

## CHAPTER IV

### STYLE AND ORNAMENT

For all its small numbers of items relative to adjacent counties such as Lincolnshire and Derbyshire, Nottinghamshire's corpus of Anglo-Saxon sculpture does contain a number of items of stylistic interest and even aesthetic merit. These include a small group that have been commonly represented within national overviews and assessments, namely the grave-cover at Hickling (p. 115, Ills. 32–52) and the shafts at Shelford and Stapleford (pp. 152, 188, Ills. 88–93, 123–40). Though in fact it is Nottinghamshire items that are not chronologically pre-Conquest — namely the lintel at Southwell (Southwell 15) and the stylistically and iconographically closely related tympanum at nearby Hoveringham (see Appendix G, pp. 226, 231, Ills. 168, 174–5) — that have garnered most attention, both nationally and internationally, in debates about their pre- or post-Conquest stylistic locus within late Viking art styles (for a recent summary see Owen 2001a; 2001b, and a contrary view, Tudor-Craig 1990). The programme of work leading to this current publication has materially upgraded the basis for any assessment in each of these well-known cases, not least in recognising for the first time at both Shelford and Stapleford the distinctive impact of targeted iconoclastic damage to their figure sculpture, which has produced a crudity of finish that has hitherto, mistakenly, been taken as part of these sculpture's original carving and style. But also, the project's fieldwork and associated research has discovered two items at South Leverton and another at Papplewick that probably ought to have a place in future considerations (pp. 130, 170, 174, Ills. 104–10, 62–7), and has re-evaluated both Rolleston 1 and South Muskham 1 in ways that lift them from a purely local significance in style-critical discussions (pp. 138, 178, Ills. 70–5, 111–18).

The interest of a part of the county's stone sculpture does lie in the additional, and largely confirmatory, evidence it gives for more humble, more mass-produced material of the later tenth and eleventh centuries. This is more appropriately discussed in groups in Chapter V below, and commonly by reference to groupings

identified and described in the Lincolnshire Corpus volume (Everson and Stocker 1999, 27–62). In those cases the style and ornamentation forms part of the defining characteristic of the grouping and is not duplicated here. This clearly applies to the examples of so-called Lindsey covers from Coates (Fig. 10 and Ills. 7–8); and to the larger numbers of mid-Kesteven covers (Fig. 8), plus the important pair of covers from Shelton (Ills. 94–9, 100–3), whose forms of decoration are drawn from the same repertoire and executed in a similar style, just as their stone type shows them as products of the same Ancaster quarries. The same applies to the remains of Ancaster shafts at Colston Bassett and Norwell (Ills. 9–13, 61). The simple forms of ornamentation of the grave-markers of the western part of the county, at Carlton and Church Warsop, also do not sustain stylistic commentary (Ills. 3–4, 5–6).

#### THE PRE-VIKING PERIOD

##### *a. Interlace and plant-scroll*

Our revised interpretation of the sculptural fragment recovered from gravel quarry workings at South Muskham in 1980 replaces the published proposal that it was an impost block from a major architectural opening, like a chancel arch (Barley 1983), with the proposition — surely correct in view of the rebates in both its upper and lower faces — that it was instead the collar from a composite cross-shaft (p. 178, Ills. 111–18). This conjures up a major cross-shaft (Fig. 29) and corresponds with the very distinctive weathering patterns evidenced by the stone. We suggest that it stood away from any church or churchyard, marking a river crossing (Chapter VII, p. 78), and with that function it may have stood in the open for far longer than most early churchyard monuments ever did without clearance and re-cycling. This monument's only surviving decoration is interlace in the collar's surviving rectangular panels, and borders with fine multiple mouldings. The well-organized and

executed patterns are similar but slightly different in the two extant panels (Ills. 115, 116): presumably there was interlace of similar type on all four faces. It is deeply and regularly cut, with narrow strands of a pronounced U-section. Liberating this sculpture from the supposed context of the architecture of a local parish church unlikely to be earlier than late pre-Conquest opens up the pre-Viking date that the interlace itself suggests stylistically. Comparison can be made with narrow-stranded, well-organized patterns deployed at Kirby Hill, Yorkshire North Riding, where they decorate one face of what is thought to be an impost block of the late eighth or early ninth century (Lang 2001, 134–5, fig. 16, ill. 369–70), and on similar architectural sculpture at Ripon Minster itself, thought to be of similar date (Coatsworth 2008, 239–41, ill. 671–5).

