



FIGURE 10
Sites with sculpture earlier than c. 920

CHAPTER IV

ANGLIAN PERIOD SCULPTURE

NUMBERS AND DISTRIBUTION

As elsewhere in Northumbria and Mercia, and in a noticeable contrast to work from the Viking period, Anglian sculpture is relatively uncommon in this region (Bailey 1980, 80–1). And the distribution of those carvings is remarkably limited.

The relative rarity of sites with sculpture of eighth- and ninth-century date, when compared to centres productive in the Viking period, is starkly evident in some crude numerical totals. Whilst acknowledging a certain statistical fuzziness caused by later movement of carvings from their original location, there are six sites in Lancashire with Anglian sculpture to be set against 21 with work of the later period. In Cheshire the contrast is even more marked: three sites produce Anglian sculpture whilst 27 have carvings of a later date. Even those figures mask a further chronological disparity, for there is a huge increase between the two periods in the total numbers of surviving carvings: in Cheshire, for example, there are at most ten sculptures of pre-Viking date compared with some 84 from the tenth and eleventh century.

Not only is Anglian carving rare, but it is unevenly distributed. In the north of the region there is a notable concentration of eighth- and ninth-century material in the valley of the river Lune at Heysham, Lancaster, Halton, Hornby and Gressingham. South of this line, other than Ribchester, there is no sculpture which can, with certainty, be attributed to the pre-Viking period until we reach Overchurch in the Wirral and Sandbach (with Over) in Cheshire.¹ The relative lack of such carvings from Cheshire is perhaps understandable since western Mercia as a whole does not have many pre-Viking sculptures. But the blank areas on the distribution map through central and southern Lancashire, within what was politically Northumbria, is totally unexpected. It cannot convincingly be explained by the relative poverty of the area. Nor can it be attributed wholly to lack of

suitable stone since this did not inhibit later sculptors in the lower reaches of the Pennines to the east of the county. Nor is it plausible that Viking-age sculpture was any more likely to be preserved or re-discovered than Anglian material. As the only writer to confront this issue across the north of England, Cambridge (1984) has convincingly argued that, whilst recognising that most Anglian sculpture is the product of monastic centres, such distributional gaps may reflect the fact that it was only *certain types* of monastic centre which produced sculpture. The implication is that pastoral provision and monastic types south of the Lune — including Chester — were of a different kind to those in the Lancaster/Hornby area.

THE LUNE VALLEY CARVINGS

No other area of Northumbria has such a heavy concentration of sites producing Anglian carvings. In the 12 miles (20 km) which separate Heysham from Hornby there are no less than five churches with sculpture from this early period (Fig. 9). Unusually also, there are several such monuments from the same site: Halton, Heysham and Lancaster have at least nine carvings each. Such quantities rank these sites alongside the production rates of eastern Northumbrian monasteries like Monkwearmouth, Jarrow, Hexham and Ripon; such numbers cannot be matched further north in Cumbria or, indeed, through most of Yorkshire or Co. Durham. The high total of some 28 Anglian carvings from just three sites (Halton, Heysham and Lancaster) also distorts the expected disparity between numbers of Lancashire carvings attributable to the early and later periods: 36 Anglian set against 54 Viking-period sculptures.

In part, this density ultimately reflects the fact that the Lune valley was one of the most prosperous parts of the county, its land more amenable to exploitation than

1. The recent discovery of a stone carrying an inscription from Rochdale might change this picture marginally, but its pre-Viking period dating is as yet uncertain (see p. 000).

other areas. This presumably accounts for the fact that British place-names are conspicuously absent from the region and that early Anglian settlement names figure in its toponymy (Fellows-Jensen 1985, maps 3A and 4A; Kenyon 1991, 87). It also explains why the valley has 'a higher than average (for Lancashire) proportion of single township and small parishes, another indication of relative prosperity and high settlement density' (Kenyon 1991, 87). Its wealth in the mid-eleventh century period made it a crucial part of the landholdings of the Northumbrian earl Tostig (Farrer and Brownbill 1906, 288).

