiastical and secular figures in a manner accessible to both ecclesiastical and secular audiences, and signifies the centrality of Christ's sacrifice and participation in the Mass as the pathway to salvation.

The iconographic programme of the Gosforth cross likewise presents ambiguous figures that initially appear to appeal exclusively to a secular, and potentially 'pagan' audience, but their arrangement within Christian frames of reference upon a monumental cross suggests that they were likewise intended to be viewed and understood by Christian audiences. While many of the figural schemes have been explained according to Scandinavian visual conventions, only one can securely be associated with Norse mythology. This suggests that those responsible for the cross intended it to be encountered by those from a Scandinavian background, while the scheme's display on a monumental cross instills it with Christian significance, a factor that is supplemented by the Crucifixion. Indeed, this scheme would have been recognisable to contemporary viewers as the crucial moment of Christ's sacrifice, enabling his Second Coming and subsequent triumph over evil. As at Nunburnholme, these theological concepts are expressed through sophisticated framing devices, which facilitates a collapse of time and space, and separates Longinus and the woman from Christ, in a manner that emphasises their affiliations with traditional beliefs. Moreover, given that the cross displays both explicitly Christian and Norse schemes, the remainder of the carvings may have been deliberately selected for their ambiguity, which would enable them to be viewed

within multivalent frames of reference. Thus, the figures confronting serpents would have been understood by both Christian viewers, and those who had yet to convert or were not fully Christianised, to represent the defeat of evil.

Analysis of these three crosses thus demonstrates that their public nature enabled them to be accessed by varied audiences. While their iconographic programmes initially appear too ambiguous to be deciphered, the carvings' carefully constructed relationships indicate that they were intended to elicit various responses from their viewers, depending on their familiarity with Anglian or Scandinavian visual traditions, and contemporary Christian thought. Furthermore, the carvings have been arranged so that they can be interpreted within multiple frames of reference, engendering responses that range from simple subject-recognition, to complex theological commentaries concerning subjects such as the *communio sanctorum*. Overall, it is clear that careful iconographic analysis of the whole monument can elucidate not only its potential patrons, but also those audiences for which it was erected.

CHAPTER 5

Patronage and Purpose

5.1 Introduction

Embedded in the discussion so far has been the subject of the late ninth- and tenth-century patrons of the sculptures commissioned in the Northern Danelaw, and the motives informing their decisions regarding the selection of monument form, material(s), iconographic schemes and programmes and the anticipated audiences. Most of the scholarship invoking patronage has focussed on ethnic and social identities, often relying upon formalist approaches to the carvings and/or the presence of iconographic schemes apparently associated with heroic legend or 'pagan' mythology.[932] While these studies have contributed to our understanding of the chronological developments of monumental typologies and the style(s) of carved ornament, they have revealed little about the intentions of those responsible for the monuments. The crosses from Middleton and Halton provide two examples of monuments that have been treated in this way, thus diminishing engagement with the monuments' potential iconographic complexity (their imagery having been deliberately selected for public display on the stone cross-form), and occluding our understanding of the patrons themselves and the motives informing their choices.

As demonstrated, the crosses were erected with the intention that they would be encountered by ecclesiastical and lay audiences with different levels of understanding. This implies that those responsible for setting them up were aware of this potential range of engagement and consciously selected the carved schemes that would present their particular ideological inclinations or aspirations to the monuments' anticipated audiences. With this in mind, an iconographic analysis of the schemes carved on the crosses from Middleton and Halton will reveal their potential symbolic significance(s), in turn facilitating an understanding of the nuanced potential motives, aims and objectives of the patrons who selected the imagery.

[932] See, e.g.: Collingwood, "Dispersion of the Wheel Cross," 322-31; Binns, "Tenth-Century Carvings," 4-10; Peter Sawyer, "The Two Viking Ages of Britain," *Medieval Scandinavia* 2 (1969): 171; Stocker, "Monuments and Merchants," 179-212; Stocker and Everson, "Five Towns' Funerals," 223-44; Townend, *Viking Age Yorkshire*, 1-5.

5.2 Middleton 2

The near-complete, tenth-century sculpture from Middleton ('Middleton 2') (Fig. 5.1),[933] was assumed to be the product of secular, 'pagan' patronage when recovered in 1948, despite its monumental cross-form. Nevertheless, it appears to convey aspects of secular lordship and Christian triumph,[934] and is considered a significant piece of evidence for the development of the Jellinge style in Anglo-Scandinavian England, and a marker of local taste, combining motifs from Irish, Scandinavian and Anglian art.[935] To contextualise the sculpture, Alan Binns attempted to establish its patrons' ethnic identities as either Norse or Danish, using place-names and historical documents alongside the sculptural evidence, with the result that he deemed the patrons to have been Hiberno-Norse settlers from Ireland.[936] Lang later modified this attribution because although the monument displays some typologically "Irish" features, its ornament emerges from an Anglo-Scandinavian repertoire,[937] which indicates, at the very least, that its patrons favoured Anglo-Scandinavian decorative features.

Only A displays figural carving (Fig. 5.2), contained within a single panel surrounded by a flat edge-moulding below the cross-head,[938] which consists of a frontally disposed human figure wearing conical head-gear, identified alternately as a helmet, hat or cap,[939] and a belt at his waist from which hangs a sheathed knife, identified by Binns as a scramasax.[940] A shield, spear and axe fill the remainder of the space surrounding the figure, who has been interpreted as seated, indicated by his apparently foreshortened legs;[941] or as a 'pagan' figure lying within his grave surrounded by his weapons.[942] Although these have been described as "typically Viking",[943] only the axe can be considered a typical Scandinavian weapon.[944]

---

[933] Lang, *York and Eastern Yorkshire*, 182-84; Appendix, I.69. Only the right-arm of the cross-head is missing.
[934] Ibid., 183.
[935] Binns, "Tenth-Century Carvings," 4. See below, 224-226.
[936] Ibid., 4-10.
[937] Lang, *York and Eastern Yorkshire*, 183.
[938] See Appendix, I.69.
[939] Townend, *Viking Age Yorkshire*, 1.
[940] Binns, "Tenth-Century Carvings," 16.
[941] James Lang, "Some Late Pre-Conquest Crosses," 18; Cramp, "The Viking Image," 14-15; Bailey, *Viking Age Sculpture*, 212; Bailey, *England's Earliest Sculptors*, 84.
[941] Lang, *York and Eastern Yorkshire*, 183.
[942] Binns, "Tenth-Century Carvings," 16; David M. Wilson, "The Vikings' Relationship with Christianity in Northern England," *JBAA*, ser. 3, 30 (1966): 45; Bailey, *Viking Age Sculpture*, 212; Murphy, *Tree of Salvation*, 106.
[943] Richard Hall, *The Viking Kingdom of York* (York: H. Morley & Sons, 1976), 15.
[944] Townend, *Viking Age Yorkshire*, 1.

Nevertheless, Bailey noting that these features provide potential insight to tenth-century secular costume and weapons, argued that it can be difficult to establish whether such headgear and weapons were in current use or were simply part of an established, traditional iconographic vocabulary.[945] Despite these nuanced distinctions, the arrangement of the knife attached to the belt has been considered practical, enabling it to be withdrawn from its sheath quickly.[946] Too little carved detail remains to determine what clothing the figure may have worn, although it is possible that these details were applied using another medium, something which may be supported by the traces of red paint found on another cross from the site.[947] These interpretations of the scheme, however, treat the carving as an 'illustration' accurately depicting contemporary weaponry, dress and their function(s), rather than a series of motifs intended to *signify* 'sword', 'shield' or 'axe'. When viewed as signifiers, the Middleton motifs may be understood to generally denote various weapons, and so designate the figure a 'warrior'.

The explanation of the scheme as depicting an inhumation is the most widely accepted, and although the monument's Christian nature is acknowledged, the scheme is nonetheless perceived to reflect contemporary customs of continuing 'pagan' burial traditions in Christian cemeteries.[948] This implies that the monument was commissioned and erected with this particular motive in mind, in turn suggesting that the monument's patron *must* have been both Scandinavian and 'pagan'. Yet, this supposition is clearly contradicted by the selection of the distinct (Christian) cross-form for displaying the scheme, which implies that, although the figure is surrounded by martial symbols associated with secular lordship, the suite was intended to be understood within Christian frames of reference.

In arguing for the patron's Norse identity, Binns (alternatively) proposed that the scheme was intended to display Norwegian dynastic connections, rather than functioning as a portrait of the patron himself.[949] He determined the patron's assumed ethnic identity using place-name evidence, arguing that the names in the region reflected Norse rather than Danish inhabitants, while also accepting the many potential ethnic combinations in the region surrounding Middleton.[950] Yet, the use of place-

[945] Bailey, *Viking Age Sculpture*, 234.
[946] Ibid.; Lang, "Some Late Pre-Conquest Crosses," 17.
[947] Bailey, *England's Earliest Sculptors*, 6; Lang, *York and Eastern Yorkshire,* 184-85.
[948] Binns, "Tenth-Century Carvings," 16-18; Wilson, "Vikings' Relationship with Christianity," 45.
[949] Binns, "Tenth-Century Carvings," 18; Kopár, *Gods and Settlers,* 200-01.
[950] Binns, "Tenth-Century Carvings," 5-7.

name evidence to establish the (Scandinavian/Norwegian) ethnic identity of the Middleton patrons is irrelevant here; Middleton itself is an Old English place-name, and so would not reflect any Scandinavian ancestry among its inhabitants. Nevertheless, Binns further claimed (without evidence) that the scramasax carved on the cross resembled one with apparent connections to "Norwegian vikings" found in the Thames near Brentford (Greater London); he also acknowledged that the weapon form was not exclusively associated with Norwegians.[951] Despite this, he concluded that the Middleton figure depicted a dead man of Norwegian ancestry, while the scheme reflected the attitude(s) of an incoming Norwegian family to local stone-carving traditions.[952]

Unfortunately, without any extant documentary, archaeological or art-historical evidence to support such claims, they must remain speculation. Further, the 'pagan' religious identity of those responsible for the monument is debatable; incoming Scandinavians were exposed to Insular Christianity from at least the mid- to late ninth century,[953] suggesting that those responsible for the Middleton cross may have been unaware of their ancestors' 'pagan' burial traditions. Moreover, their exposure to Christianity and Christian monuments is demonstrated by their selection of the ring-headed cross surmounting the shaft, a feature considered to be transmitted to Yorkshire in the tenth century by those arriving from Ireland or Scotland, and who had settled in the region *at least* two generations after Halfdan's initial settlement.[954] Furthermore, the *absence* of grave goods in the few Scandinavian graves found in England undermines the explanation that the figure's disposition reflects Scandinavian burial practises.[955] Overall, it is unlikely that the figure was intended to represent a deceased individual, ancestral or otherwise.

Moving away from such concerns, Bailey, noting the identical proportions shared with the figure on Middleton 5, argued that both were produced using the same template for their upper halves, with a separate one used for their lower bodies.[956] While template use implies that Middleton 2 is the product of an established sculptural workshop,[957] the resulting formulaic nature of the portraits raises serious doubts that

[951] Ibid., 16.
[952] Ibid., 18.
[953] See Introduction, 44-67.
[954] Bailey, "Chronology of Viking-Age Sculpture," 177-79; *ASC*, MS C, 48.
[955] Lang, "Some Late Pre-Conquest Crosses," 17.
[956] Bailey, "Chronology of Viking-Age Sculpture," 181; Bailey, *Viking Age Sculpture*, 247. For Middleton 5: Lang, *York and Eastern Yorkshire*, 185-86; Appendix, I.70.
[957] Wilson and Klindt-Jensen, *Viking Art*, 103.

their patrons were primarily ('pagan') Scandinavian warriors. It suggests that they may simply have chosen to express their social status according to contemporary martial conventions.[958] This further implies that if both crosses were not jointly commissioned, then the patrons of Middleton 2 and 5 were interested in publicly displaying similar, potentially martial, aspects of their secular identities. Their shared attributes also imply that contemporary audiences considered them typical features of secular male dress, suggesting a potential motive for their patrons' selection of this particular figural type for public display. Furthermore, multiple template use on site has implications for identifying the decisions and concerns of those responsible for Middleton 2. Despite their use, the patron's input is suggested by the details accompanying the 'portrait'. Unlike the Middleton 5 figure, whose only weapon is a sword, that on Middleton 2 is accompanied by a suite of weapons, suggesting that the patron consciously decided to portray the carved figure with numerous accoutrements to differentiate their monument from others at the site, while underscoring the figure's martial status.