The even larger cross-shaft at Stapleford (p. 188) seems similarly to have stood outside exposed to the elements throughout its life, also perhaps originally serving as a public monument marking a river crossing rather than as a burial monument. It displays a variety of fine interlace patterns, but, since they were cut quite shallowly in the Millstone Grit that is the stone type of this monument and have suffered prolonged weathering, they are no longer easily analysed or categorized (Ills. 123–35). Their most distinctive characteristic is that they are organized in horizontal bands or zones, divided by mouldings. This suggests comparison with the fine shafts at Wolverhampton, Staffordshire (Cramp 1975, pls. XVI, XVII; see Ill. 195) and Masham, Yorkshire North Riding (Lang 2001, ill. 597–603), and their elaborate, fine-stranded interlace. Whereas these are both eighth-century monuments, what can be made out of the interlace on Stapleford 1 features a mixture of plain plait, Stafford knots (Cramp 1991, xxxii, fig. 23 — simple pattern E), enclosed patterns and free rings, which suggest a later date, perhaps in the first half of the ninth century. One large panel on face B of zone 3 is filled with fine fleshy plant-scroll featuring split leaves with rounded ends and flower whorls (Ills. 126, 131), and elsewhere there seem to be short runs of plant-scroll and even scrolling buds emerging from the free ends of interlace (see below for the figure sculpture).

Plant-scroll is the dominant motif of the two fragments that have so far been noted of the major cross-shaft at South Leverton (no. 1a–b — see p. 170, Figs. 26–8, and Ills. 104–7). It seems that it probably filled the single rectangular panel of at least one broad face on this shaft, perhaps both broad faces. The carving in this case is fine and shallow in a hard

and fine-grained local Triassic sandstone. This plant-scroll was definitely inhabited at least with birds, and its foliage features simplified berry bunches and a three-leaved ‘bud’, or three-petalled ‘flower’, whose leaves or petals have tightly curled tips. A fine stylistic assessment is problematic because both stones, having been reused in internal fabric, are heavily pecked in order to key plaster. Nevertheless, their strongest analogies lie with a series of Mercian monuments including the north shaft in the market place at Sandbach, Cheshire (Bailey 2010, ill. 272), one of the Bakewell, Derbyshire, fragments (Hawkes 2002, fig. 2.31), and plant-scrolls at Scalford, Leicestershire (Parsons 1996, fig. 4a) and Wilne, Derbyshire (Browne 1891–2) — see Everson and Stocker 2007, 39, pls. 2–3 — but the heavy stylization of the scroll at South Leverton perhaps suggests a ninth-century rather than earlier date. The orientation of these links to Mercia rather than contemporary Northumbria is perhaps the most important aspect of this particular stylistic evidence.

It is a great pity that what appears to be a patterning of roundels representing a run of multi-stranded plant-scroll, with variations in the thickness of the running stems, does not survive with greater legibility on face B of the stylish shaft at Shelford (p. 154, Ill. 90). Set alongside the evidence from South Leverton 1, it might have told us more — by its similarity or contrast — about the regional linkages of this key ornamental form in Nottinghamshire and about continuity or change in its handling from pre-Viking to Viking eras.

#### *b. Figure sculpture*

As noted by way of introduction to this section, the figure that features on the main face of the Stapleford shaft has suffered from having had its surface carefully planed off, in an act of iconoclasm (pp. 191–2, Ills. 128, 134–6). Because some marks loosely akin to eyes appear in that new surface, previous observers have not only overlooked the deliberate damage but have put forward some bizarre interpretations of the figure, including that it might be horned and therefore (improbably) represents St Luke. Stylistically, too, the combination of an ill-proportioned, flat, almost featureless forward surface with moulded edges has easily been thought crude and poorly carved; and has promoted a tendency to view the sculpture as later in date than might otherwise be justified. The insight about the systematic and purposeful damage to this figure invites a re-assessment based on the little that survives of the original carving at the periphery of the figure. Here the draperies appear deeply worked and