The precise nature of early ecclesiastical provision and estate ownership within this economically attractive landscape is now difficult to establish. Scholars have claimed that, variously, Heysham, Lancaster and Halton were all early minsters (Kenyon 1991, 102–3; Higham, N. 2004a, 167; Blair 2005, 216); if so, then they were more closely situated to each other than most such entities and must have had complex and changing patterns of relative status. Yet the examples of Gateshead, South Shields and Jarrow show the possibility of such monastic propinquity and also suggest that it was not necessary for one establishment to be a dependent of the other (Cambridge 1984, 77; see also Foot 2006, 251–82). The associated networks of estate structures cannot have been simple either: Kenyon for example, in a study of archaic cattle renders, has suggested that the Heysham estate included Gressingham as an upland dependency used for seasonal grazing (Kenyon 1991, 92–3).

Whatever their administrative relationships, the sculptures produced at these sites are closely related to each other. Not only does this close integration show itself in choice of motifs and their exclusive combination within the area, but it is also signalled by the fact that almost all of the sites share in the same sophisticated literate world which readily used inscriptions in both Latin and the vernacular on stone carvings and architecture: witness the wall painting at Heysham (Higgitt 1990) and the existing (or inferred) inscriptions on Halton St Wilfrid 3 and 5, Halton Green, Hornby 1 and 2, Lancaster St Mary 1 and 2 — and Lancaster Vicarage Field 1 (Ills. 483, 489, 504, 551, 557, 566, 568, 603–10). Such geographical density of inscriptions is unmatched elsewhere in Northumbria.

To a degree the Lune valley Anglian carvings share decorative tastes which are common to the Northumbrian monastic network. This is well exemplified by the cross-heads of Halton St Wilfrid 8, Heysham 3 and Lancaster Vicarage Field 4 (Ills. 496–500, 513, 619–22). These use various motifs, in differing combinations, which are based on metalwork forms: zigzag ornament forming triangular cells; hollowed sub-rectangles, pelleted



FIGURE 11
Lune valley type scroll

surrounds; 'spine-and-boss' ornament (Bailey 1996b, 38–42; id. 2003a, 232–5). This kind of decorative repertoire is common to a series of early Northumbrian monastic sites like Lastingham, Northallerton, Jarrow, Carlisle, Ripon and Hexham (Lang 1991, ill. 622; id. 2001, ill. 673; Cramp 1984, pl. 93.497; Bailey and Cramp 1988, ill. 210; Coatsworth 2006, 20, 22; id. 2008, ill. 237–9, 667; Cambridge and Williams 1995, fig. 33).

The numerous vine-scrolls reflect the same pan-Northumbrian preferences. Long ago Cramp traced the evolution of many full-length panels of uninhabited medallion and single scrolls back to Hexham, where the so-called 'Acca's cross' shows its early form (Cramp 1965; id. 1974; Bailey and Cramp 1988, 16). But, in the course of the eighth century, the plant suffered very distinctive mutations in the area between Lowther in Cumbria and the Lune valley. The most recognisable variant is what is here termed 'the western split-stemmed scroll', whose distribution reaches from Lowther to Heysham with a distant offshoot at Hoddom (Collingwood 1927a, fig. 51). In this type the side-shoot springs from the main stem at the base of a curve, and then follows that curve upwards before spiralling away (Fig. 10). This variant form is known from Heversham and Lowther

in Cumbria (Bailey and Cramp 1988, ills. 354, 441, 443), on Halton St Wilfrid 6, Halton Green, Heysham 1, Lancaster St Mary 2, 3, 6, ?10, and Lancaster Vicarage Field 1 (Ills. 492, 504, 515, 570–6, 577–80, 588, 590, 602, 603–6). To the east of the Pennines, the only example of an equivalent type of split stem is from Jarrow, but there the spiralling offshoot area is occupied by a large leaf (Cramp 1984, pls. 90.475, 100.529). The detailed analysis of individual sculptures in the catalogue below reinforces this picture of a stylistic (and motif repertoire) unity embracing Lowther, Kendal and Heversham in the north, with the Lune valley in the south; identical foliate and fruit forms, combinations of border mouldings, and types of panel division are shared across the whole set. Inevitably some carvings are more closely linked to others. In organisational terms, for example, Lowther 1 can be grouped with Lancaster St Mary 3 and Lancaster Vicarage Field 1, but none could be mistaken for work produced to the east of the Pennines.