Above the figure's shoulders are two round pellets, which have been explained as the part of the chair on which the figure is seated.[959] Indeed, Lang argued that the scheme represents a lordly figure enthroned upon a *gifstol* (gift-stool), based on descriptions of such figures in Old English poetry and later Old Norse sagas.[960] In the light of traces of paint surviving on Middleton 3, he further suggested that the chair may have been painted on the surface of the stone, around the sides of the figure's carved body,[961] an argument supported by the distinct delineations between the figure and the surface of the shaft. Natalie Russell later observed the unusual disposition of the figure's right hand with its thumb positioned to the left, an arrangement that suggests the figure is gesturing with his open hand either towards the weapons on his right, or toward the viewer; both possibilities complement Lang's claim that the figure should be viewed as seated.[962] Yet the apparent 'norm' was to depict seated frontal figures without weapons, because they were typically ecclesiastical or clerical figures;

[958] Townend, *Viking Age Yorkshire*, 3-4.
[959] Lang, "Some Late Pre-Conquest Crosses," 18; Bailey, *Viking Age Sculpture*, 212; James Lang, "Pre-Conquest Sculpture in Eastern Yorkshire," *Medieval Art and Architecture in the East Riding of Yorkshire*, ed. Christophoer Wilson, BAA Conference Transactions 9 (Leeds: Maney and Son, 1989), 4.
[960] Lang, "Some Late Pre-Conquest Crosses," 19-20. See also, Abels, "What has Weland," 569-573.
[961] Lang, "Some Late Pre-Conquest Crosses," 18. Lang, *York and Eastern Yorkshire*, 184-85 (Middleton 3).
[962] Natalie Russell, "Horsemen and Warriors: Sculptural Patronage in Viking-Age Northumbria" (MPhil Thesis, University of York, 2008), 97.

conversely, standing (or indeed seated) profile figures with weapons were understood to be secular.[963] In this context, the Middleton figure is exceptional; it combines the frontal seated ecclesiastical pose with the accoutrements that typically accompany armed standing figures.[964] These factors imply that the Middleton patron may have chosen this arrangement to distinguish his portrait from those of seated ecclesiastical figures, and to emphasise his secular social standing, despite the portrait's preservation on a cross-shaft.

This emphasis on secular social standing finds sculptural analogues in the portrayals of secular figures at Repton (Fig. 5.3) and Bewcastle (Fig. 5.4), though such figures are considered exceptional in Anglian sculptural contexts.[965] There are significant differences between the arrangements of the pre-Viking figures and that at Middleton, however, with the Bewcastle figure standing in profile, and that from Repton shown on horseback. Yet, both the Repton and Middleton figures wear sheathed knives suspended from the waist, and their upper bodies have been rotated 90˚ to face frontally. Nevertheless, the secular nature of the Bewcastle figure indicates that the Middleton figure's arrangement within a panel on a cross-shaft may have been intended to encapsulate some themes of secular lordly ideals, as suggested by earlier examples. The Repton rider scheme was developed from late antique iconographic traditions adapted to include vernacular features of martial dress and weaponry.[966]

A similar phenomenon may have occurred at Middleton, with the appropriation of the seated ecclesiastical figure type, which was adapted in keeping with vernacular Anglo-Scandinavian visual languages to portray a figure in secular dress surrounded by markers of his martial status. Its display on a monumental cross further suggests that, like the Bewcastle and Repton figures, those responsible for the monument intended that he would be viewed within Christian frames of reference, potentially as an ideal Christian lord. This is also implied by the figure's seated disposition, apparently upon a *gifstol*, which was understood by contemporary audiences as a symbol of the lord's generosity, power and authority, as at Nunburnholme.[967] The necessity of such a public display of secular authority and martial power during the tenth century may be explained by the instability of land-holding in the Northern

[963] Cramp, "The Viking Image," 12-15.
[964] Ibid., 15. See also, Lang, *York and Eastern Yorkshire*, 189-93 (Nunburnholme); Ch.4, 191-93.
[965] Kopár, *Gods and Settlers*, 111; Bailey and Cramp, *Cumberland, Westmorland*, 61-72 (Bewcastle); Hawkes and Sidebottom, *Derbyshire and Staffordshire*, 198-205 (Repton).
[966] Hawkes and Sidebottom, *Derbyshire and Staffordshire*, 202.
[967] Lang, "Some Late Pre-Conquest Crosses," 19-20.

Danelaw, which was affected by West Saxon attempts to acquire estates from land-holders in the region, particularly those belonging to Scandinavian groups or those of Scandinavian descent.[968] This encroachment was intensified by rights granted to the Church in the Northern Danelaw, such as those apparently granted to the church of Beverley under the aegis of Athelstan, enabling this ecclesiastical community to collect grain from every estate in East Yorkshire.[969]

Such potential social instability may well reveal the motives of those responsible for erecting the Middleton cross. They appear to have consciously chosen to depict an enthroned figure with symbols of martial power according to vernacular Anglo-Scandinavian visual traditions and, emphasising the figure's potential Scandinavian connections through the types and styles of weapons accompanying him, declared his status as a local landholder with secular authority in the region. As Middleton has been recognised as a site marking continuity in the local Christian landscape due to the presence of both Anglian and Anglo-Scandinavian monumental stone crosses,[970] the backdrop of the monumental cross-form is significant. It means the secular figure is displayed beneath the cross-head, whose proportions are nearly equal to that of the shaft,[971] suggesting that his earthly, secular power might also be mediated by his standing within a Christian community.

Seeking to underline the articulation of secular authority, Murphy attempted to explain the decoration in the cross-head on B and the interlace on the shaft below (Fig. 5.5), as uniting the two to present the viewer with a "whole and living tree",[972] which – like Middleton 1 – he regarded as Yggdrasil,[973] with the arms of the cross-head intended to recall Yggdrasil's branches and Woden's sacrifice on it, while the chevrons decorating the ring-head symbolise the newly rising sun, following Ragnarök.[974] As argued earlier, the cross-head belongs to a local, regional group,[975] while the carvings' stylised nature, the absence of any identifiable iconographic features that might invoke Ragnarök and a deficiency of Yggdrasil depictions either elsewhere in the region or Scandinavia – with one debatable exception on Gotland

[968] Hadley, *Northern Danelaw*, 155-58.
[969] Ibid.
[970] Ibid., 270; Blair, *Church in Anglo-Saxon Society*, 314-15.
[971] Lang, "Some Late Pre-Conquest Crosses," 17.
[972] Murphy, *Tree of Salvation*, 119-20. For Faces B and D: Appendix, I.69.
[973] Ibid.
[974] Ibid., 102.
[975] Lang, "Some Late Pre-Conquest Crosses," 17; Lang, *York and Eastern Yorkshire*, 183; Bailey, *Viking Age Sculpture*, 183-84.

(Fig. 5.6) – make this claim difficult to substantiate. Overall, therefore, it is unlikely that the non-figural decoration of B articulates Yggdrasil and Ragnarök.

The Jellinge-style beast on C (Fig. 5.7), however, can be explained in the light of the output of the workshop responsible for the production of the crosses locally. It was originally considered an unsuccessful attempt by Anglo-Saxon craftsmen to produce carvings in this Scandinavian style, following the late ninth-century Scandinavian settlement in Yorkshire.[976] It is now recognised as a tenth-century attempt at copying Jellinge-style beasts, which find more proficient sculptural analogues at York,[977] with Bailey arguing that there is no explicit relationship between the Middleton patrons' ethnicity and the Scandinavian origins of the motif, indicating only that the Middleton patron considered the Jelling animal acceptable for public display, as opposed to functioning as an ethnic Scandinavian identifier.[978] It thus suggests that they were interested in appropriating Scandinavian visual languages for public display on their monument.

The creature has certainly continued to be viewed as one associated with Norse mythology, however, particularly that invoking Yggdrasil and Ragnarök. Murphy argued that it represents Niddhogg, the serpent living within the roots of the tree,[979] despite the myths preserved in the later Icelandic texts claiming that none of the Norse pantheon were capable of binding Niddhogg.[980] Yet, as on Middleton 1, the creature on C is clearly 'bound' – here with fetters that segment his body and traverse his jaws and his feet. This makes it extremely unlikely that the beast represents the allegedly unrestrainable Niddhogg, despite Murphy's somewhat confused insistence that the creature should nevertheless be identified as such – bound within Christ's cross – forcing the beast, and by extension the monument itself, into a preconceived narrative 'proving' their patrons' (Scandinavian) ethnic and ('pagan') religious identities.[981]

[976] Binns, "Tenth-Century Carvings," 21-22; Wilson and Klindt-Jensen, *Viking Art*, 104; Wilson, "Vikings' Relationship with Christianity," 45; Peter Foote and David M. Wilson, *The Viking Achievement: The Society and Culture of Early Medieval Scandinavia* (London: Book Club Associates, 1970), 299-300; Peter Sawyer, *The Age of the Vikings* (London: Edward Arnold, 1971), 163.
[977] Lang, "Some Late Pre-Conquest Crosses," 21-23; James Lang, "Anglo-Scandinavian Sculpture in Yorkshire," in *Viking Age York and the North*, ed. R.A. Hall (London: CBA, 1978), 16; Bailey, *England's Earliest Sculptors*, 95; James Graham-Campbell, *Viking Artefacts: A Select Catalogue* (London: British Museum Publications, 1980), 160.
[978] Sawyer, "The Two Viking Ages," 171; Sawyer, *Age of the Vikings*, 163-6; Bailey, *Viking Age Sculpture*, 210-11.
[979] Murphy, *Tree of Salvation*, 114.
[980] Ibid., 117.
[981] Ibid., 117-18.

Within the context of the monumental cross, however, other explanations emerge for this carving and that on A, which, as recently as 2014, has continued to be perceived as an image of the "new Scandinavian elite".[982] This does not mean that Christian frames of reference have been ignored. Thompson, for instance, argued that the weapons on A may have held symbolic meanings derived from either Exodus 15:3 or Psalm 34:2, enabling the beast on C to be understood as a potential reference to Revelation 20:2.[983] She also recognised a potential relationship to Ephesians 6, a passage invoked in homilies by Ælfric and Wulfstan, arguing that the weapons surrounding the Middleton figure should be understood as the accoutrements of a spiritual warrior.[984] While the scheme may be understood in isolation as a literal, visual rendering of this passage, the primary theme of Ephesians 6:10-17 is the triumph of God over evil. This suggests that the figure could well be viewed in relation to the bound beast on C, both potentially invoking Revelation 20:1-6, with the figure and his weapons intended to reference the righteous who had abjured the beast.

Alternatively, as on Middleton 1, the beast on C may represent the biblical Leviathan, based on the arrangement of its fetters. The cord bisecting the beast's body and passing through its jaws may be explained as a visual interpretation of Job 40:20-21 or Job 40:24, which questions whether the Leviathan's tongue can be tied.[985] As noted, early medieval commentators perceived the binding of Leviathan's jaws as a sign of Christ's triumph over evil; Gregory, for instance, stated that Christ's Incarnation caused the Leviathan's jaws to be bound and false doctrines to be silenced.[986] If the bound beast was intended to be viewed in this way, then the figure on A may have been understood as a member of the faithful who triumphed over evil, through recognising Christ's Incarnation, sacrifice and salvation, all indicated by the cross-head above.

Put another way, the arrangement may suggest that the figure and bound beast represented a highly schematized adaptation of *milites Christi*, known to have circulated in Carolingian contexts. This depicted warrior saints trampling serpents in conjunction with scenes of the Annunciation, Christ as the Lamb of God and Christ enthroned with the Apostles, among others, to symbolise the victory over evil

[982] Townend, *Viking Age Yorkshire*, 87.
[983] Thompson, *Dying and Death*, 150.
[984] Ibid.
[985] See Ch.3, 162-65; Ch.4, 217-18.
[986] Gregory the Great, *Moralia in Iob*, XXXIII, 10.18, Mark Adriaen, ed., CCSL 143B (Turnhout: Brepols, 1985), 1689.

facilitated by faith in Christ.[987] By the ninth and tenth centuries the concept was being adapted and applied to secular rulers or warriors, by then understood as defenders of the Church.[988] Furthermore, visual presentations of secular rulers as *milites Christi* were in circulation as early as the tenth century, as evinced by the manuscript depiction of Louis the Pious (Fig. 5.8), where he is disposed frontally within an acrostic poem. He wears a helmet and armour and carries a shield and cross in an arrangement that emphasises both his role as defender of the faith and his secular, imperial authority.[989] The Middleton scheme may well articulate this concept, although unlike the Carolingian *milites Christi*, the Middleton warrior neither tramples a serpent nor carries a cross; rather, he is arranged in a frontal, seated pose, apparently adapted from those of hieratic ecclesiastical figures to emphasise his secular authority, and by extension, his potential martial success(es). The placement of this image opposite the fettered beast may have been intended to express the figure's triumph over the beast and the evil it represents through his Christian faith, signified by the monument form.

The apparent simplicity of the overall scheme at Middleton has been attributed to the perception that those who commissioned and encountered this monument were unlikely to be literate in either Latin or Old English, and unfamiliar with the Psalms and other offices of the Church as they were likely to be new converts.[990] This view, however, diminishes the potential significance of the Middleton patron's choice of monument form and subject-matter and is anachronistic in the light of the tenth-century dating, which, as noted, implies that its patron potentially experienced prolonged exposure to Insular Christianity and Christian monuments.[991] Furthermore, the apparently vernacular Anglo-Scandinavian stylistic repertoire of its carvings may imply its patron's prolonged residence in the Northern Danelaw, given that both the monument type and style of ornament were deemed appropriate for public display.