complex and what seem to be wings and a collar are deeply articulated. To match this evidence, and for the front surface to be planed-off in this way, the figure as a whole — we deduce — was carved in a generally classical and rounded manner. Though the limited extent of surviving three-dimensional sculpture does not allow a developed analysis, this all points stylistically to a pre-Viking date. The deployment of a single, front-facing hieratic figure, set at a height to have maximum authoritative impact on the observer, also sits comfortably with a date and a tradition which regionally produced the Wolverhampton column in Staffordshire (Kendrick 1941, 13; see Ill. 195) or the cross-shaft at Edenham in Lincolnshire (Everson and Stocker 1999, 157–60, ills. 163–6). The question of who the figure might have represented is also opened to renewed debate by the recognition of its damaged surface. We tentatively suggest St Michael, on the basis of the figure's wings, the identification of a possible beast at its feet and of local topographical factors (pp. 194–5). Such an iconography, informed by a keen awareness of the saint's traditional powers and associations, might support stylistic indications in pointing to a pre-Viking rather than later date for this major monument.

The figure sculpture here described for the first time in the context of Anglo-Saxon studies as South Leverton 2 (p. 174, Ill. 108–10) is a surprising discovery and a doubly significant one. The rigidly upright figure exhibits no degree of sophistication or finesse in its carving, unless in its differentiation of the toes of the down-pointed feet. But that is because it is, as we propose, the lower part of the main figure of a monumental crucifixion. This was probably deployed as a form of architectural elaboration and ritual focus in an early church at the pre-Viking monastery at South Leverton, perhaps over a chancel arch or perhaps on the west façade (see Chapters VI and VII, pp. 68, 74). The figure's drapery is depicted in simple, broad, low-profile bands organized in a markedly patterned, almost herringbone, effect. Seen from below and at a moderate remove, and probably painted, the simplicity of the carving in merely defining broad zones will have been a positive and effective aspect of the work, rather than a negative one. In stone its closest analogies lie with the crucified figure on the Auckland St Andrew cross, Co. Durham (Cramp 1984, 37–40, pl. 3.6), thought there to be the crucifixion of St Andrew, bound to the cross, rather than Christ. Its finely detailed drapery exhibits a knotted, bow-like arrangement at or just below the waist, which creates a change of orientation of the flat

V-folds in very much the same manner as at South Leverton (Ill. 191). Auckland St Andrew 1 is dated on style-critical grounds to the last quarter of the eighth or first quarter of the ninth century. In manuscripts, the insistent patterning effect of the broad flat bands of the robe at Leverton is found at a similar pre-Viking date in the depiction of Christ on the Cross in Würzburg, Universitätsbibl., Cod. M. p. th. (Alexander 1978, cat. 55, ill. 265). In this late eighth-century painting, Christ appears in a long patterned robe, with feet poking out below (see Ill. 192). The folds of the garment take the form of two lines of swags, forming a sort of curvilinear herringbone. Their direction changes at the waist, where there is a narrow belt. The extreme stylization and colouring that emphasizes the patterned effect links with manuscript illumination in the Irish tradition; and if the same liveliness of colouration had also been deployed on the South Leverton sculpture, it might easily have had a similar impact. Perhaps a hint of Irish influence here is significant, because, more generally too, the sort of stylized and patterned full-length drapery is what we see distinctively in the earliest crucifixions, in all media, in the Hiberno-Saxon art world. Classic, much cited, examples are the eighth-century copper-alloy plaque from St John's, Rinnagan, Co. Westmeath (Youngs 1989, 140–1) and in the Anglo-Saxon manuscript tradition, Durham Cathedral Library MS A. II. 17, dated to the late seventh or early eighth century (Alexander 1978, cat. 10, ill. 202).