Both the ‘general Northumbrian’ taste in the cross-heads and the regionally-limited Lowther/Lune scroll forms constitute a necessary background for interpreting a third element in these Anglian carvings: seemingly exclusive links in the ninth century to west Yorkshire sites in the Ure, Wharfe and Aire valleys. There is no doubt that there are close parallels in style and motif between Lune valley sculptures and work produced at Otley, Dewsbury and Ripon (Coatsworth 2008). These parallels could be attributed to a common enthusiasm for ninth-century period fashions which combined heavy, deeply-modelled classical figural sculpture with animated miniature scenes, often reviving early Christian iconographic forms. Both areas could thus be drawing independently on similar Carolingian-based tastes. But if this were the explanation for these likenesses, then it needs to be emphasised that the enthusiasm was geographically limited in Northumbria to the Lune valley and the eastern foothills of the Pennines.

It is however possible to argue for a more substantial and direct link. The detailed analyses in the catalogue below show several features which individually, or in combination, only appear in the two areas: these include iconographic types, monument forms, and varieties of knotwork and vegetable ornament. Thus Hornby 1 (Ills. 547–52) depicts a bush-vine topped by a pelleted rosette of the kind used by the so-called ‘Uredale master’ on the Cundall/Aldbrough shaft. The same Yorkshire carving shares a rare interlace pattern with Hornby, and the two crosses both set angelic busts at the top of the shaft (Lang 2001, 41–3). And it is at Ripon, in Uredale, that we find other Hornby details — like the knotwork types, pelleted zigzags and the block-like nature of the lower

cross-arm — exclusively repeated and combined.

Halton adds further evidence for trans-Pennine links, even if we reject Lang’s attempt to group its carvings with Otley, Easby and Masham as ‘apostle pillars’ associated with baptism (Lang 1999; id. 2000, 116–17). The only surviving parallel for the particular type of evangelist symbol seen on Halton St Wilfrid 2 (Ills. 476–9) seems to be from Otley, whilst its positioning on a separate panel on the shaft — not head — can only be matched at Ilkley. The deeply-modelled, half-turned figure below the evangelist symbol on the same Halton fragment is very close to the types found at Otley and Easby. Dewsbury and Otley have figures kneeling before an angel in a variation on the composition seen on Halton St Wilfrid 3 (Ills. 481, 483), whilst Lang (1990a, 14) has drawn attention to the analogies between the classical hair-styles of Little Ouseburn in Yorkshire and those of Halton St Wilfrid 5 (Ill. 489). To this catalogue we can add the evidence from Heysham 1 (Ills. 509–11, 514) which has a squared base whose best parallel lies at Otley and whose ambitious cable moulding can be exactly matched at Dewsbury. And in both areas there is a strong tradition of placing figures, including busts, under arches with slab capitals.

This listing suggests more than independent derivation from common models or a wider awareness of contemporary motifs and tastes, and is presumably what lies behind the recent comment that the ‘Lune valley group could be a trans-Pennine colony of a major centre such as Ripon’ (Blair 2005, 216). This suggestion would also, of course, chime with the earlier documented acquisition of territory in northern Lancashire by St Wilfrid. Given, however, the (ultimately) Hexham derivation of the Lune scrolls, and the early development of distinctive western varieties, it would seem more likely that this trans-Pennine impact is a ninth-century phenomenon reflecting the artistic dynamism of many of the west Yorkshire monastic sites.

THE SOUTHERN ANGLIAN GROUP: THE SITES OF OVERCHURCH, SANDBACH AND OVER

Whatever their internal variations, and however open they were to Carolingian-inspired figural iconography, the Lune valley carvings are Northumbrian monuments; their motifs link them to the north and east. By contrast, the other Anglian carvings in the region, at Sandbach (with Over) and Overchurch, are Mercian sculptures whose art — though not its surviving inscription — finds its parallels in the Midlands and the south of the

country. Nowhere is this more apparent than in the animal ornament of Overchurch and of Sandbach Market Square 1 whose sculptural and metalwork analogues all lie in the Mercian heartlands (see p. 000).