Indeed, the programme's apparent simplicity is best explained by late antique and early medieval tendencies to reduce complex, 'real' events to a series of stylised and flattened elements arranged on a planar, two-dimensional surface.[992] Hawkes

[987] Chazelle, *The Crucified God*, 125.
[988] Katherine Allen Smith, *War and the Making of Medieval Monastic Culture* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2011), 96-99.
[989] Russell, "Horsemen and Warriors," 134-35.
[990] Thompson, *Dying and Death*, 151.
[991] See above, 221, 224.
[992] Jane Hawkes, "Design and Decoration: Re-visualizing Rome in Anglo-Saxon Sculpture," in *Rome Across Time and Space: Cultural Transmission and the Exchange of Ideas, c. 500-1400*, ed. Claudia

argued that the reduction of three-dimensional space removes the events depicted from 'real' time, emphasising the authority of the figure's actions and their relevance, making them eternal.[993] At Middleton, the sculptor's attempts to represent a frontal, seated figure with all the attributes of his secular and martial authority has resulted in a similar flattening of space, while the absence of any other contextualising features have (deliberately) removed the figure from any specific temporal event.

In eliminating notions of 'real' time or space, an iconic portrait has been created, which could be understood by the viewer to represent past and future experiences or presences, in a manner analogous to that Hawkes identified in Anglian monuments.[994] If the figure is indeed depicted on a *gifstol,* this arrangement, removed as it is from temporal events and recognisable spaces, would render him eternally fixed in this specific place and magnanimous attitude, which those responsible for the monument may have considered appropriate if the image was intended to be commemorative. Furthermore, bearing in mind West Saxon attempts to dominate the region, the permanence of the monument's medium and the elimination of temporal settings and/or events in its carvings may reflect a deliberate effort by its patrons to monumentalise a *perpetual* claim to the estates or other land under their control, and convey these ambitions to contemporary audiences.

The collapse of time and space may also carry additional implications for understanding the Middleton patrons' selection of a fettered beast for public display. If this represented either the bound Leviathan or the dragon of Revelation (or perhaps both), then its placement opposite the atemporal enthroned figure may imply that the scheme had intended eschatological references. This is further suggested by the setting of the scheme below the cross-head, which, as on Middleton 1, places them within the context of Christ's Incarnation, sacrifice and salvation, enabling the figure on A to be understood as representing a member of the Elect at the Second Coming, with the beast on C signifying Christ's triumph over death, evil and the eradication of sin.[995]

Although its carvings appear ambiguous, when viewed within its contemporary context, the iconography of the Middleton cross is not incompatible with the socio-political events of the early to mid-tenth century. The arrangement of the figure on A may reflect either the ambitions of its patrons, or the individual it commemorates,

---

Bolgia, et al. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 212-13; Hawkes, "Stones of the North," 44-45.

[993] Hawkes, "Design and Decoration," 212-15; Hawkes, "Stones of the North," 44-45.

[994] Hawkes, "Stones of the North," 47-50.

[995] See Ch.3, 162-65.

asserting their status as local lords/landholders, while the accompanying weapons might have been deliberately intended to represent Scandinavian martial and visual conventions, denoting Scandinavian social affiliations. The planar arrangement further underscores the socio-political ambitions of those responsible for erecting this monument, enabling the portrait to assume aspects of the immaterial. While the beast on C can certainly be viewed within the development of Scandinavian artistic styles, this does not preclude the possibility that it carried Christian symbolic significances, alluded to by the removal of the figure on A from temporal events, and their shared position in relation to the cross-head. Thus, viewing the arrangement of the carvings against the Middleton patrons' conscious selection of the cross-form for their display reveals the carvings' multivalent nature, facilitating potential understandings of the monument that encompass both sacred and secular significances.

5.3 Halton

As already intimated, discussions of the fragmentary tenth-century Halton cross-shaft (Fig. 5.9) have likewise focussed on its secular iconography, with the carvings on C identified as episodes from the legend of Sigurd the Völsung, thereby implying secular patronage.[996] As late as 1973, the cross was considered a product of the patronage of a Northumbrian earl, Tostig, intended to commemorate ancestral claims, although any sculptural or documentary evidence supporting this connection is circumstantial at best.[997] Despite such potential associations, the Anglian nature of the monumental cross-form and the remaining carvings were also observed early on – as an attempt to imitate the Bewcastle cross – although the implications of such relationships have not featured in more recent assessments of the cross.[998] Nevertheless, the cross-form does suggest that the Halton patrons intended the carvings to be viewed and interpreted within Christian frames of reference, something further implied by the selection of images carved on A.

---

[996] Bailey, *Cheshire and Lancashire*, 181-82; Collingwood, "Sculpture…West Riding," 214; Collingwood, *Northumbrian Crosses*, 160; Cramp, "The Anglian Tradition," 11. Appendix, I.39.
[997] W.S. Calverley, "Pre-Norman Cross-shaft at Heversham," *TCWAAS*, ser. 1, 13 (1895): 119; Calverley, *Notes*, 192-94; Pattison, "Nunburnholme Cross," 230-31; Kopár, *Gods and Settlers*, 200-01. Although see also, Lang, "Sigurd and Weland," 93-94; Bailey, *Viking Age Sculpture*, 123.
[998] W.G. Collingwood, "On Some Ancient Sculptures of the Devil Bound," *TCWAAS*, ser. 2, 3 (1903): 388; Collingwood, "Sculpture…North Riding," 294; Collingwood, "Sculpture…York," 152-53; Kendrick, *Late Saxon*, 58; Cramp, "The Viking Image," 17; Lang, *Anglian Sculpture*, 14; cf. e.g.: Coatsworth, "Iconography of the Crucifixion," 1, 33-40; Bailey, *Viking Age Sculpture*, 120-22; Margeson, "Volsung Legend," 189-90; Kopár, *Gods and Settlers*, 33-35.

Although attracting little attention, potential Christian significance(s) for these schemes (Fig. 5.10a) have been acknowledged. Arranged in two panels, the lower (Fig. 5.10b) contains two profile figures, each standing on a long-stemmed chalice-shaped pedestal or short column with cup-shaped capitals. These have been explained as representing the mounds beneath which Adam and Eve are buried, included here to emphasise the theme of Redemption.[999] A long-stemmed Latin cross with a trapezoidal, stepped base stands between the figures who each reach toward it with one hand. The pair was initially identified as John and Mary,[1000] although they are indistinguishable due to their long robes and the absence of any identifying attributes. If intended to depict these figures, they must have been included to underscore the historical event of the Crucifixion,[1001] alluded to by the 'empty cross', which Nancy Edwards has recently argued also references the resurrection.[1002]

They find contemporary sculptural analogues on the tenth-century cross-shaft at Kirkby Wharfe (Fig. 5.11) and the tenth- to eleventh-century monument at Burton-in-Kendal (Fig. 5.12), where figures accompanying a cross are likewise identified as John and Mary,[1003] assumed to emphasise the historical nature of the Crucifixion. The cross at Kirkby Wharfe, however, is shown flowering, associating it with the Tree of Knowledge and themes of redemption,[1004] and both here and at Burton-in-Kendal the figures are disposed frontally, and do not stand on pedestals. In fact, closer parallels to the Halton panel are found at Hope (Derbys.) (Fig. 5.13) – carved in lower relief – and a later tenth-century cross-shaft fragment from Lindisfarne (Nld.) (Fig. 5.14).[1005] At Hope, two standing profile figures wearing short garments flank a Latin cross, each grasping it with one hand. The Lindisfarne figures, also wearing short kirtles, are similarly disposed, although the upper portion of their cross has been obliterated by damage to the stone.

[999] Coatsworth, "Iconography of the Crucifixion," 1, 40.
[1000] Ibid., 1, 33-34; Calverley, *Notes*, 186;
[1001] Coatsworth, "Iconography of the Crucifixion," 1, 37.
[1002] Nancy Edwards, "Crucifixion Iconography on Early Medieval Sculpture in Wales," in Cambridge and Hawkes, *Crossing Boundaries*, 40-43.
[1003] Coatsworth, *Western Yorkshire*, 186. For Kirkby Wharfe 1: Coatsworth, *Western Yorkshire*, 185-86; Appendix, I.55. For Burton-in-Kendal 1: Bailey and Cramp, *Cumberland, Westmorland*, 82-83; Appendix, I.19.
[1004] Coatsworth, *Western Yorkshire*, 186; Bailey and Cramp, *Cumberland, Westmorland*, 82-83; Coatsworth, "Iconography of the Crucifixion," 38-40.
[1005] Hawkes and Sidebottom, *Derbyshire and Staffordshire*, 184-86 (Hope 1); Cramp, *County Durham and Northumberland*, 197-98 (Lindisfarne 8); Appendix, I.66.

Although the Halton pair's identity as John and Mary was re-confirmed as recently as 2010,[1006] the absence of identifying attributes and the various Anglo-Scandinavian comparanda suggest that this identification is perhaps best rejected. Unlike the frontal figures at Kirkby Wharfe and Burton-in-Kendal, for instance, neither is nimbed. Indeed, they lack even the gender-specific garments worn by the figures at Kirkby Wharfe.

The omission of the nimbus at Halton may have been deliberate, linking it more closely with those monuments from Lindisfarne and Hope, where the figures' short garments probably denote their secular status.[1007] This might suggest that those at Halton could be viewed in the same way, but the length of their garments strongly implies ecclesiastical identity, with the absence of haloes indicating only that they did not enjoy *saintly* status. Overall, the shared features probably imply the use of a common model type, adapted at Hope and Lindisfarne to portray secular figures.

There are, however, some notable differences between the schemes. Neither the Hope nor the Lindisfarne figures stand on pedestals, for instance, suggesting that this feature was deliberately included at Halton. Alternatively, it may indicate the use of an additional (distinct) iconographic model. Although the pedestals have been explained as representations of Adam and Eve's burial mounds,[1008] the verticality of their stems repudiates such interpretation. Furthermore, this explanation does not suggest *how* the figures have come to be shown standing on top of the columnar pedestals, something that the Halton patrons apparently deemed significant enough to include. This supports the suggestion that an alternative iconographic model lies behind the arrangement and perhaps indicates that the symbolic significance of this hypothetical model was also adopted.

One potential model is that found on numerous early Christian terracotta pilgrim tokens associated with the cult of Saint Symeon the Younger, issued in the late sixth to seventh centuries.[1009] On one series (Fig. 5.15), the saint is flanked by angels, disposed frontally and seated with foreshortened legs on a column, whose base and capitals are cup-shaped. Another arrangement shows only the saint's head and torso flanked by angels above the column (Figs. 5.16a-b), but this column lacks the distinctive capitals or stepped-base found in other depictions. Bissera Pentcheva

[1006] Bailey, *Cheshire and Lancashire*, 180-81.
[1007] Hawkes and Sidebottom, *Derbyshire and Staffordshire*, 186. See above, 230; Ch. 3, 170-71.
[1008] Coatsworth, "Iconography of the Crucifixion," 1, 40.
[1009] See, Bissera V. Pentcheva, *The Sensual Icon: Space, Ritual and the Senses in Byzantium* (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University, 2010), 19-44.

suggested that this second iconographic type was likely intended to allude to Christ's Crucifixion.[1010] While possible, this may not fully explain the function of the Halton columns, where the cross already implies the Crucifixion. Nevertheless, the portable nature of the pilgrim tokens, would have made them ideal transmitters of an iconographic model ready for adaptation.

Temporal and spatial distances between the eastern Mediterranean and the Northern Danelaw notwithstanding, the portability of such models would have facilitated their circulation across Europe into Scandinavia and/or the Insular world via pilgrimage or trade routes. Scandinavian contact with Byzantium was extant from at least the early ninth century, evinced in the coins of the Emperor Theophilos (829-842) excavated in Birka, and lead seals associated with early military contacts between Scandinavian and Byzantine populations, from the aristocratic settlement of Tissø and the trading centres of Hedeby and Ribe.[1011] Further contacts are implied by archaeological evidence from the Scandinavian-settled regions in England and Ireland: namely, silk fragments from York, Lincoln, London and Dublin that were excavated in tenth-century contexts and consequently assumed to derive from trade with Byzantium.[1012]

While direct trade contacts suggest one potential point of introduction for portable iconographic model/s, other explanations involving indirect transmission are also possible. For instance, Byzantine relics, liturgical equipment and coins circulated in Wessex during the tenth century, and the Byzantine term *basileus* (king; emperor), attested as early as 935 in the charters of Æthelstan, continued to be used throughout the late tenth-century reign of Edgar.[1013] Perhaps even more significant are localised adaptations of Byzantine (Christian) iconographies on eleventh-century pectoral crosses found in Scandinavia. Roland Scheel argued that a figure with a moustache on the cross from Gåtebo, Sweden was adapted from Byzantine imagery to conform to Scandinavian visual or cultural conventions, while other eleventh-century pectoral crosses adapted *Maria orans* iconography into images of a crucified figure.[1014] Such

[1010] Ibid., 25-26.
[1011] Fedir Androshchuk, "What Does Material Evidence Tell Us About Contacts Between Byzantium and the Viking World, *c.* 800-1000?" in *Byzantium and the Viking World,* ed. Fedir Androshchuk, et al. (Uppsala: Uppsala Universitet, 2016), 95-97.
[1012] Jonathan Shepard, "Small Worlds, the General Synopsis and the British 'Way from the Varangians to the Greeks'," in Androshchuk, et al., *Byzantium and the Viking World*, 21-22.
[1013] Ibid., 26-29; Roland Scheel, "Concepts of Cultural Transfer Between Byzantium and the North," in Androshchuk, et al., *Byzantium and the Viking World*, 63.
[1014] Scheel, "Concepts of Cultural Transfer," 59-62.

phenomena imply the availability of (Christian) Byzantine models and suggest that localised modifications of them were deemed acceptable. Overall, long-established contacts with Byzantium, through economic, military and diplomatic activities, suggest several potential ways images of the stylite saints may have arrived in the Northern Danelaw.