These positive stylistic considerations, then, make South Leverton 2 not only an important addition to the small category of monumental Anglo-Saxon roods but also a rare example dating from the pre-Viking era. Though there is an element of circularity in the argument, this is certainly the chronological context we have argued for it in discussing the evidence for the presence of an early monastery at South Leverton (Everson and Stocker 2007; here Chapters III and VII, pp. 24, 67–8). Negative stylistic considerations tend to confirm the assessment. South Leverton 2 stands apart stylistically from the group of late Saxon monumental roods in southern England that are normally discussed together (Coatsworth 1988; Tweddle *et al.* 1995, 73–6). Its long-robed Christ has nothing in common with the revived fashion for long robes exhibited at Langford 2 and Walkern, for example, and their simple, naturalistic depiction (Tweddle *et al.* 1995, ills. 294–5, 397).

In the case of the lost sculpture at Granby in the south east of Nottinghamshire (Appendix C, p. 212), it might seem that any attempt at detailed stylistic

discussion is pointless, since there is no sort of surviving image of the stone but only a description contemporary with its discovery by the antiquary who took an interest (Esdaile 1845, 50). The carving clearly included figure sculpture, however, and what might be urged is that, since the stone was taken to be a Roman item — and has been accepted as such by scholars since — that carving was deep and modelled and naturalistic. If therefore the stone was actually part of an Anglo-Saxon shaft, as its inclusion in Appendix C proposes as a possibility, those classical stylistic traits might make it more likely to be pre-Viking than later.

### THE ANGLO-SCANDINAVIAN PERIOD

#### *a. Interlace and animal types*

What remains of a single interlace panel on one narrow side of the shaft at Shelford (p. 154, Ill. 88) displays a complex pattern of symmetrical interlace, with the strands enhanced with an incised medial line. It describes a 'complete and turned pattern' (Cramp 1991, xxix–xxx, figs. 14, 15A), but is laid out without sure control since the individual units quickly fall out of step with each other as they progress up the shaft. Neither the pattern nor its technical production is stylistically diagnostic, though, as compared with the evidence of the figure sculpture on the two broad faces of this shaft (see below).

At Hickling, by contrast, both interlace and animal types are significant factors in the debate about the date of this grave-cover (p. 115, Ills. 32–52). The bears' heads and shoulders that principally justify the monument's categorization as a hogback are quite clearly depicted, with the ridge-rib of the coped cover itself emerging from their mouths (Ills. 32, 35). Details visible include their large square fore-paws, each with three 'fingers' or claws, and muzzle straps; and in the case of the one at the 'head' end the animal's eyes can also be made out. Although they are not carved fully in the round, both heads stand proud of the sculpture on the 'lid', and provide a pronounced terminal at either end. The depiction is not so thoroughgoing, however, as to occupy the end surface and remove the evidence of the stone's first use as Roman column (Fig. 19, p. 119). The motif of a bound quadruped or beast in combat in a network of strands is repeated in the monument's small, irregularly-shaped panels, principally in three of the four quadrants of the cross at its 'head' end with the filler in the fourth supplied by interlace in the manner of the background strands of the beast motif, but also randomly elsewhere (Ills.

32, 35, 45–52). At one level these motifs are common currency in the repertoire of Anglo-Scandinavian ornament in the East Midlands and Yorkshire; there is a significantly close parallel on the grave-cover from Narborough, Leicestershire (Ill. 183). But those who have taken this beast as the *leitmotif* for their understanding of the date and context of the Hickling cover emphasize its role as a development of the so-called 'Mercian Great Beast' and view its occurrence here and elsewhere in the southern part of the East Midlands as a revival of distinctively Anglian styles, most likely to occur only with the secure recovery of the northern Danelaw by the Wessex kings after the mid tenth century (Kendrick 1949, 79–81; Plunkett 1984, I, 106–10). A clear and pertinent parallel for the style of Hickling, as every commentator has noted, is the shaft at Desborough in Northamptonshire (Kendrick 1949, 79–80, pl. LII; see Ills. 181–2). This is not simply because it deploys a very similar version of the beast in combat motif several times over, but, even more strikingly, because of the identical style of carving that both monuments display. This sees relatively large areas of stone removed to create extensive shallowly sunken surfaces from which the reserved ornamentation stands sharply proud. The body of East Midlands stone sculpture where this style of execution is consistently deployed is the so-called Lindsey covers of northern Lincolnshire in the later tenth and early eleventh century, though with different decoration and to different effect (Everson and Stocker 1999, 50–7, fig. 14; here p. 62, Fig. 10). Clearly as part of this conception, too, large pellets or discs are randomly deployed as space-fillers in the panels on both the Desborough shaft and at Hickling.