The Overchurch inscribed stone seems to have been part of a large and deep lid which presumably formed the upper part of some kind of shrine or sarcophagus (Ills. 222–8). There is little in the later documented history of the area, however, to suggest that this was an important site. Its medieval parish, indeed, was confined to a single township, though it is immediately adjacent to the extensive parish of the British-named Landican (later Woodchurch) and there are extensive remains surviving at Overchurch of a circular churchyard and associated structures (Higham, N. 1993b, 132–3; O’Hanlon and Pealin 1995).

At first sight, Sandbach similarly does not appear to be a particularly significant centre, though it was on a major route southwards through the region. Higham’s examination of Middlewich hundred and the early ecclesiastical structure in the area, however, suggest that its early parish originally encompassed Davenham, Middlewich and Warmingham, and that a large subordinate *parochia* had become detached from it before the Norman Conquest (Higham, N. 1993b, 165–71). Its original high status can perhaps be judged by the fact that the adjacent large and single medieval parish of Astbury is named as being ‘east’ of Sandbach (Blair 2005, 251, 309). Astbury and Sandbach seem originally, indeed, to have constituted a bipartite organisation typical of most Cheshire hundreds, and Higham has speculated that, following a common Cheshire pattern, Sandbach was part of a Lichfield episcopal estate whilst Astbury began under secular patronage (Higham, N. 1993b, 169–71; id. 1995, 11). If both the suggested bounds of the original estate and the fact of episcopal control are accepted, then it becomes easier to explain both the availability of relevant resources in the immediate area — organising, for example, the extraction and transport of the stone of the two Market Square crosses from a quarry source at least 12 miles (20 km) to the east (see p. 00) — and some aspects of the sources and meaning of the iconography of the Market Square monuments.

Possession of Middlewich may well point to an additional resource available for investment in sculptural patronage. The site was obviously important enough to give its name to the hundred and has provided good evidence for Roman-period extraction of salt (Philpott, R. 2006, 83). Clear archaeological proof of later, pre-Norman, exploitation of salt here is, admittedly, not yet forthcoming as it is for Shavington to the south

(Newman and Brennand 2007, 89), but the *wic* element in Cheshire was used exclusively for saltworking and Dodgson’s analysis of Wulftric Spott’s will of 1004 shows that Newton by Middlewich certainly had a salthouse at the end of the tenth century (Bu’lock 1972, 66; Dodgson 1970b, 240–1, 243–4; id. 1997, 221; Higham, N. 2004a, 178). This is meagre evidence but might suggest a supplementary resource on the accompanying estate which could have been directed, along with episcopal wealth, into these ambitious sculptures.

The detailed analysis in the catalogue below shows that at least three of the scenes on Sandbach Market Square 1 preserve rare examples of early Christian themes which are not well evidenced elsewhere in Europe: the Road to Calvary; the *Traditio Legis cum Clavis* and the Transfiguration (pp. 000–00). Intriguingly, however, all occur among the early ninth-century Carolingian frescoes at Müstair (Birchler 1954). Hawkes has speculated that diplomatic and ecclesiastical relations between Gaul, Mercia and the Lichfield diocese in the period 787–803 — and later attempts to articulate that lost diocesan status in the years after 803 — may account for the use of such rare and prestigious forms. Higham has taken this argument further, building on Hawkes’ observation that the iconography of Sandbach Market Square 1 ‘systematically extols the power and authority vested in the Church and its sacraments through Christ, his incarnation and passion’ (Hawkes 2002, 147; id. 2003a, 14). He claims that ‘there is a strong emphasis on the power and authority of the Church which contrasts with the more normally monastic context of so much pre-Viking sculpture in both Northumbria and Mercia ... [this] may imply that this was a non-monastic church, but one in contact with the highest ecclesiastical authorities in the region’ (Higham, N. 1993b, 168). Piling speculation on speculation, this is probably a deduction too far: an emphasis on ecclesiastical authority, the centrality of sacraments and the essential duty of evangelism are, after all, concepts which were equally central to the early Anglo-Saxon *mynster* as we now understand that complex concept (Blair 2005; Foot 2006). Nevertheless, the Market Square crosses show this part of northern Mercia in active contact with some of the most innovative continental art of its period.