While the seated and half-length saints associated with distinctive columns on the tokens do not fully explain the full-length, standing figures at Halton, this does not preclude the possibility that the Byzantine *columns* could have been appropriated. As Pentcheva demonstrated, the *vitae* of stylite saints show that upon their deaths, their bodies were displayed upon a wooden plank laid across the top of the column.[1015] One *vita*, recording the life of a fifth-century saint, explains how the plank was placed upright, due to the agitation of the crowd before the column following his death.[1016] Furthermore, Pentcheva argued that images of the stylite saints on their tokens were intended to display the saint's assimilation with Christ, enabling pilgrims to witness the Holy Spirit's descent.[1017] While the Halton cross is unlikely to have performed any particular function along pilgrimage routes, the carved figures' contact with the cross in the lower panel of A does imply themes of recognition, witness and veneration, analogous to those anticipated by the token. These concepts may be fundamental to understanding the motives of those responsible for selecting and arranging this scene for public display.

The Halton scheme certainly differs from its closest Anglo-Saxon analogues, particularly with its stepped base. Indeed, this feature appears to be absent from all four of the Anglo-Saxon comparanda, implying that it reflects a choice made by the patrons, consciously informed by Christian theology. As noted, stepped cross-bases were associated with the marble steps leading up to the True Cross of Golgotha, as recreated in Jerusalem.[1018] Its depiction here suggests that the Halton patrons intended the carved cross to recall Golgotha, the historical event of the Crucifixion, and by extension, the cross of the Crucifixion and Christ's salvific sacrifice upon it.

These associations are also reflected in the overall monumental form of the Halton cross, which stands within a ninth or early tenth-century stepped-base (Fig.

[1015] Pentcheva, *Sensual Icon*, 57.
[1016] Ibid.
[1017] Ibid., 28.
[1018] Roe, "Irish High Cross," 220.

5.17);[1019] given its date and presence at the site this may well have been the original base. Its stepped arrangement supports this suggestion because the form is not attested in the extant corpus of surviving Anglian cross bases,[1020] implying that the patrons deliberately selected it when other base forms were available. It suggests they were aware of its significance and deemed it an appropriate 'support' for the carvings on the cross-shaft, which included this type of cross-base. Conversely, if the original base of the Halton cross was not stepped, the depiction of just such a monument on A and the survival of a stepped-base elsewhere at the site, may well have inspired its selection for supporting the (later) cross. Either way, the stepped-base featured in the carving suggests that the monument's patrons had some understanding of Golgotha as the site of the Crucifixion, the Crucifixion itself and the redemption offered by Christ's sacrificial death, all betokened by the True Cross, and intended to publicly display that awareness.

Those responsible for the Halton scheme, however, likely intended for it to carry additional Christian theological significance, as implied by the disposition of the flanking figures who grasp the stepped-base cross. This suggests that the panel was intended to reflect traditions associated with the veneration and adoration of the cross current from the ninth century onwards. Chazelle observed that early to mid-ninth-century Carolingian treatises on the cross demonstrate ecclesiastical understanding(s) that Christ's death blessed the cross and its form,[1021] rendering visual representations of the cross sacred and also to evoke memories of Christ's sacrifice and the victorious nature of his death upon it, further increasing the devotion of the faithful.[1022] In the ninth century, encounters with the cross would encourage awareness of the miraculous nature of Christ's death, and cognisance of the cross as the source of redemption and an instrument for revealing sacred wisdom.[1023] At Halton, these concepts are visualised in the stepped-base cross invoking Golgotha, the True Cross, the Crucifixion and Christ's sacrifice, while the figures' contact with this cross suggests their belief in Christ's dual nature, revealed to them by his sacrifice, which made possible humanity's redemption.

[1019] Bailey, *Cheshire and Lancashire*, 177-83 (Halton 1), 193 (Halton 10). For the stepped-base in Ireland, see: Roe, "Irish High Cross," 214-224; Werner, "On the Origin," 98-106.
[1020] Bailey, *Cheshire and Lancashire*, 193.
[1021] Chazelle, *The Crucified God*, 114-16.
[1022] Ibid., 114.
[1023] Ibid., 116.

From the time these concepts were, as already discussed, celebrated alongside praise of Christ's triumph in at least three liturgical feasts (the *Adoratio crucis,* the *Exaltatio crucis* and the *Inventio crucis*),[1024] at least two, the *Exaltatio* and *Inventio crucis,* were practised during Good Friday celebrations from the early to mid-eighth century, and rendered visually at Ruthwell.[1025] The readings for the *Exaltatio crucis* (14 September) made explicit connections between the cross, Christ and his victory, while also emphasising Christ's elevation on the cross as the means of liberating humanity from sin.[1026] As early as the late seventh century, the papal procession from the Lateran to Santa Croce in Hierusalem in Rome directly referenced the Good Friday processions to Golgotha in Jerusalem, and included the act of papal veneration of the relics of the True Cross, considered an appropriate manner of greeting Christ.[1027]

Ó Carragáin argued that by the late eighth century, this ceremony was adapted to local circumstances in communities outside Rome,[1028] suggesting that some form of the *Exaltatio crucis* may have been celebrated at Halton in the tenth century. This seems to be supported by the scheme on A in which the stepped-base of the cross, referencing Golgotha and the Crucifixion, recalls the ceremony's imitation of the Good Friday processions in Jerusalem and Rome. The figures' contact with the cross further invokes the papal and episcopal acts of kissing the cross during the ceremony. Indeed, the late eighth-century Ordo XXIV describes a version of the *Exaltatio crucis* where the kissing of a cross held upright between two clerics in a manner adapted from imperial court protocol, and later, the papal liturgy.[1029] The prominence of these feasts contributed to early medieval understandings of the cross as the instrument of Christ's death, one that revealed his divine nature and wisdom as the means of humanity's salvation. The Halton arrangement, explicitly imitating the ceremony, suggests that the scheme may have been derived from liturgical celebrations witnessed by the monument's patron(s).

The ninth-century Good Friday *Adoratio crucis* built on aspects of these earlier liturgical ceremonies, sharing some features with them.[1030] For instance, it too emphasised Christ's divine victory, but on the Continent it also incorporated the act of

[1024] Ibid., 139-42. See Ch.3, 171-75.
[1025] Ó Carragáin, *Ritual and the Rood*, 180.
[1026] Ibid., 190-92.
[1027] Ibid., 193.
[1028] Ibid., 197.
[1029] Ibid., 200.
[1030] Bradford Bedingfield, *Dramatic Liturgy*, 125-26.

adoration; those participating in the ceremony imitated Christ by prostrating themselves before the cross.[1031] Chazelle emphasised its differences to the earlier ceremonies, however, arguing that while the *Adoratio* also focussed on Christ's suffering and triumph, it was distinguished by emphasising Good Friday as the anniversary of Christ's *death*, rather than his victory.[1032] In this ceremony, Christ's death was thus recognised as the essential condition of his victory, and the subsequent reunification of the faithful with God.[1033] The performance of the *Adoratio* is attested in tenth-century Anglo-Saxon England in the *Regularis Concordia*, where the rite emphasised Christ's death and elevation on the cross.[1034] As noted, this included lay participation.[1035]

These aspects of the *Adoratio* may have implications for understanding the arrangement of the ancillary figures on pedestals, which elevate them, enabling them to reach the stem of the cross, itself elevated on its stepped-base. Their placement corresponds to Christ's elevation on the cross, suggesting a correlation between the figures' adoration of the cross and elevation; it emphasises their recognition of Christ's sacrifice and his divinity as the means of their own salvation. Their placement may also reference the tenth-century performance of the *Adoratio*, during which the cross was held up by two deacons, a feature shared with the *Exaltatio*.[1036] This potential reference is supported by the length of the figures' garments, indicating their ecclesiastical identity, suggesting that the Halton patrons selected the arrangement for its potential visual parallels with the liturgy, something that could have been witnessed and understood by the laity. The inclusion of the figures' physical contact with the cross indicates that it was crucial to conveying the scheme's overall significance. Bedingfield has demonstrated how physical engagement with the cross was fundamental to the ritual, being intended to make Christ's divinity apparent to those participating in it.[1037] This is significant when considering how the Halton figures' hands grasp the stepped-base cross – in other words, they symbolically grasp the True Cross of the Crucifixion on Golgotha.

[1031] Chazelle, *The Crucified God*, 163.
[1032] Ibid., 152.
[1033] Ibid., 164.
[1034] Bradford Bedingfield, *Dramatic Liturgy*, 123.
[1035] Ibid., 126-32. See Ch.3, 172-73.
[1036] Ibid., 127.
[1037] Ibid., 133.

Thus, while the cross-form makes these associations explicit, the pair of figures included in the scheme make Christ's divinity implicit through their attitudes of adoration and contact with the cross, implying the recognition of the cross as a symbol not only of Christ's Crucifixion, but also his triumph. Those responsible for this monument must have selected this combination of iconographic details with the intention of mimetically making Christ present for those encountering it. It is further possible that their decision was influenced by the ritual of the *Adoratio crucis* as it was performed in Anglo-Saxon England. Such multivalent frames of reference, involving contemporary theological concepts and liturgical ceremonies, are significant when considering the motives informing these decisions. It suggests that the patrons either experienced or were told of these liturgical ceremonies and theological views, and their meanings for the faithful; that they had sufficient understanding of these concepts to include an image that explicitly references them; and they intended to present the concepts it encapsulated for public reception. At the most basic level, the image presents a visual cue for those encountering it on the form of the cross, prompting them to recall Christ's death on the cross at Golgotha, while the figures flanking the cross might remind them that they, too, should adore Christ. For those initiated into Christianity, and those more learned clerical audiences encountering it, the image would have prompted recollection of certain aspects of the Easter liturgy and other feasts celebrating the cross throughout the liturgical year, such as the *Exaltatio crucis*, with the acts of witnessing the elevation or ritual unveiling of the cross, and/or the contact participants made with it in these liturgical ceremonies.[1038]

Such intentions have implications for further recovering the scheme's significance, in light of the image depicted in the panel above. Here, a central figure is shown frontally with his arms crossed over his chest and a book in his left hand (Fig. 5.18). Two vertical elements protrude on either side, joined behind his head by horizontal features. The unusual rounded arrangement of his shoulders finds parallels at Kirkby Stephen, Gainford (Co. Durham) and Leeds,[1039] indicating a shared interest in this figural type. Yet, none of these examples provide direct analogues for the overall scheme at Halton; the central figure is flanked by two diminutive profile figures, both appearing to grasp his legs. The pair is either seated or crouching, as indicated by their bent knees. Closer sculptural analogues occur on the fragmentary

[1038] Ibid., 127-28; Chazelle, *The Crucified God*, 273.
[1039] W.G. Collingwood, "A Cross-shaft of the Viking Age at Kirkby Stephen," *TCWAAS*, ser. 2, 12 (1912): 32. See Appendix, I.54, I.32-35, I.64.

cross-shafts from Nunburnholme (Fig. 5.19a), Barwick-in-Elmet (Fig. 5.19b) and York Minster (Fig. 5.19c). Consequently, the central figure at Halton has been identified as a seated ecclesiastic or angel (as at York).[1040]

The arrangement is also found in Ireland – on the Cross of the Scriptures at Clonmacnoise, Muiredach's Cross and the Tall Cross at Monasterboice – each apparently depicting the *traditio legis cum clavis*, although there are slight variations among them.[1041] That on the east face of the Clonmacnoise cross depicts three figures wearing long garments, the central one seated (Fig. 5.20). His arms are outstretched towards the two standing flanking figures to offer a key to that on the left and a book to that on the right.[1042] The scene is repeated on the west face of the Monasterboice Tall Cross (Fig. 5.21), but here, all three figures stand, with Peter on the left receiving a key and Paul on the right accepting the book, in a scheme apparently paired with a depiction of the Raised Christ.[1043] The *traditio legis cum clavis* on the west face of Muiredach's cross (Fig. 5.22) is paired with a representation of the Raised Christ.[1044] Here, however, the figures' disposition forms a closer analogue to the Clonmacnoise scheme, with a seated central figure flanked by Peter standing on the left to receive the key, while Paul standing on the right receives the book. It is distinguished from Clonmacnoise by a winged creature above Paul.[1045] The Raised Christ, carved in the panel below features three standing frontal figures that hold books.