Much of the interlace that forms part of the decorative mix at Hickling is also affected by this distinctive technique of carving. Mostly that interlace takes the form of free rings, elaborated with incised medial lines and complicated with two-strand twists criss-crossing through them (Ill. 52). One tight panel on the lid (Ill. 48) might be a straight lift from the repertoire of mid-Kesteven covers (Everson and Stocker 1999, fig. 9; here p. 54, Fig. 8). But elsewhere, and most noticeably on the two long side panels, the interlace is drawn out, leaving substantial fields between its elements and emphasizing their bold relief, and a scatter of large pellets infill the larger spaces (Ills. 33–4, 42–4).

Hickling 1 is an ambitious, one-off monument. As the catalogue entry makes clear, supported by the discussion in Chapter VII (p. 80), different considerations might be brought forward and different emphases canvassed that lead to proposed dates span-



ning a century from the early tenth to the early eleventh. That is from the period before 930, that would see this grave-cover as a monument of the Scandinavian land-taking and reflecting a period of influence southwards by the Viking kingdom of York, through a period in the mid tenth century that would see Hickling 1 as a key element of an Anglian revival of style and decoration in sculpture of the southern East Midlands, to an era of renewed Scandinavian land acquisition in the context of the invasion by Swein and Cnut and the latter's efforts at rapprochement with the English Church. Wholly stylistic arguments do not seem to resolve this in a clear-cut way. In fact in Chapter VII (p. 80) we suggest that the early date is most likely because of the place the Hickling cover occupies in relation to the group of hogbacks of 'wheel-rim type', as defined by Jim Lang (1984, 101), and within the grouping of 'Trent Valley hogbacks' (as defined in Everson and Stocker 1999, 35–6), which stand as progenitors to the remarkable phenomenon of the mid-Kesteven cover type (ibid., 36–46; Stocker and Everson 2001). It is particularly unfortunate that, in the analyses of administrative and tenurial structures in relation to early sculpture which we explore later in Chapter VII, Hickling fails to emerge as a plausible place for a distinctively early or senior church site of the type the early date for the grave-cover might signal.

The remarkable interlaced consecration crosses on Costock 1 (p. 102, Ills. 14–17) even more clearly exhibit a form that, in style-critical terms, points to connexions with the Hiberno-Norse of Yorkshire, Ireland and Man. Yet that monument probably does not date from the period of maximum Hiberno-Norse influence in the East Midlands, in the early tenth century, but rather to the eleventh. This may presumably indicate a continuing or renewed vitality of artistic or cultural links with the north and west, which is not otherwise evidenced (unless in the Hickling cover); though the incidence of similar ornamental forms on clearly Romanesque items in the East Midlands, as at Lenton and Castle Bytham (Zarnecki 1998; Everson and Stocker 1999, 320–2), shows their prolonged occurrence and assimilation to a post-Conquest repertoire.

#### *b. Figure sculpture*

Foremost amongst the examples of later pre-Conquest figure sculpture stands the cross-shaft fragment at Shelford (p. 152, Ills. 88–93). The two powerful images here have emerged from our analysis as iconographically rich and multivalent sculptures. A factor in this, as noted above, is the clear recognition