Little can be said about the site of Over, which has produced a fragment of carving which seems to relate to the Sandbach sculptures in its use of a prominent boss and the ornamental trick of running interlace into scroll (Ills. 218–21, 257, 264, 266). Over was one of four medieval parishes forming the Domesday hundred of Rushton; by that date the entire parish was in the

hands of secular tenants, one of whom intriguingly also appears at Sandbach (Higham, N. 1993b, 146–7). What should be stressed perhaps is that the actual stone used for the carving has been transported over a distance of some 6 miles (10 km). Combined with the fact that there is no succeeding Viking-age carving from this ill-drained area of Cheshire, this suggests that the site was of more significance than now appears from its documented history.

ANGLIAN SANDBACH: RELATIONSHIPS AND INFLUENCE

The catalogue entries for the two — perhaps three — Market Square crosses, together with those for the associated sculptures now in St Mary's churchyard, provide detailed analyses of the iconography of these ninth-century carvings (pp. 000, 000, 000). This section is concerned with more general issues: defining the form and origins of the basic figural type; examining the claims for a 'Columban' element in the carvings; and identifying the later impact of these sculptures within the area.

Hawkes (2002, 33–4, 130–1; 2003a, 4–5) has drawn attention to the uniformity of many of the figural forms on the shafts, Sandbach Market Square 1 and 2 (Ills. 244–72, 273–92). One group of figures is defined by being seen in profile, with arms bent at the elbow across the chest; they have large heads with long foreheads leading to an extended nose and pointed (bearded) chin, and are dressed in a short kirtle with dipping hemline, often under some form of over-garment. What is most distinctive, however, about the Sandbach treatment is the manner in which, firstly, the outline of the brow and nose forms part of the same continuous curve and, secondly, a *double* moulding runs round the head (see Ill. 262). The outer of these two mouldings terminates over or below the nose and extends as far as the nape of the neck, where it occasionally ends in a curl. In the catalogue below this is described as a 'double outlined profile head'.

As background to this idiosyncratic outlining treatment, Hawkes (2002, 33–4, fig. 2.3) invoked the evidence of Mercian coinage of the eighth century in which a somewhat similar double feature appears to represent a *cynhelm* — presumably here functioning as a prestige form of headgear. The parallel is an intriguing one and, as additional support for this interpretation, one could point to other representations of a helmet, though using a single band of moulding, elsewhere in

Insular sculpture: see, for example, the profile figures at Brompton and Sockburn in the Tees valley (Bailey 1980, pls. 54, 59). Nevertheless, despite these parallels, this 'double moulding' version of a helmet would be highly unusual, and a closer examination of the motif across both Market Square carvings suggests that another explanation is more probable.

Firstly, there is no doubt that this double outline is particularly well marked on profile figures on Sandbach Market Square 2. Here the inner moulding is quite distinct, and separated, from the outline of the head (Ills. 262, 284, 286, 288, 292). By contrast, the (probably) earlier Sandbach 1 usually treats the inner moulding as *not* markedly separated from the head but as merely marginally raised from it. Nor does this inner moulding extend as far as the nose or deeply into the nape of the neck. This is the treatment best seen on the Magi busts of face A and several of the figures on the north side, face B (Ills. 263, 270). An interesting variant on this scheme is provided by the leaning figure on face B where the inner moulding clearly springs from a point well back on the forehead (Ill. 269). Even on Market Square 2, where the inner moulding is so distinct, it springs from the forehead *above* the nose line (Ill. 262). All this suggests that the inner moulding on shaft no. 1 was originally intended to represent hair *underneath* a second feature, and that it became more stylised and emphasised in the hands of the imitative sculptor of no. 2.

But what then does the outer moulding represent? Following Hawkes, it could be identified as a helmet. In support of that explanation we could invoke a Viking-age carving at Nunburnholme in Yorkshire, where an outer moulding with curling ends seems to represent a hat; this is set over an inner moulding which begins on the forehead above the eye and clearly signifies hair (Lang 1991, ill. 721).

There is nevertheless an alternative explanation. This is best approached by returning to the particularly well-preserved head of the leaning figure on face B of Market Square 1 (Ill. 269; Hawkes 2002, fig. 2.16). Here the outer moulding can be seen to encompass the whole head as far as the chin. This surely is some form of halo. If this were accepted, however, then we must acknowledge that a mark of sanctity is more generously distributed on these crosses than one might expect. The soldier leading the bound Christ to Calvary, for example, might seem an unlikely candidate for a badge of holiness (Ill. 267). A standard figural form may here have been generalised unthinkingly.