Harbison explained that these *traditio* schemes designated Peter and Paul as the head of the Church through their acceptance of the keys and the New Law (respectively).[1046] He further suggested that the scene's pairing with the Raised Christ on Muiredach's cross was deliberately intended to emphasise the influence of the Church of Rome.[1047] Roger Stalley, *contra* Harbison, emphasised the differences between the schemes to argue that they were likely based on different iconographic

[1040] Collingwood, "Sculpture…West Riding," 137; Collingwood, *Northumbrian Crosses*, 159; Pattison, "Nunburnholme Cross," 228; Lang, *Anglian Sculpture*, 14; Lang, "Sculptors," 89; Coatsworth, *Western Yorkshire*, 94-95 (Barwick-in-Elmet 2); Appendix, I.8; Lang, *York and Eastern Yorkshire*, 54-55 (York Minster 2), 189-93 (Nunburnholme); Ch.4, 190-208; Appendix, I.104 and I.75.
[1041] Peter Harbison, *The High Crosses of Ireland: An Iconographical and Photographic Survey* 1 (Bonn: R. Habelt, 1992), 49, 81, 144, 150; Hawkes, *Sandbach Crosses*, 56-59.
[1042] Harbison, *High Crosses*, 1, 49.
[1043] Ibid., 1, 150.
[1044] Ibid., 1, 144.
[1045] Ibid., 1, 294.
[1046] Harbison, *High Crosses*, 1, 294.
[1047] Ibid., 1, 295; Roger Stalley, "Irish Sculpture of the Early Tenth Century and the Work of the 'Muiredach Master': Problems of Identification and Meaning," *PRIA* 114c (2014): 165-67.

models, which underscored affiliations with the *Maiestas domini*.[1048] If so, it might suggest that the central figure at Halton was similarly intended to recall aspects of the *Maiestas*, a suggestion supported by its placement above the Adoration of the Cross: this pairing explicitly links Christ's sacrifice on the cross with his Second Coming and the Last Judgment.

In Anglo-Saxon England, the North Cross at Sandbach provides an analogue to the Irish schemes (Fig. 5.23).[1049] Here, the enlarged central figure is flanked by two nimbed figures, with a winged creature depicted above Peter, on the right, holding the keys; Paul, on the left, holds the law.[1050] Hawkes suggested that the bird present here (and at Monasterboice) indicates the adaptation of early Christian models, with only the flanking figures' attributes being varied.[1051] Early depictions of the scheme (limited to the *traditio legis*) were sometimes related to those of the *Majestas domini*, and were intended to emphasise Christ's triumph over death and his presentation of the Word to Peter and Paul, who were expected to relay it to the Christian community at large.[1052] At Sandbach the combined *traditio legis cum clavis* was juxtaposed with the Crucifixion and Transfiguration to denote the presence of Christ's Church on earth, and the commemoration of his sacrifice in the Eucharist as the means to humanity's salvation, a message that would be conveyed to the Christian community by Peter and Paul.[1053] As Hawkes observed, the Sandbach scheme was also intended as a general expression of the Church's divine authority, and its security, ensured by secular leaders.[1054]

The absence of attributes held by the flanking figures at Halton indicate that this scheme was not intended to represent the *traditio clavis/legis,* but given the similarity of its arrangement to the other Insular schemes, it was likely adapted from just such a scheme, or from a model similar to those underlying the Irish and Anglian scenes. If this was the case, it seems unlikely that the Halton scheme was intended to designate the establishment of Christ's Church on earth. Rather, its pairing with the Adoration of the Cross below emphasises Christ's triumph over death as fulfilling divine prophecy, something further suggested by Christ's absence from the carved

[1048] Roger Stalley, "European Art and the Irish High Crosses," *PRIA* 90c (1990): 143-45; Stalley, "Irish Sculpture," 163-64.
[1049] Bailey, *Cheshire and Lancashire,* 110.
[1050] Hawkes, *Sandbach Crosses*, 56.
[1051] Ibid., 143.
[1052] Ibid., 56-58.
[1053] Ibid., 60-62.
[1054] Ibid., 144-45.

cross. His triumph over death is also invoked with the central figure's hieratic, seated pose, associated with the *Majestas domini* images. The grasping actions of the figures in the upper panel also reflect those of the figures below, underscoring the revelation of Christ's divinity and their roles as witnesses to this phenomenon.

Yet, while the Halton arrangement generally corresponds to that of the Sandbach *traditio legis cum clavis* and the three Irish scenes, there are some significant differences. For instance, the flanking figures at Halton are disposed differently; they sit or crouch at the feet of the central figure, rather than standing or kneeling at his side, although this placement may be attributed to the narrow proportions of the cross-shaft. Moreover, the Halton figures lack the attributes that could identify them as Peter and Paul, seeming only to grasp the legs of the central figure. Together, these features suggest that an alternative iconographic model was used at Halton, or that several were conflated. Coatsworth and Lang independently proposed that the image may depict the risen Christ,[1055] based on the features it shares with an image of the Raised Christ on the Durrow cross, which provides the closest visual analogue to the Halton scheme (Fig. 5.24).[1056]

This depicts Christ as an enlarged, central figure without a nimbus, sitting with a book held over his knees and angels over his shoulders. He is flanked by two profile figures seated in chairs, who touch the book. Although the angels are absent at Halton, the shape of their wings resembles the curvilinear features above the Halton Christ's shoulders. The seated arrangement of the flanking figures at Durrow also resonates with the Halton pair, although the latter are not seated on chairs. Harbison argued that the Durrow scheme was likely derived from earlier Christian variants in Rome, which showed Christ enthroned with his hand raised, themselves derived from imperial images of the emperor's *ad locutio*.[1057] In early Christian contexts, the image was understood to symbolise the power Christ wielded in heaven and on earth.[1058]

Harbison suggested that the Durrow scheme's closest analogues, found in Rome, included an early ninth-century metal casket in the Vatican Museum (Fig. 5.25) that depicts Christ, raising his right hand in blessing and holding a book in his left, enthroned between two standing figures, identified by their attributes as Peter and Paul. The second, a now lost early eleventh-century fresco from Sant'Urbano alla

[1055] Coatsworth, "Iconography of the Crucifixion," 33; Lang, *Anglian Sculpture*, 14.
[1056] Lang, *Anglian Sculpture*, 14; Harbison, *High Crosses*, 1, 79.
[1057] Harbison, *High Crosses*, 1, 292-93.
[1058] Ibid., 1, 292.

Caffarella, Rome, preserved in a seventeenth-century drawing, showed Christ enthroned with his right hand raised, and flanked by two figures identified in inscriptions as Peter and Paul (Fig. 5.26). Harbison consequently concluded that the two flanking figures at Durrow were Peter and Paul, and that it did not illustrate Christ's Mission to the apostles, given the exclusion of the remaining apostles.[1059] The Durrow Christ raises neither hand, however, indicating a significant departure from the two suggested examples and the early Christian schemes based on the *ad locutio*: an important distinction, given that this is the fundamental action used to identify the iconographic type. Its inclusion at Halton is thus significant; it suggests that the scheme may form a closer parallel to the Roman examples, particularly that depicted on the casket.

Nevertheless, it is possible to identify further parallels between Durrow and Halton. At Durrow, as at Halton, neither flanking figure carries an attribute; rather, each touches the book held by the central figure. Thus, while the central figure at Halton displays details preserved in Roman depictions of the Raised Christ, the flanking figures share with their counterparts at Durrow the absence of attributes. This implies that an iconographic model based on Roman images of the Raised Christ was circulating and being adapted in the Insular world for public display. As a variation of the Raised Christ, its pairing with the scheme below is appropriate, given that the central significance of the Raised Christ was the revelation of Christ's power in heaven and on earth, while the Crucifixion and its celebrations fulfilled and commemorated divine prophecy and Christ's divinity.

Furthermore, as noted, Raised Christ schemes could be depicted adjacent to the *traditio*, as on Muiredach's cross. While acknowledging that the Durrow Raised Christ may have been a variation of a *traditio* scheme, Stalley identified key differences between the two: namely, the absence of the keys and scrolls held by the flanking figures.[1060] Although the Raised Christ scheme on Muiredach's cross does not provide a direct analogue to the Halton panel, its pairing with the *traditio* scheme, whose figural arrangement *does* correspond to that at Halton, may enable further understanding of the Halton panel's symbolic significance. Its resemblance to both the Durrow Raised Christ, the Sandbach *traditio legis cum clavis* and those elsewhere in Ireland implies that the Halton arrangement conflates two such schemes. Thus, while

[1059] Ibid., 1, 293.
[1060] Stalley, "Irish Sculpture," 166-67.

the Halton figures' potentially deliberate ambiguity prevents the scheme from being securely identified as either iconographic type, its resemblance to both engenders the possibility that it was based on either the *traditio legis cum clavis* or Raised Christ, or conflated both.

Moreover, the *traditio legis cum clavis* shares certain symbolic significances with the Raised Christ; both emphasise Christ's triumph over death as a means of establishing his divine authority over heaven and earth. This suggests that the Halton patrons, recognising the potential significance of such figural arrangements, intended to make Christ's divinity and authority explicit in the central figure's seated, hieratic pose, while also referencing his role as Judge at the eschaton. As with the scheme below, they may have intended the upper panel of A to be understood within multivalent frames of reference, enabling it to invoke Christ's triumph over death, aspects of his divine authority and potentially his role as Judge, as witnessed by the ancillary figures.

The complex Sigurd scheme on C is also arranged in two panels (Fig. 5.27).[1061] These have been described as "purely pagan",[1062] and "alien to Christian sentiment",[1063] in the face of the monumental cross-form and the Christian imagery on A, and other assessments of Sigurd iconography.[1064] At the base of the lower panel (Fig. 5.28) is a rectangular table with two legs, shown in profile to the right.[1065] On it is a pair of pincers, with two bellows below.[1066] To the left a profile figure sits in a high-backed chair, leaning forward with a large hammer in his outstretched hand, ready to strike the table/anvil before him. Above is a sword on the left, arranged vertically with its blade pointing upwards. Another pair of pincers is depicted to its right, with a frontal, headless figure. The seated and headless figures have both been identified as Reginn: first, forging the sword for Sigurd, and then beheaded, following Sigurd's conversation with the birds,[1067] represented in the upper panel (Fig. 5.29). Here a profile human figure stands on the left, identified as Sigurd partaking in his

[1061] See Appendix, I.39; Face D has also been assumed to include imagery associated with the Sigurd legend, despite the absence of any confirmatory attributes: Calverley, *Notes*, 190; Baldwin Brown, *Anglo-Saxon Sculpture*, 232; Bailey, *Cheshire and Lancashire*, 179; Kopár, *Gods and Settlers*, 33-35; Cf. Davidson, "Sigurd," 228; Düwel, "Zur Ikonographie und Ikonologie," 244.
[1062] Kendrick, *Late Saxon*, 59.
[1063] A.P. Smyth, *Scandinavian York and Dublin* 2 (Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press, 1979), 2:271.
[1064] H.R.E. Davidson, *Pagan Scandinavia* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1967), 126-127; Margeson, "Volsung Legend," 208.
[1065] See Appendix, I.39.
[1066] Bailey, *Cheshire and Lancashire*, 179.
[1067] Bailey, *Viking Age Sculpture*, 120.

mystic meal, wearing a short kirtle and raising his left hand to his mouth.[1068] Before Sigurd are four vertical features, whose bases are plaited together; above are five intersecting vertical features forming boughs surmounted by two birds.[1069] Although the roasting of the dragon's heart is not included here,[1070] the panels do present several of the most significant episodes of the Sigurd cycle: the forging of Sigurd's sword; Sigurd sucking his thumb and the subsequent conversation with the birds; and Reginn the smith's beheading.