of the detrimental impact to their appearance of (probably sixteenth-century) iconoclasm. The impact of this was not solely in the removal of the Virgin's facial features on the main face of the monument (Ills. 89, 92), but also in more crudely smashing an image of God the Father or Yahweh borne in glory by his tetramorph chariot, a.k.a. the four-winged angel of that reverse face (Ill. 91, 93). This perception has an impact, too, on any stylistic and aesthetic judgment on this monument. For, while the outstanding quality of these figure sculptures was warmly recognised by Kendrick's evaluation that 'this Shelford cross must have been a magnificent carving' (1949, 79), he and others nevertheless subsequently thought that what we now recognize as iconoclastic damage was rather an original, deliberate exaggeration of scale in the carving of the angel's left hand, perhaps (improbably) raised in blessing (see Ill. 93). Such deformity of scale might be understood as an exhibition of Scandinavian vigour, but it would represent a very crude effect. Since we can now envisage a small image of an enthroned Yahweh, supported on the in-scale left hand of the angel on one side, and a fully featured Virgin and Child on the other, the cross indeed becomes 'a magnificent carving', as outstanding for its stylish production and finish as it seems to be for its learned iconography. The context for its production and presence here is surely more than parochial, and may be a local pre-Conquest institution or monastery, perhaps one with specific Marian relics and affiliations, and even possibly with Irish connexions (see the catalogue entry and Chapter VII, p. 74). The Virgin and Child would then be fully, and in a way not hitherto recognized, a 'Columban Virgin' in the network of affiliations that Jane Hawkes has tellingly characterized (Hawkes 1997). The shaft's strictly stylistic links, however, lie in the period around 900 and immediately following, and most closely with the cross-shaft at Nunburnholme in the East Riding, which Lang's studies have shown to be a complex monument of several phases of carving (1977; 1991, 189–93). Hair styles and drapery styles are especially close to the first phase of Nunburnholme, which also features a Virgin and Child (Lang 1991, ill. 723; here Ill. 188). But Shelford 1 has quite specific and complex objectives in what it seeks to portray — wishing to invoke the Old Testament narrative of Ezekiel and needing the angel to be specifically a cherubim and tetramorph (with four wings, full of eyes, and with a man's bearded face); and wishing to portray certain specific facets of the Virgin, including the virtue of her girdle. That complexity — and the sculpture's success in achieving it — might suggest

that Shelford was drawing on more subtle models than other sculpture, and specifically probable manuscript sources, which might combine drawn and painted imagery with scriptural and hagiographic text. If that inference holds good — and the proposed early monastic context certainly makes it plausible — then Shelford might stand as a source and inspiration for Nunburnholme, rather than vice-versa as the weight of study of the Yorkshire monument might imply.

The late cross at Rolleston (no. 1, p. 138, Fig. 21 and Ills. 68–9, 70–5) would be much better known to modern scholarship had it not suffered insidious degradation, and a final reduction to a small and vulnerable fragment. This does nevertheless retain the only figure sculpture that formed part of the stone originally recovered from the fabric of All Saints church, Rolleston during restorations in the last years of the nineteenth century. The figure in the small rectangular panel is of a winged quadruped, probably a lion: the evangelistic symbol of St Mark. It is deeply and stylishly carved, but the creature's posture — with backward-turned head and tail curved between the rear legs and up behind the body — is not chronologically diagnostic. The rectangular panel, forming the lower terminal of the cross-head, however, makes the complete cross-head likely to have been of Corpus type A11 or A12 (Cramp 1991, xvi, fig. 2; see p. 140, Fig. 21), and the evangelist symbol makes it highly probable that a further three rectangular cross-arm terminals on this face of the cross-head were carved with the other evangelist symbols, accoutred with wings and books (cf. Hart 7, Co. Durham: Cramp 1984, 95, pl. 82.417). Just as the stylistic aspects of this item find no obvious parallels in the Anglo-Scandinavian monuments of late pre-Conquest Nottinghamshire, so too its cross-head form (which probably did not feature a ring) and iconographic programme associate it with contemporary work at Durham, which was itself drawing on long Anglian traditions in that area. Particular comparison can be made with a group of sculpted cross-heads from the Chapter House at Durham Cathedral and with a related grave-cover decorated in high relief with a cross of this same type there. They share with Rolleston 1 a similar cross-head form, a deeply incised sculptural technique, and two of them (Durham 5 and 12) deploy a suite of evangelist symbols as at Rolleston (Coatsworth 1978; Cramp 1984, 68–72, 74, pls. 43.205, 51.241). This Durham material is thought to be eleventh-century in date, perhaps belonging earlier rather than later in the century. Rolleston is nevertheless unequivocally an East Midlands product, since it is carved in

Lincolnshire Limestone of Ancaster type. That those quarries had the capacity to produce well-modelled and iconographically complex items is shown by the cross-shaft from Harmston in Lincolnshire (Everson and Stocker 1999, 176–7, ill. 195–8), and perhaps the rood represented by Great Hale (*ibid.*, 170–2, ill. 185–6). The bold double-cabled border to the Rolleston panel might also be a trademark of the Lincolnshire quarries.