Not all Sandbach figures are of this large-headed, short-kirtled profile form. The central figures at the

bottom of face A of Market Square 1 (Ill. 266), for example, have flared and pleated skirts of the type seen in the Turin and Lichfield Gospels (Alexander 1978, ills. 209–13), whilst the more elongated flanking figures have scalloped hems to their garment which presumably reflect the same (ultimate) late antique models which lie behind similar scalloping on other ninth-century Mercian figures like those at Breedon (Cramp 1977, fig. 55).

In two recent publications Hawkes has linked the large-headed profiled Sandbach figural type to forms found on Scottish carvings of eighth- and ninth-century date extending from St Andrews to Iona and Islay; figural art in the Book of Kells has also been invoked as a parallel (Hawkes 2002, 130–1; id. 2003a, 4–5). I do not find these analogues particularly convincing. More significant however is her commentary on the Virgin and Child depictions on the two Market Square crosses (Ills. 263, 292; Hawkes 1997a; id. 2002, 141–3). Her study of the *c.* 20 Insular carvings of this scene suggests that a limited number of models lay behind their production, and that some of the earliest versions survive at centres which, at some stage, had been associated with the Columban community. At Sandbach this ‘Columban’ linking is seen in the fact that the closest parallels for the compositional type used on Market Square 2 (Ills. 287, 292) can be found on the mid-eighth century crosses of St Martin and St Oran on Iona and at Kildalton on Islay. In addition the only parallel for the Virgin type on no. 2 is seemingly found in the Book of Kells. ‘The use of one such scheme at Sandbach could be viewed as no more than coincidence; two such images are at least a matter for speculation. They suggest that the images may have been utilised ... because of their known association with the Columban community’ (Hawkes 2002, 142). The evidence is inevitably somewhat thin, but in this context it is important to note the continuing role of the bishops of Mayo in Southumbrian councils into the late eighth century (Cubitt 1995, 40, 158).

Given the size of the Sandbach carvings, and the paucity of other Anglian sculpture in the Cheshire plain, it is not surprising to find traces of imitative and derivative work elsewhere in the area. Significantly, given the cultural division across the region emphasised above, this impact runs to the east and south. We have already noticed that the Sandbach detail of prominent bossing, here combined with the otherwise rare ornamental trick of flowing from interlace to scroll, recurs at the nearby site of Over (Ills. 218, 220, 257, 264, 266). At a greater distance, Bakewell in Derbyshire has at least two shafts which clearly draw upon Sandbach motifs. On one is another example of scroll and interlace combination —

the knotwork being of exactly the same type as used on the south face of Sandbach Market Square 1 (Ill. 257; Hawkes 2002, 87, fig. 2.31). On a second Bakewell carving there is a readily recognisable ‘Sandbach type’ figure, carrying a book, whose nose forms a continuous curve with the forehead and whose head is surrounded by a single moulding (Hawkes 2002, fig. 5.4). He is shown as part of a scene which also contains a boss pellet, a central figure with cross over his shoulder (see the Transfiguration on the east face of Sandbach Market Square 1, Ill. 266), and which is framed by a ‘Sandbach type’ border of rounded cable moulding combined with a thinner inner moulding. The other face of this shaft has figures, again with single moulding outline to the head, in a stepped scheme whose organisation and dimensions match the north face of Sandbach Market Square 2 (Ills. 274, 286; Hawkes 2002, fig. 2.20).

Other carvings now at Bakewell may also be related (Routh 1937, nos. 9, 13, 14, 15). These include one with a pendant triangle containing a diminutive profile figure with hand across his chest in a typical Sandbach gesture (Routh 1937, no. 15). Yet another, probably later, Bakewell carving (Routh 1937, no. 23) uses the Sandbach double frame with cable arris, and shows a stooped cross-carrying profile figure with spare pellet which echoes elements of the Calvary sequence on the west face of Sandbach 1 (Ill. 267; Hawkes 1998, fig. 4, reversed), though it lacks the distinctive Sandbach figural style. Noting that many of the Bakewell stones originated from other sites, Hawkes (2002, 139) has suggested that the whole of this Bakewell group may even have originated from Sandbach or a site linked to it.