Bailey observed that, if read from top to bottom the narrative is presented anachronistically, with Sigurd's meal and the birds following Reginn's decapitation. This he attributed either to the artist's training or the model – which he suggested did not employ panel divisions – being adapted.[1071] The non-sequential narrative can nevertheless be explained as a result of the selection of the monumental cross-form forcing this iconographic scheme to fit the narrow dimensions of the rectangular shaft, despite the availability of other monumental forms, such as hogbacks or grave slabs. The patrons clearly chose to display the scheme on a cross-shaft, which necessitated both its adaptation to fit the confines of the field and its atypical arrangement, in panels in keeping with the figures on A, probably inspired by the extant Anglian monuments at the site. The fragmented (un-chronological) arrangement of the Halton scenes indicates that they were intended to be viewed and understood as a complete narrative cycle, read across the panel divisions separating them. The phenomenon also occurs in the Road to Calvary depiction on the early ninth-century Sandbach cross (Fig. 5.30),[1072] demonstrating that split narrative schemes were not unknown within Anglian sculptural traditions. Features of the Halton cross thus correspond to Anglian sculptural practises through the selection of the cross-form, panel divisions used to display its carvings and the way these were disposed across the panels. Evidently, the patrons deliberately chose to display heroic images alongside Christian imagery and according to Anglian sculptural traditions, with the result that the chronological narrative of the Sigurd cycle has been fragmented.

[1068] John McKinnell, "Eddic Poetry in Anglo-Scandinavian Northern England," in Graham-Campbell, et al., *Vikings and the Danelaw*, 328. This figure has been identified with the left-hand figure superimposed on the cleric on D at Nunburnholme: Pattison, "Nunburnholme Cross," 230; Kopár, *Gods and Settlers*, 37; see Ch.4, 197-201.
[1069] Bailey, *Cheshire and Lancashire*, 179.
[1070] Calverley, *Notes*, 190; Collingwood, *Northumbrian Crosses*, 160.
[1071] Bailey, *Viking Age Sculpture*, 120-22.
[1072] Hawkes, *Sandbach Crosses:* 77-79; Bailey, Cheshire and Lancashire, 111-12.

As noted, only a small portion of episodes involving Sigurd and his companions were deemed acceptable for display on stone monuments in the Northern Danelaw and Scandinavia, with sculptors in both regions apparently working within fixed iconographic traditions.[1073] The omission of certain episodes at Halton is thus significant, suggesting that the patrons were remarkably selective and intended to achieve a specific objective by means of the episodes they did include.

Most scholarly discussions of these carvings have focussed on their connections to four tenth-century monuments from the Isle of Man preserving the same schemes.[1074] Three of these, however, from Kirk Andreas, Jurby and Malew (Figs. 5.31a-c), also include depictions of the serpent-dragon Fafnir, an episode absent at Halton,[1075] although it might once have been included in the missing portion of the shaft above. More interesting, however, is that Reginn's decapitation is absent from the Manx monuments; the Halton motif is thus analogous only to those depicted elsewhere on the monuments widely dispersed at Kirby Hill, Gök (Sweden) and Ramsund (Figs. 5.32a-c).[1076]

Furthermore, the inclusion of the beheaded Reginn in the smithy does not correspond to later Icelandic versions of the legend, which do not identify the location of the event.[1077] Lang thus suggested that the Halton carvings may present a conflation of this legend with that of Weland the Smith.[1078] While possible, the Halton patrons evidently considered the decapitated figure a central component of the Sigurd story, and situated it in the central space near the horizontal panel divisions. This emphasis on Reginn's treachery and subsequent decapitation implies it was considered significant for understanding the overall iconographic programme.

With this in mind, it is worth considering further the details of the Kirby Hill fragment (Fig. 5.33), which displays parallels with the figural schemes on A and C at Halton.[1079] Here, the thumb-sucking figure of Sigurd and the beheaded Reginn were arranged below a Crucifixion, which was originally disposed in the (now lost) cross-head. Although not directly analogous to Halton, Kirby Hill demonstrates that Sigurd

[1073] Davidson, *Pagan Scandinavia*, 126-27.
[1074] Sue Margeson, "On the Iconography of the Manx Crosses," in *The Viking Age in the Isle of Man*, ed. Christine Fell, et al. (London: Viking Society for Northern Research, 1983), 100-01.
[1075] Ibid.; Margeson, "Volsung Legend," 186-90; Düwel, "Zur Ikonographie und Ikonologie," 249.
[1076] Lang, "Sigurd and Weland," 84-86.
[1077] *Völsunga Saga*, ed./trans. Finch, 34; *Lay of Fafnir*, ed./trans. Larrington, in *Poetic Edda*, 159-60.
[1078] Ibid., 90; Kopár, *Gods and Settlers*, 52.
[1079] Bailey, *Viking Age Sculpture*, 121; Lang, *Northern Yorkshire*, 130-32 (Kirby Hill 2 and 7); Appendix, I.49-50.

iconography was considered compatible with the Christian message of salvation and implies that contemporary audiences accepted this, a response anticipated by the Halton patrons. Thus, although the Halton Sigurd imagery has been assumed to commemorate ancestral claims or promote heroic ideals,[1080] its juxtaposition with overtly Christian images implies alternative iconographic significance(s) for the monument overall. While Christian parallels for the selection of legendary motifs have been (erroneously) dismissed as conjectural,[1081] there are several potential Christian correspondences, which are mediated by the monumental cross-form. One explanation, for instance, was that Fafnir's defeat offered a convincing parallel for Christian episodes corresponding to the defeat of evil, as in passages related to Leviathan and the dragon in Revelation.[1082] Its presence at Kirby Hill is, however, only *implied* by the thumb-sucking figure; its presence at Halton cannot be confirmed, suggesting that the defeat of evil may not have been a primary concern of the Halton patrons.

Other parallels, however, have also been observed, particularly those involving the legend and Genesis, the shared feature being the acquisition of knowledge from either trees or a mystic meal.[1083] At Halton, the deliberate selection and combination of particular elements from the narrative emphasise Sigurd's meal, the knowledge of Reginn's treachery bestowed by the birds and Reginn's subsequent beheading. Despite their panelled arrangement, the prominence of the meal and beheading are supplemented by the figures' central arrangement in the scenes. Overall, this suggests that the Halton patrons intended to publicly convey the themes of revelation and recognition in their portrayal of this narrative cycle, providing an appropriate analogue to the images on A.

Thus, although the Halton cross has been invoked primarily for its Sigurd imagery, the monumental cross-form and the accompanying panels on A make the monument's Christian nature explicit. The Christian significance of A is emphasised by visual references to the historical event of the Crucifixion at Golgotha as the means of human salvation with the ahistorical figures accompanying this cross further underscoring the importance of the historicity of the Cross and Crucifixion. These

[1080] Kopár, *Gods and Settlers,* 200-01.
[1081] Ibid., 53.
[1082] Bailey, *Viking Age Sculpture*, 124; Bailey, *England's Earliest Sculptors*, 92-93; Thompson, *Dying and Death*, 168.
[1083] Lang, "Sigurd and Weland," 94; Bailey, *Viking-Age Sculpture,* 125; Bailey, *England's Earliest Sculptors,* 92-93; Kopár, *Gods and Settlers*, 53-56.

figures and their contact with the cross also recall contemporary liturgical ceremonies of adoration, which likewise address the recognition of Christ's divine nature, and his triumph over death.

These features are further emphasised in the upper scheme, potentially based on images of the Raised Christ and/or the *traditio legis cum clavis*, and so signifying Christ's divine authority on heaven and earth. Its multivalency, expressed in the arrangement of the figures, also anticipates Christ's role as Judge at the eschaton, making it an appropriate accompaniment for the Crucifixion. The Sigurd scenes, initially anomalous amongst such Christian frames of reference, nevertheless include motifs carefully selected and arranged (within Anglian sculptural traditions, condensing the narrative and enabling its viewing across panel divisions) to express the themes of revelation and recognition. Despite the secular associations of the *Völsungssaga*, the Halton patrons' careful selections emphasise aspects of the narrative that appropriatly complement the Christian images on A, and likewise emphasise themes of recognition and subsequent redemption. It is apparent that those responsible for the Halton cross intended it to publicly display these ideas, implicit in the combination of the Christian and legendary material. Overall, the iconography indicates that while the patrons may have been secular, they also had a meaningful and informed understanding of Christian traditions, whether through their own participation in the Church or through other potential encounters with ecclesiastical communities.

5.4 Summary

The crosses at Middleton and Halton have been presumed to be the products of secular patronage because their iconographic programmes include secular imagery, apparently providing evidence of their patrons' ethnic identities. Yet, their monumental form, medium and accompanying images indicate that their patrons intended the crosses to be viewed and understood as Christian. The monumental cross-form and the use of stone, associated with Rome and its Church, in lieu of other materials and monument forms is particularly significant at Middleton, where the Christian nature of the carvings might otherwise be obscured. Although the Christian imagery at Halton is more well-defined, these images have been overlooked in favour of the Sigurd cycle carved on C. Together, the two monuments demonstrate how significant the form of

the cross and the early medieval associations of stone are for recovering the potential motives and objectives of the patrons.

The opposing images of the warrior and serpent at Middleton appear entirely secular, but their disposition beneath the cross-head enables them to be understood within multiple frames of reference. They can be viewed simply as images of a warrior and a bound serpent intended to present the ambitions and tastes of either its patrons or the individual it commemorates, but their ambiguity facilitates more complex readings when viewed in the context of the cross-form; they can be understood to reference eschatological events, signifying Christ's triumph over death, evil and the eradication of sin. Moreover, the iconography also seems to reflect its contemporary socio-political context, when the public display of an individual's status as a landholder or local lord might be considered necessary in the face of West Saxon incursions. While the prominent Scandinavian-style beasts and weapons may emphasise the social or ethnic affiliations of the Middleton patrons, their presentation on a cross suggests that these patrons wanted to exploit both the potential sacred and secular significances of the monument.

The objectives of Anglo-Scandinavian patrons to invest in public monuments with both sacred and secular frames of reference is even more apparent at Halton, where overtly Christian images are combined with those depicting secular legend to express themes of recognition and revelation. These explicitly reference Golgotha and the Crucifixion by including a cross with a stepped-base, and also (potentially) the base of the monument itself, and are enhanced by contemporary liturgical ceremonies intended to celebrate the cross itself. Juxtaposed are the motifs associated with the Sigurd legend that were selected and arranged to emphasise Sigurd's post-prandial gaining of wisdom, revealing Reginn's treachery and resulting in his death. As at Middleton, viewing the monument's carvings as part of a holistic iconographic programme, whose images have been deliberately selected by the patrons and arranged on the monumental cross-form for public display, reveals that they should be viewed within Christian frames of reference as intended by the patrons.

CONCLUSION

1. Overview

This study set out to reassess the relative significances of the sacred and secular figural iconographies of the Anglo-Scandinavian stone crosses produced in the Northern Danelaw, on the understanding that these monuments and their carvings have been regularly regarded as the products of 'pagan' (Scandinavian) patronage since they first came under scrutiny by late nineteenth-century antiquarians. In the intervening period, numerous art-historical studies have addressed the monuments' stylistic and typological features to establish chronological developments and regional distributions, but iconographic studies have remained scarce. Given the predilection for relying on twelfth- and thirteenth-century Icelandic texts to identify the tenth-century Anglo-Scandinavian figural carvings, however, such iconographic studies that have been undertaken have prioritised those images believed to originate in Norse myth and legend at the expense of any accompanying Christian carvings, and perhaps more significantly, have ignored the monumental-cross form selected for their display.

These studies have thus perpetuated a 'pagan'-Christian binary that isolates these (apparently) anomalous images from their monumental and cultural contexts, ignoring the nuanced socio-political developments coeval with their production that are now recognised in historical and archaeological scholarship. This has prevented any meaningful consideration of the motives informing the selection and display of certain motifs, and their potential symbolic significances, which were dependent upon their arrangement within individual iconographic programmes. By addressing the phenomena of conversion and Christianisation within the Northern Danelaw, this study has demonstrated that art-historical perceptions of the Scandinavian settlers as 'pagan' invaders contradict the documentary and archaeological evidence, which indicates that the Scandinavian settlers accommodated Anglian administrative and political features to establish and legitimise their authority. This has demonstrated that collaboration with the Church was one of the most significant cultural aspects appropriated by the Scandinavian settlers, indicating both that the effect of their settlement on ecclesiastical activity was far from devastating, and that the settlers perceived the cultural value of the Church as a powerful institution.

Moreover, consideration of conversion and Christianisation has established that the ecclesiastical framework in the Northern Danelaw evolved post-settlement into a gradually, but increasingly secularised institution – a situation that provided an environment conducive to the production of stone crosses under the aegis of well-informed Anglo-Scandinavian patrons with access to a range of visual models. By reconsidering and establishing the position of the Church during the late ninth and tenth centuries as culturally relevant, this study has demonstrated that the monuments can be viewed in relation to contemporary poetic, homiletic, exegetical and liturgical texts circulating in the region at the time. In turn, this has demonstrated that the methodological approaches generally applied to Anglian, pre-Viking monuments to recover their symbolic significances provide extremely fruitful results when applied to the Anglo-Scandinavian sculptures. A thorough understanding of these factors has enabled the adoption of a thematic approach to the monuments, which has addressed not only patronage and audience perceptions of the crosses and their carved iconographic programmes, but also those aspects of the monuments that maintained visual and conceptual links with the monuments produced during the Anglian period, not least the adoption of the monumental cross-form.