With the figure on Papplewick 1 (p. 130, Ills. 62–7), we are also dealing with the cut-down residue of a larger sculpture, but here with a human figure which seems to represent St Peter enthroned. (A tentative suggestion as to the nature of the original scene is advanced in Chapter VI, pp. 69–70, elaborating on the catalogue entry.) It is the only sculpture in the main catalogue that is carved in the local Linby stone, and must stand at the interface between pre- and post-Conquest work. Stylistically, this sculpture is clearly not a developed Romanesque piece. It lacks the modelling in the round of mature Romanesque work, which is illustrated — albeit in a simple, crude form — by the doll-like figure with clothing rendered in patterned rolls that is set next to it in the porch at Papplewick (Ill. 63). What is stylistically distinctive about Papplewick 1 is the contrast between its head and defining accoutrements of crozier and keys, which are carved in rounded high relief, and the remainder of the figure and its accompanying paraphernalia of throne etc, which are given depth by removing background stone to create slightly raised, flat surfaces, and given detail for drapery etc. by incised linework. While in conventional style-critical thinking this contrast might be attributed to a difference in sources or models, here it seems rather to reflect an emphasis on, or highlighting of, the keys within the carving at the expense of the ancillary details. Relevant analogies might be drawn with the damaged crucifixion at Walkern, Hertfordshire, where the head is in high relief but below the waist Christ's garments are indicated by incised lines cut into a flat surface (Tweddle *et al.* 1995, 240–1, ill. 397; see Ill. 185); with the figural panel at Barton-upon-Humber, Lincolnshire, where the head is sculpted but the remainder of a figure is believed to have been supplied in plaster or paint (Everson and Stocker 1999, 101–2, ill. 17, with references); or with the sequence of figural panels at Daglingworth, Gloucestershire, which seem to want completion through painted details (Bryant with Hare 2012, 155–9, ill. 100–6). All these are probably eleventh-century work.

The eyes of the Papplewick figure are extraordinary,

and an especially notable aspect of this emphasis on specific details within the sculpture (Ills. 66–7). If the intention was, as we suggest in the catalogue entry, to convey religious intensity, divine inspiration, or even apocalyptic significance — ‘*Oculi autem eius sicut flamma ignis*’, as the Book of Revelation describes the eyes of the rider of the white horse, a type of Christ and suitable model for his principal earthly representative (Revelation 19: 11–12) — or even just papal authority, they are splendidly effective, albeit in a naturalistic, rather than crudely stylized, fashion.

These two late sculptures from Nottinghamshire, at Rolleston and Papplewick, which probably belong to the mid or later eleventh century, exhibit no trace or impact of Viking art styles. This absence of any distinctive signs of the Scandinavian traditions of the East Midlands stands in marked contrast to the sculpture that decorates the famous lintel at Southwell and the closely related tympanum at Hoveringham. Those two items are included in our catalogue of the

continuing sculptural traditions of the county precisely because they do deploy the latest of the Scandinavian art styles to have an impact on the decorative repertoire and sculptural output of the county (Appendix G, Hoveringham 1 and Southwell 15, pp. 226, 231, Ills. 168, 174–5). Since, despite periodic suggestions to the contrary, they are not pre-Conquest in date, they are discussed briefly in Chapter VIII (p. 89). Yet they have nothing to do with the international Romanesque, which might have been expected given their calendar date. Their place in this review of pre-Conquest stylistic trends in Nottinghamshire is important and necessary because they draw inspiration not so much from art-style traditions endemic to the county itself, but rather from elite national and international fashions represented by such artefacts as Bishop Flambard’s crozier (Kendrick 1949, 118, pl. LXXXIII.1), and mark the influence of cultivated senior prelates such as the archbishop of York on developments at Southwell.