Other Viking-age, stooped, cross-carrying figures at Hope in Derbyshire and Leek in Staffordshire — the Leek example with pellet bosses — may reflect knowledge of the same Sandbach Calvary scene (Hawkes 2002, figs. 5.5, 5.6; Routh 1937, pl. XV, A). Stylistically at a further distance are the small figures with profile faces and wearing kirtles with sharply drooping corners, set in small arched niches and associated with haphazardly-placed pellets, at Alstonefield and (without such pellets) at Norbury (Pape 1945–6, pl. facing 21; Routh 1937, pl. XVII); these could be seen as Midlands continuations of a style established at Sandbach. Other possible traces of Sandbach’s impact include the double serpents of Checkley (Pape 1946–7, 29) and, more convincingly, the ‘interlace men’ of tenth-century Derbyshire and Staffordshire which are clearly related to the motif seen on Sandbach St Mary 5 (Ill. 310; Browne 1887c). ‘More convincingly’ since the masks set over interlace

in the frames of Market Square 2 (Ills. 287, 292) offer a plausible background for the development of the motif.

MONUMENT FORMS AND METALWORK INFLUENCES IN THE ANGLIAN PERIOD

The dominant monumental form both in the Lune valley and in Cheshire is the cross-shaft. Broad and narrow faces can usually be readily distinguished but slab-like types are absent. Where sufficient survives to give any sense of scale, these shafts vary in size from more than 4 m in the case of Sandbach Market Square 1 to less than 1 m at Lancaster St Mary 3; such variation potentially reflects differences in function. Architectural and furniture sculpture makes an appearance at Heysham (nos. 12, 13, and possibly nos. 2, 16, 17) whilst no. 6 from the same site is a possible pre-Viking slab; Overchurch 1 was probably the top of a shrine or sarcophagus. As expected, all surviving heads are of free-armed shape; forms represented include A10, C10, D9/11 and E10.²

The most noticeable feature of the Anglian carvings from both Sandbach and the Lune valley area is the manner in which they draw upon motifs and techniques which properly belong to the medium of metalwork. To understand the reasons for this we need to set the discussion in the wider context of the evidence I have assembled elsewhere both for painting of monuments, and for metalwork, glass, paste and jewelled attachments being displayed on them (Bailey 1996a, 119–24; id. 1996b, 34–46; id. 2003, 227–39; see also Lang 1990b). Part of that evidence comes from this region: Lancaster St Mary 2 and Halton Green, for example, still preserve traces of red paint on their surfaces (pp. 000, 000), whilst the head of Sandbach Market Square 1 retains the drilled holes for fixing the flange of a metallic cone over the carved boss (Ill. 250). In addition the drilled holes on the flat-topped bosses of Lancaster St Mary 1 may have fulfilled the same purpose, or could, like the large hole on face C of Sandbach Market Square 1, have contained a jewelled inset (Ills. 267, 562).

The metallic, jewelled and polychrome appearance of these monuments was then further enhanced by decorative organisations which use features and forms which are either prominent in metalwork, or are functionally essential to the art of the metalworker.

The zigzags and pelleted outlines of Halton St Wilfrid 8, Heysham 3 and Lancaster Vicarage Field 4

have already been noticed as examples imitating known metallic forms (Ills. 496–500, 513, 619–22). Painting of the ‘cells’ created by their angled mouldings, or even inseting them with glass in the manner of seventh-century Poitiers (Hubert *et al.* 1969, pls. 68, 73, 74), would have given them the appearance of a massive jewelled cross. In the same area, one face of Lancaster St Mary 1 has a metallic-looking rectangular cell whose shape, when painted, must have called to mind the effects of metalwork settings like those of the Bologna shrine and Monymusk reliquary (Ill. 566; Henderson and Henderson 2004, ills. 167, 320). On this cross also the discontinuous form of zoomorphic interlace comes close to the appearance of repoussé knotwork of the kind found on the base of the Ormside bowl or the Hexham bucket (Ill. 562; Webster and Backhouse 1991, no. 134; Bailey 1974b, pls. XXV, XXVI), whilst the reverse uses minimal incised ornament of a type popular in contemporary metalwork (Ill. 564). Further inland, at Halton, a series of shafts have narrow horizontal borders decorated with small pellets which, if they are not directly copying the beaded borders of work like the Enger reliquary (Hawkes 2002, fig. 3.15), resemble the nailheads used to hold down ornamental strips (Ills. 483, 494).