2. Monumentality

Indeed, foregrounding monumentality as crucial to the perception of the crosses by contemporary Anglo-Scandinavian audiences has also counteracted the current fragmentary nature of numerous crosses, which has been considered an obstacle to assessing their iconographic programmes. Accepting the nature of their monumental form has demonstrated that the cross was deliberately selected by the patrons when other forms were available, and at certain sites, may have been selected in response to extant monuments. The cross-form itself imbues the images carved upon it with inherently Christian significances, and when erected in outdoor environments, including churchyards and secular estates, it enabled the monuments to be understood as Christianising the landscape.[1084]

By giving primacy to the cross-form, particularly at sites with extant Anglian monuments where stone crosses continued to be produced after Scandinavian settlement, the iconographic programmes of the monuments can be perceived as

[1084] See Introduction, 74-78; Ch.3, 146-77; Ch.4, 178-80.

agents actively involved in complex theological commentaries. This phenomenon suggests that the Scandinavian settlers were aware of the Christian significance of the cross-form and adopted it with the intention of projecting Christian ideologies into/onto their surroundings using monumental sculpture. The appropriation of the format may also suggest that the settlers may have deemed the extant monuments or their iconographies insufficient or unintelligible, but perhaps most significantly, it indicates the Church's continued influence. This is particularly evident in the iconographies derived from Christian visual repertoires that were selected to adorn the crosses from Dacre and Middleton.[1085]

At Dacre, re-framing the cross-form has made it possible to extract the potential Christian meanings inherent in its carvings, which were initially assumed to represent a Norse mythological subject but have since been re-identified as a representation of the Fall. When viewed in the context of its monumental support, this scheme, expressing humanity's damnation, would form an appropriate analogue to the (now missing) cross-head, which would have designated Christ's sacrifice and the potential for redemption. This juxtaposition would have been entirely appropriate within both the monumental context of the cross-form, and the socio-religious context of its production – that of the conversion and Christianisation of the Scandinavian settlers during the late ninth and tenth centuries. Indeed, the themes of redemption and salvation invoked by the iconographic programme appear to hinge on the potential baptism scheme situated between the cross-head and the Fall. Its placement suggests that initiation into the Church and subsequent participation in the Eucharist, which celebrates Christ's sacrifice, alluded to by the cross-form, are the means by which salvation can be attained. The deliberate ambiguity of the carvings would encourage clerical and secular viewers alike to contemplate their own position in the history of salvation, and given Dacre's ecclesiastical status and the ongoing conversion and Christianisation of the Scandinavian settlers, such themes of initiation would have been entirely relevant, if not fundamental, to obtaining salvation through the Church.

Deliberately ambiguous images are also mediated by the monumental cross-form and medium of Middleton 1, where they invoke Christian frames of reference that enable this cross to be integrated into a larger network of stone monuments associated with Christianity, the Church and its liturgical and theological traditions. When viewed in relation to the cross-head that links them, the carvings on the

[1085] See Ch.3, 148-65.

opposing broad faces can be viewed and understood within multivalent frames of reference that appeal to secular and ecclesiastical viewers. Within secular frames of reference, the hunt scheme could be associated with the patron's secular status, while the bound serpent could simultaneously be viewed as a decorative feature rendered in Scandinavian visual languages or as a visual expression of conquered evil. Yet, viewed within Christian frames of reference, the serpent could likewise be interpreted as representing salvation from evil, as a result of Christ's Crucifixion, a relationship implied by its placement beneath the cross-head. This context further enables the hunt scheme opposite to be viewed as a commentary on accepting Christ to achieve salvation. As at Dacre, Christ's sacrifice is implied by the cross-head, but here it is fundamental to recovering the Christian nature of the carvings, and it facilitates references to Christ's Crucifixion as the precondition for the preservation of the soul from evil. The iconographic programme of Middleton 1 thus presents a parallel to the visual expressions of initiation and participation in the sacraments celebrating Christ's sacrifice emphasised on the Dacre cross, albeit less explicitly. The public presentation of the most basic tenet of Christianity on monuments from two sites – that salvation can be achieved by accepting Christ – indicates that this remained a primary concern that was not only considered appropriate within the context of Scandinavian settlement, conversion and Christianisation, but which could be represented within multivalent frames of reference that appealed to viewers from multiple backgrounds.

Nevertheless, the typology of ring-headed crosses such as Middleton 1 (understood to originate in Ireland) raised another important issue related to monumentality, which queried whether this imported monumental form and associated motifs can be attributed to a single settlement event: namely, Ingimund's *c.* 902 arrival from Dublin. This study has demonstrated that the appropriation of certain features associated with Christian lordship and administration throughout the late ninth and tenth centuries, such as the production of coinage incorporating Christian iconographies and legends, indicates earlier contact with Christianity across both the Irish Sea region and the Continent. In turn, this suggests a *prolonged* exposure to Christianity and its associated monuments, as well as a complex understanding of its central tenets, which would have facilitated an environment conducive to the production of stone crosses in the Northern Danelaw that invoked imported iconographies and theological concepts.[1086]

[1086] See Ch.2.

3. Transmission of Visual Languages

The transmission of visual languages and theological ideas is certainly relevant to any understanding of the Anglo-Scandinavian crosses that were erected between the late ninth and tenth centuries, with certain aspects of their surviving iconography, inscriptions and monumental cross-heads emerging from contacts with Scandinavia, the Continent or Ireland. This study has attempted to reconcile the cultural networks that engendered the transmission of new visual elements with the continuum of Anglian forms and styles into which the new modes of representation were incorporated, in order to facilitate further understanding of the sculptural practise that survived or was re-invented in the Northern Danelaw. To address the extent of these iconographic fusions, the programmes of the Ilkley, Leeds and Whalley crosses were analysed in their entirety, as opposed to prioritising the seemingly exceptional secular carvings. This demonstrated that Christ's Second Coming and the Last Judgment were expressed visually on stone crosses from Yorkshire and Lancashire, indicating that it represented a primary theological concern during the period of Scandinavian incursions and settlement.

These theological concepts were expressed visually from the earliest stages of Scandinavian settlement in the late ninth century, as demonstrated by the Ilkley cross, whose iconographic programme may have been influenced by the Archbishop of York, possibly in response to Scandinavian activities in the region. The evangelist symbols included in its figural programme, clearly identifiable by their attributes, signify Christ's Incarnation, Passion, Resurrection and Ascension, and thus provide a commentary upon his human and divine natures. Their juxtaposition with the *Maiestas* on the opposing face also explicitly invokes the four living creatures of the Apocalypse, which significantly demonstrates an awareness of patristic traditions and suggests their relevance to those responsible for the erecting the Ilkley cross. These iconographic significances complement the salvific themes expressed at Dacre and Middleton by presenting symbols that explicitly invoke Christ's Second Coming, which was enabled by Christ's sacrifice on the cross and understood as the fulfilment of the promises made at the Annunciation. While the presentation of these Apocalyptic figures at Ilkley on a public monument would have reminded contemporary Christian viewers of the salvation or damnation that potentially awaited them at the Last Judgment, the arrangement of the figural carvings also likely reflects the theological concerns of the Church during a time of regional political and religious instability,

further demonstrating the presence of an informed clergy in the region who may have influenced the production of stone sculpture post-settlement.

This certainly seems to be the case, given the stylistic similarities of the figures and plant-scroll carved on the Ilkley crosses and the tenth-century Leeds cross, where the iconographic programme has been shown to demonstrate continuity with earlier iconographic, exegetical and homiletic traditions associated with Christ's Ascension. Rather than using explicitly Christian schemes to accomplish this, however, visual material of secular and Scandinavian origin was incorporated into the lower panels of its broad faces. This involved the use of a new iconographic model to depict Weland the smith, that was probably translated from portable media to the new medium of stone. The new, Christian context of the motif invested it with new meanings, and the public nature of its display increased the scope of its audience. Significantly, the motif of Weland's flight does not appear to have been represented visually beyond the end of the tenth century, although the legend continued to be recorded textually into the thirteenth. This may indicate that the motif was no longer considered appropriate to depict in ecclesiastical *or* secular contexts, or that later depictions of the flight no longer survive, despite the legend itself potentially retaining cultural relevance. The lacuna between the textual and visual representations could likely benefit from additional consideration, although it is beyond the scope of this study.

Nevertheless, the new meanings acquired by the motif after its (re)introduction into a Christian visual context were also shown to have some bearing on the ecclesiastical figures it accompanies, suggesting that all the figures in the iconographic programme were deliberately chosen and arranged with the intention of producing a complex theological commentary, the successful communication of which depended, in part, upon the verticality of the cross-shaft. This helps to convey the upward movement implied by the Weland motif, and also dictates the proximity of each figure in relation to the cross-head, which implies Christ's sacrifice and proof of everlasting life. The intended purpose of the iconographic programme was likely to express concerns related to Christ's Ascension, which maintains Anglian iconographic traditions by schematically depicting the event that precedes Christ's Second Coming, the iconographic subject of the Ilkley cross.

Moreover, during the Ascension, Christ issues his command to the Apostles to spread the gospel to the four corners of the earth, which seems to be implied by the central book-bearing figure at Leeds. Significantly, this reference also implies a

potential connection beyond the stylistic and typological similarities to the Collingham (1) cross. This cross probably depicts Peter and Paul with their attributes of keys and new law, suggesting that the gospel and the act of preaching it were considered critical ecclesiastical interests during the late ninth and tenth centuries, a feature that seems particularly relevant in the context of ongoing conversion and Christianisation. The iconographic selections at Leeds, although initially appearing unusual choices for a Christian monument, nonetheless indicate that extant Christian and imported (secular) Scandinavian motifs could be amalgamated and arranged to fulfil the ideological purposes of those responsible for the monument, which were, moreover, in keeping with Anglian Christian theological interests.

On the other hand, the figural carvings of the Whalley cross appear to exclusively maintain connections with Anglian visual, exegetical and homiletic traditions, although these are expressed more conceptually – using schematic motifs – than they may have been prior to Scandinavian settlement. Nevertheless, its iconographic programme offers a new expression of older theological concerns, which emphasise Christ conquering evil, the significance of individual salvation, the absolving of sin and the penitential emulation of Christ. The expression of these concepts was achieved by arranging schematic *orans* figures, on each face of the cross, unaccompanied by obvious secular signifiers, which would have been entirely familiar within a Christian context. These reference Christ's dual nature by invoking his humanity at the Crucifixion, while his divinity is denoted by the nimbed figure arranged between two serpents, intended to portray Christ in Majesty conquering evil.

Although the figure of Christ in Majesty shares obvious connotations with the *Maiestas* depicted at Ilkley, the multivalent orants also articulate the rewards obtained by the blessed after Christ's Second Coming. The overall iconographic significance of the Whalley scheme thus offers an additional parallel to those of the Dacre and Middleton crosses by implicitly articulating that the reward of salvation can only be achieved by accepting Christ and acknowledging his sacrifice, implied by the cross-head. In turn, this demonstrates that the acceptance and emulation of Christ were considered critical to achieving salvation, and remained a prominent feature of Christian thought *across* the Northern Danelaw after Scandinavian settlement. Moreover, the articulation of these apocalyptic and salvific themes on Anglo-Scandinavian crosses at two sites in the northwest (Dacre and Whalley) and at two sites with Irish typological connections (Middleton and Leeds) potentially suggests

that these ideologies, prominent in Irish art,[1087] may have had increased popularity in the Irish sea region; it is a correlation that may benefit from additional investigation. Regardless of such possible links, this study has demonstrated that the preoccupation with Christ's Second Coming was not limited to exclusively ecclesiastical communities and patrons in the Northern Danelaw; at Leeds it is clear that they were invoked with secular interests in mind.

4. Patronage, Anticipated Audiences and Revelation

Indeed, the introspective contemplation of images related to Revelation and Christ's Second Coming appear to have been primary concerns of secular Anglo-Scandinavian patrons, as demonstrated by the iconographic programmes of the Halton and Gosforth crosses. Although patronage has been invoked in the scholarship primarily with the aim of establishing the assumed (secular or 'pagan') social or ethnic identities of patrons on the basis that the crosses contain imagery derived from secular contexts, this study has demonstrated that prioritising consideration of the monumental form, medium and accompanying images enables the iconographic programmes of crosses such as Halton, Middleton 2 or Gosforth to be viewed within Christian frames of reference.

As with Middleton 1, approaching Middleton 2 with an understanding of the monumentality of the cross-form and the medium used is critical for recovering its Christian frames of reference. These two features enable the monument to be associated with Rome and its Church, and facilitate the potential multivalency of the carved images that adorn them, drawing parallels not only with the deliberately ambiguous images of Middleton 1 and Dacre, but also with the secular images at Leeds. Upon initial consideration of Middleton 2, however, the images appear entirely secular – at least until their disposition beneath the cross-head is taken into account. This enables the figure carved on one broad face with his attributes denoting his martial status to be viewed simultaneously as 'warrior', potentially intended to represent the patron or a commemorated individual, as well as a potential visual representation of a *milites Christi*. Moreover, the weaponry further denotes the patron's interest in presenting their martial ambitions or interests, and this may reflect

[1087] See, e.g., Kees Veelenturf, *Dia Bratha: Eschatological Theophanies and Irish High Crosses* (Amsterdam: Stichting Amsterdamse Historische Reeks, 1997).

contemporary socio-political events, such as conflicts with West Saxon incursions. Here, the (public) presentation of an image that refers to the ideals associated with martial prowess and (Christian) lordship may well have been deemed necessary.

