

ART. XI.—*Pre-Norman sculpture from Brigham*. By  
RICHARD BAILEY, M.A.

*Read at Seascale, July 13th, 1962.*

THERE are two other unpublished fragments of pre-Norman sculpture at Brigham church in addition to the vine-scroll shaft discussed in CW2 lx 42-45. As with the scroll fragment, no information is available concerning their discovery, though this presumably post-dates W. G. Collingwood's county inventory of 1923<sup>1</sup> in which they receive no mention.

The first (Plates Ia and Ib) is the lower part of a cross-shaft, 18½ in. at its highest, with parts of two sculptured faces surviving. The ornament is shallowly cut and there are clear traces of tool marks on the broader side.

The narrow face carries a broad interlace, with a medial incised line, intermixed with foliage elements. One of these, a leaf, terminates an interlace strand whilst the other, a rounded knob, grows from the edge of the plait in the lower left corner of the panel. The leaf, with the two berries at its base, is of a type known from the earliest period of Northumbrian sculpture.<sup>2</sup> The drilled holes in the berries give it a very snake-like appearance but, whilst this may have been the sculptor's intention, similar drilling occurs on late Anglian scrolls at Crayke<sup>3</sup> in Yorkshire and at Carlisle<sup>4</sup> in contexts which suggest that this is purely a decorative feature.

Foliate interlace seems to have been a part of the Northumbrian sculptural repertoire before the period when Scandinavian influences can be traced in the art of the north. The head of the Irton cross<sup>5</sup> provides a good

<sup>1</sup> CW2 xxiii 250.

<sup>2</sup> e.g. Bewcastle, D. M. Wilson, *The Anglo-Saxons* (1960), pl. liii.

<sup>3</sup> YAJ xxxiv, pl. facing 278.

<sup>4</sup> W. G. Collingwood, *Northumbrian Crosses* (1927), fig. 105.

<sup>5</sup> T. D. Kendrick, *Anglo-Saxon Art to A.D. 900* (1938), pl. xcii, 2.



(a)

PLATE I.—Brigham: the cross-shaft.

facing p. 156

tewaas\_002\_1963\_vol63\_0014

Photos: C. Chaplin



(b)



(a)



(b)

PLATE II.—Brigham: the hogback.

example from a 9th or early 10th century date and there is a similar kind of interlace, though not as clearly datable, from High Hoyland.<sup>6</sup> In the Scandinavian period of the 10th and 11th centuries it is common to find foliate details mixed with interlace: from Yorkshire the well-known Collingham cross,<sup>7</sup> and sculpture at Brompton, Gilling and Hauxwell<sup>8</sup> provide good examples. In metalwork Mr Radford has published a very close parallel to this Brigham interlace on a crosier drop from Hoddam which dates probably to the 10th century.<sup>9</sup>

Foliate interlace is also found on metalwork, usually assigned to the 9th century, whose style betrays a southern English origin.<sup>10</sup> Irish metalwork of the 10th century is also frequently decorated with foliate interlace: the most recent discussion of this material views this feature as a reflection of southern English art.<sup>11</sup> There is, however, no need to assume that foliate interlace in Northumbrian sculpture is similarly a reflex of southern English art, though it is of interest to note its presence in another medium at a date contemporary with the Irton cross. Many vine-scrolls in the north,<sup>12</sup> dating as early as the 8th century, show a tendency to assume interlacing form, and the evolution from vine-scroll to foliate interlace can be traced through a series of late Anglian scrolls<sup>13</sup> without any need to refer to outside influences.

The decoration on the narrow edge could thus be of either late Anglian or Scandinavian date, but the animal ornament on the main face clearly places this Brigham shaft in the 10th or early 11th centuries when the Scandinavians dominated the area. Bound up in a broad,

<sup>6</sup> Collingwood, *op. cit.*, fig. 99, a.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, fig. 31, g.

<sup>8</sup> *YAJ* xix 298c, 323k, 331a.

<sup>9</sup> D. & G. *Trans.* 3 xxxii 115-123. For dating see M. McDermott, *Proc. Roy. Ir. Acad.*, sect. C, lviii (1957) 187.

<sup>10</sup> e.g. Trewiddle hoard, *Archaeologia* xcvi (1961), pl. xxiii, a. Æthelwulf's ring, Kendrick, *op. cit.*, fig. 25. See also Bruce-Mitford in Harden (ed.) *Dark Age Britain* (1956), pls. xxii D, xxiii A and B.

<sup>11</sup> M. McDermott, *op. cit.*, 190 ff.

<sup>12</sup> e.g. Collingwood, *op. cit.*, fig. 39.

<sup>13</sup> e.g. Lancaster, Masham, Ilkley, Collingwood, *op. cit.*, figs. 46, 63, 133.

somewhat irregular, strapwork is the rear part of a flat ribbon animal, the edges of its body marked by an incised contour line. A hip and a spiral leg can be clearly discerned and there seem to be traces of a tail running down the arris edge and curling in behind the leg. Whilst the ribbon animal is a familiar feature of all periods of pre-Conquest art, this type of treatment, in which the animal is overwhelmed by coarse interlace, is typical of one of the English varieties of the Scandinavian "Jellinge" style. A shaft from Otley<sup>14</sup> provides a good example of this style and there are numerous parallels for the ribbon animal with its contoured edges.<sup>15</sup> One of these, on a slab from Levisham, also has a spiral leg strikingly similar to that at Brigham.<sup>16</sup>

The shaft can thus be referred to the 10th, or perhaps early 11th, century, the period normally assigned to the Jellinge style in this country — a dating which is also indicated by the comparatively large undecorated area since this is a feature of many late crosses. It is typical of much Northumbrian sculpture of this date in its mixture of Scandinavian taste and Anglian derived features like the foliate interlace and, probably, the well-marked hip of the animal.<sup>17</sup>

The second fragment (Plates IIa and IIb), greatest height 10½ in., is part of a well-known type of pre-Conquest grave-cover which takes the form of a building.<sup>18</sup> All that has survived are the ends of two rows of tegulation on one side, with part of a spiral decoration on the "wall" below, some traces of tiles on the reverse, and part of the gable end. Since so little remains it is impossible to reconstruct the original form with any certainty. The roof seems to have been at least slightly hipped but there is little indication as to the shape of the ridge, though

<sup>14</sup> T. D. Kendrick, *Late Saxon and Viking Art* (1949), fig. 10.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, pl. lxiv.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, pl. lxvi.

<sup>17</sup> e.g. Otley, Dacre, Heversham, Collingwood, *op. cit.*, figs. 47, 52, 58.

<sup>18</sup> See Collingwood, *op. cit.* 164 ff.

this probably had the bowed shape of the hogback type. There is certainly little room for any animal's head at the end of the ridge. Dating is almost impossible since this relies upon the small amount of spiral decoration on the "wall" and this could be paralleled on monuments as far apart in date as the early 9th century "lion stone" from Dacre<sup>19</sup> and the 11th century shaft at Leeds.<sup>20</sup>

As far as it has been possible to trace, all of the surviving pre-Norman sculpture from Cumberland has now been published, though some of the pieces known earlier in the century have since disappeared. The inventory shows that there are fragments of 123 crosses, slabs and grave covers known from 36 sites. In a period when so much of the art is of uncertain provenance, the sculpture provides a firmly localised art form which reflects the complex and changing cultural influences on the area between the 7th and 11th centuries A.D.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, fig. 58.

<sup>20</sup> Kendrick (1949) 107 and pl. xli.