It is, however, on the two Sandbach Market Square shafts that we see these tendencies carried to full excess. The most obvious of these is the manner in which every piece of the relief ornament on the larger shaft, no. 1, is connected to another; nothing is left isolated from its framing panel. Thus beards and fronds link the figures on face B to their flanking mouldings, whilst extensions to the feet of figures on face A pass into the scenes below (Ills. 264, 266, 270). This echoes the techniques of openwork metal ornaments and is comparable with a similar approach adopted on the crucifixion slab Penrith 11 (Bourke 1993; Webster and Backhouse 1991, no. 107a; Bailey and Cramp 1988, 103, 141, ill. 525). The presence of pellets or bosses scattered across the surface is part of the same picture, reflecting the rivets which are required to fix metalwork sheets to a wooden core (Ills. 264, 272): the York helmet, Altheus reliquary and Rupertus cross provide instructive parallels (Tweddle 1992, figs. 429–31; Hubert *et al.* 1969, pl. 315; Webster and Backhouse 1991, no. 133). Against this background it is reasonable to compare the heavy cable moulding on the edges of the shaft to the U-shaped tubes designed to hold metalwork surfaces in place (Ill. 264); such

2. The descriptive terminology used here is that of the Grammar of Anglo-Saxon Ornament (Cramp 1991). A digital version of this is presently available on the Corpus website <<http://www.dur.ac.uk/corpus>>.

borders appear on the Hexham plaque and St Mumma reliquary, and also on numerous Irish pieces and the local Ribchester mount (Webster and Backhouse 1991, no. 104; Hubert *et al.* 1969, pl. 311; Mac Dermott 1955, pl. XXXVII; Youngs 1989, nos. 44, 47, 59, 119, 120, 125, 128, 129, 130; Garstang 1906, pl. facing 260). As a final element in this catalogue of metalwork symptoms we can add the triangular forms gripping the corners of the shaft (Ills. 258–61) which repeat a characteristic metalwork method of attaching sheets to a wooden core (Rix 1960; Mac Dermott 1955, pls. XXVI–XXVIII, XXXI–XXXVI, XXXIX).

Many of the same ‘metalwork symptoms’ identified on Sandbach Market Square 1 are also present on the smaller shaft, no. 2: cabled mouldings; pendant triangles grasping the corners of shafts; bossing; ornament always touching its frames. Yet more are added here. Thus the organisation of the ornament on the east face (A), with rhomboid panels set one above the other, forming a series of triangular side panels (each frame with prominent bosses at the intersections and lateral angles: Ills. 273, 285, 289–90) is a characteristic and long-lived form of division in Insular metalwork, reaching its apogée in the late eighth and ninth centuries, but with its use persisting into the tenth (Mac Dermott 1955, pl. XLIIa; Wilson, D.

M. 1956, 34; id. 1958; id. 1964, 42, nos. 10, 154; Wilson and Blunt 1961, pl. XIXb; Graham-Campbell 1975, 44–5; Webster and Backhouse 1991, nos. 131, 187). Similarly the arched nests of the figures on the lower part of face C (Ills. 287, 292) could well have been suggested by a metalwork model such as the late eighth-century Berlin Enger reliquary which depicts Mary, flanking figures and attendant figures overhead — all within their own separate niches and with nail-head bosses intruding into the scene (Hawkes 2002, fig. 3.15).

Elsewhere I have argued that these skeuomorphic forms are not the result of unthinking copying of models in other media (Bailey 1996a, 119–24; id. 2003, 229–39). In combination with painted surfaces and decorative attachments they are, rather, designed as symbolic statements of power and status, drawing on the prestige associated with the jeweller and metalworker in both biblical tradition and Anglo-Saxon society. Similar motives lie behind analogous examples in Ireland and Scotland (Harbison 1977; Richardson, H. 1984b, 129–30; Henderson, I. 1993, 215–16). Allusively also, such treatments recalled the silver and *crux gemmata* crosses of Golgotha whose actual — or imagined — existence was such a powerful image in early Christian art (Wood 2006).