Such iconographic interpretations would be impossible, however, without also considering the figure's relationship to the cross-head and the bound serpent on the opposing face, which, in its multivalent frames of reference, further reflects potential affiliations of the Middleton patrons. While this may indicate Scandinavian social or ethnic associations, this need not be the case, given that Scandinavian artistic styles circulated widely on a variety of media and could be reproduced for a patron from any background. The presentation of the beast on the cross does, however, suggest that the patrons wanted to exploit both its potential sacred *and* secular significances. It can be viewed as both a decorative motif, and when its fetters, position beneath the cross-head and relationship to the human figure are taken into account, as a representation of evil defeated. Together, the two images and the monumental cross present complex references to eschatological events that signify Christ's triumph over death and evil, and the subsequent eradication of sin. Thus, the iconography of Middleton 2 indicates that its patrons had a complex understanding of Christianity and commissioned their monument with the intention of presenting a set of images that could viewed and understood within both secular and sacred frames of reference.

The Gosforth cross likewise represents a monument that is assumed to have been designed or commissioned under secular influence, and has been viewed as a visual presentation of mythological episodes associated with Ragnarök. Yet, consideration of the cross within the parameters of audience engagement – a fruitful counterpart to patronage – has demonstrated that while the cross may have been the product of secular patronage, it, too, manipulates deliberately ambiguous figures by presenting them within Christian frames of reference. This implies that, as at Middleton, those responsible for the carvings intended for them to be viewed and understood by secular audiences, perhaps with traditional beliefs, but also by those initiated into Christianity. This is evidenced by the only definitively Christian scheme on the cross, a Crucifixion, which would have been recognised by contemporary viewers as the crucial moment of Christ's sacrifice, which engendered his Second Coming and triumph over evil. These eschatological references are implicit in the sophisticated framing device used in the scheme, which facilitates the collapse of time and space, and separates Longinus and the female figure from Christ. Their

arrangement outside the frame emphasises their affiliations with Roman and Scandinavian traditional beliefs, respectively, but may also have been intended to invoke concepts related to the veneration of the cross. This potential connection certainly deserves further consideration, because as this study has demonstrated, the veneration of the cross featured prominently in the carved iconographic programmes of tenth-century Anglo-Scandinavian crosses, including those from Halton, Nunburnholme and Alnmouth.

Furthermore, only one scheme at Gosforth can be securely identified as emerging from a Norse mythological context: that of Loki tended by Sigyn. Its inclusion in the Gosforth programme suggests that the patrons or those responsible for designing the cross anticipated that it would be viewed by those from a Scandinavian background, who possessed knowledge of Scandinavian traditional belief and its associated mythologies. The placement of the scheme opposite the Crucifixion, however, suggests that those responsible for the monument intended a juxtaposition between the two that perhaps contributes to the eschatological concerns invoked by the other carvings. These include deliberately ambiguous schemes formed of figures confronting beasts or serpents, whose multivalency would have appealed to viewers from both Christian and traditional backgrounds as representing the defeat of evil. As several of these are situated near the cross-head, it is apparent that the defeat of evil is enacted by Christ's sacrifice, a factor that is reiterated by the depiction of the Crucifixion below, in which Christ emerges from the frame, referencing his Second Coming and the Last Judgment. Thus, within Christian frames of reference, Loki – receiving temporary relief from his suffering – may well represent those for whom the Final Judgment would bring an end to earthly torment: or render it permanent.

Revelatory themes are also present on the Halton cross, although these are presented within a series of narrative images that are recognisably associated with the Sigurd legend. The scenes selected for display have been arranged over the two panels such that they emphasise Sigurd's post-prandial receipt of wisdom, which reveals Reginn's treachery and results in his beheading. Despite their secular origins, the carvings are displayed on a cross-shaft, indicating that their patrons intended them to carry Christian associations, something further underscored by the explicitly Christian images on the opposing face.

Although these have been overlooked in the scholarship in favour of the Sigurd cycle, this study has demonstrated that the Anglo-Scandinavian patrons at Halton had

a clear objective of investing in a public monument that could accommodate sacred *and* secular frames of reference. Indeed, the overtly Christian images complement those of the Sigurd scheme by expressing themes of recognition and revelation. They include references to Golgotha and the Crucifixion by including a cross with a stepped-base that was potentially also used as the base of the monument itself, indicating that those responsible for the monument were acutely aware of the Christian significance of the stepped-form. Moreover, the arrangement of the figures flanking the cross in this scheme invoke contemporary liturgical ceremonies intended to celebrate the cross itself. This suggests that the Halton patrons were well-informed about contemporary Christian liturgical practises, and could negotiate the potential significance of the veneration of the cross, as practised in the liturgical ceremonies, its relationship to Christ's Second Coming and the potential relevance of these features to corresponding episodes in secular legend.

5. Liturgical Concerns

As noted, the veneration of the cross has emerged as a primary concern reflected by the iconographic programmes of the crosses analysed in this study, suggesting that the anticipated audiences of the monuments could have recognised the significances of such schemes and their relationship to the contemporary liturgy. While the scholarship has considered patronage, the identities and perceptions of the intended audiences have remained understudied, but have proven a fruitful line of enquiry for developing our understanding of the Anglo-Scandinavian stone crosses. Indeed, the documentary evidence from the *Hoedoeporicon of St Willibald* and *De Obsessione Dunelmi* indicates that audience engagement with monuments was expected, and monuments could be erected with the intention of eliciting a response from the viewer/s. Significantly, the documents also supply potential functions of the crosses (as commemorative monuments for the deceased and as monuments used for daily prayer), and demonstrate that they could be erected upon secular estates, to be encountered by secular *and* ecclesiastical audiences.

Together, this suggests that the images were deliberately selected and arranged, and that their subject-matter and placement dictated different viewing experiences for different audiences, depending on their familiarity with Christian theological concepts. It is clear that there was some expectation that Anglo-Scandinavian audiences could

elicit complicated meanings from the visual and spatial relationships of certain images, as Anglian audiences did at Collingham prior to Scandinavian settlement. This monument was potentially encountered by two audiences, the first a clerical one with the ability to contemplate the fundamental beliefs of Christianity as invoked by the figural arrangement. This clerical audience could have had the ability to assess the theological concepts underpinning the foundation of the Church, reaffirmed in the Apostles Creed, and implicit in the iconographic programme by the figures of Peter and Paul presented on opposing faces of the cross-shaft.

The deliberate ambiguity of the carvings, however, also suggests that the second anticipated audience likely consisted of laypeople present on the ecclesiastical estate, who would have been aware of the clerics' activities and could potentially identify the saintly status of the carved figures, but may not have been capable of deciphering their particular theological significances or relationships. Nevertheless, the public nature of the cross would have facilitated both types of audience engagement, and possibly influenced the erection of Collingham 2, which includes no figural carvings. Its display of Scandinavian-derived zoomorphs does, nonetheless, suggest that it was erected with the expectation that it would be encountered by Scandinavian audiences and the motifs were thus selected to make the cross accessible to those familiar with such visual conventions.

Despite the shift away from depicting complex, yet deliberately ambiguous, figural subject-matter at Collingham, this phenomenon remained a feature of the iconographic programmes of later Anglo-Scandinavian crosses, such as that from Nunburnholme, which appears to have been selected and arranged to elicit particular responses from both potential ecclesiastical and secular audiences. As argued here, the iconography of the cross conveys liturgical concerns involving the Eucharist and Christ's sacrifice. Such connections would have been particularly obvious to ecclesiastical audiences, and their knowledge would have informed their encounter with the cross, enabling them to contemplate the significance of Christ's sacrifice (depicted in the Crucifixion scheme), celebrated in the Mass (reinforced by the over-carved pair of figures representing Paul and Anthony), as the path to salvation. This may also have been recognisable to secular audiences, but it is likely that the potential ecclesiastical viewers were more well-informed, and could decipher the relationship between the Christ's sacrifice, the Mass, the angels carved on the upper portion of the

shaft and the architectural settings of certain figures, which together denote the earthly and heavenly realms of the human and divine.

Recognition of this would have enabled the recollection of the *communio sanctorum*, the ability of all Christians (secular and ecclesiastical, living and dead) to participate in the body of Christ, understood as the Church, and celebrated in the Mass to achieve eternal salvation. While this particular connection may have been incomprehensible to particular secular audiences, it does indicate liturgical interest, which is enhanced by the carving of the figure performing Mass. Nevertheless, certain explicitly Christian *and* secular images on the cross do indicate that a secular audience was anticipated, and the distinctive garments and attributes of the ecclesiastical figures would have rendered them recognisable to such viewers. Indeed, the carved secular figures would have appealed to them, encouraging them to recollect the ideals appropriate to secular lordship. As on Middleton 2, this perhaps reflects contemporary socio-political concerns related to asserting Anglo-Scandinavian political dominance in the face of West Saxon incursions.

Moreover, certain explicitly Christian images included in the iconographic programme at Nunburnholme would have been recognisable to secular audiences, such as the Virgin and Child or the Crucifixion scheme. These complementary images could have been viewed and understood as the fulfilment of divine prophecy through Christ's sacrifice as foretold at the Annunciation, thus engendering the potential salvation of the viewer, and providing a corollary to the iconographic significances of the Middleton 1 and Dacre crosses. As noted, the Nunburnholme Crucifixion also conveys concern for the veneration of the cross as indicated by the diminutive figures that flank the carved cross, further implying a concern for additional contemporary liturgical rites, apart from the Mass and *communio sanctorum*, that are intended to underscore the centrality of accepting Christ and his sacrifice on the cross as the path to salvation.

Indeed, the interest in the cruciform and its liturgical significance are also expressed visually on the Alnmouth cross. As has been argued, the monumentality of the cross-form reframed it as a crucial component of the carved subjects; it is an approach that has enabled the carvings to be addressed more thoroughly than in previous studies, which have tended to prioritise the Old English inscriptions. At Alnmouth, however, the potentially commemorative nature of the inscriptions

complements the Crucifixion scheme by implicitly invoking themes of revelation and redemption appropriate to their monumental and socio-political context.

Moreover, the concept of monumentality brought to bear at Alnmouth facilitates further understanding of the base of the carved cross in the Crucifixion scheme, whose interlace decoration presents a vernacular visual language. The carved cross, rendered in this way, enables a temporal collapse that would also have involved the cross-head. Together, these features invoke a complex commentary that attests the historicity of the Crucifixion (implied by the figures of Stephaton and Longinus in the scheme) and remarks on the revelation of Christ's divinity at the Resurrection, contemporary liturgical performances, and the anticipated eschaton and final resurrection. It is clear that a rich liturgical and exegetical tradition informed aspects of the Crucifixion scheme at Alnmouth, which emphasises aspects of the liturgy associated with the interplay of dark and light, Christ's death and divinity and damnation and salvation.

6. Summary

Consideration of these 10 Anglo-Scandinavian crosses has thus demonstrated ecclesiastical endurance beyond the initial Scandinavian incursions and settlement, although the extant ecclesiastical frameworks were subject to change. Nevertheless, these ecclesiastical communities were able to facilitate the conversion and Christianisation of the Scandinavian settlers, engendering an environment conducive to the production of stone crosses. The figural iconographies of the surviving monuments indicate that they were designed by well-informed patrons to elicit response/s from a range of contemporary audiences, and that many were erected with the intention of projecting Christian ideologies into/onto their surroundings. Furthermore, their iconographic programmes indicate that the images were selected and arranged deliberately, to complement and comment upon one another as they had on analogous Anglian monuments. By extension, this suggests that although the carvings of the Anglo-Scandinavian monuments were informed by and reflected Christian worldviews, they could incorporate new motifs or typological features to enhance the likelihood of achieving the objectives of their patrons. The motives that have emerged as a result of analysis carried out in this study suggest that major patronal and spectatorial concerns encompassed issues of Christian initiation; the

veneration of the cross; the celebration of Christ's sacrifice in the Mass; understandings of the Crucifixion as the event that engendered redemption; and, finally, anxiety for the fate of the soul at the Last Judgment. Above all, each of these considerations appears to reflect the central tenets of Christianity as established in the Creed, which was known to be circulating in the Old English vernacular during the period of Scandinavian settlement. The rich and complex meanings inherent in the carvings thus imply that they emerged within a Christian environment enriched by connections to the Insular world, Scandinavia and the Continent, which indicates the presence of ecclesiastics who could not only influence the production of stone sculpture, but could communicate these aspects of Christian teachings in such a way that their affiliations with the liturgy could potentially be apprehended by contemporary viewers.

i