

of secular types of Anglo-Scandinavian monument (see Chaps. II and IV, pp. 19, 36) and for continued influence from patrons, ecclesiastic and/or aristocratic, in touch with eleventh-century art styles, such as the Ringerike style, otherwise rare in northern sculpture, but at Otley found on sculpture of a high quality of carving, though with elements which suggest an Anglo-Scandinavian adaptation (Chap. V, p. 54).

Although the West Riding is unusually rich in inscriptions (Chap. VIII below), there are none which can be identified with a specific historical figure or event; and save at Ledsham, none of the small amount of surviving architectural sculpture is *in situ* (Chap. IV, pp. 44–5). Evidence for dating therefore comes from comparison with contemporary metalwork and manuscripts where possible, and with developments in sculpture in other areas. Much of this evidence has been argued in the context of individual sculptures (see catalogue), and sometimes in relation to aspects of decoration and iconography, and this is indicated below where this is so. There were period fashions in pre-Conquest art, and in western Europe more generally, and sculptors and other artists of Northumbria came into contact with many of these, through trading or cultural connections, or in the case of the Vikings through conquest and settlement: examples visited again below are the revival of classicising influences in the late eighth to ninth centuries, and, as noted above, the evidence for knowledge of the eleventh-century Ringerike style.

It is difficult to identify ‘schools’ of sculpture, but centres of influence and single monuments which influenced later carvers can, I think, be identified convincingly, and there are a small number of cases in which it is possible to suggest the work of an individual sculptor on more than one work, sometimes from more than one site.

#### CENTRES OF INFLUENCE IN THE ANGLIAN PERIOD

##### RIPON AND LEDSHAM IN THE SEVENTH TO EIGHTH CENTURIES

There is considerable historical evidence for Wilfrid’s church at Ripon, built between 669 and 678, its splendours recorded by Wilfrid’s biographer, Eddius (Colgrave 1927, chs. VIII, XV–XVII). This has been supplemented by modern archaeology, and the crypt at Ripon, which shares many features in common with that from Wilfrid’s slightly later foundation at Hexham in Northumberland, has also been subject to archaeological examination (see Chap. II, p. 14, and Hall 1995; Hall and Whyman 1996). The crypt has been subject to fine analysis, based on detailed comparisons

with Hexham and its use of elements found in continental examples and in contemporary accounts of the Holy Sepulchre, to prove beyond doubt its Wilfridian origins (Bailey 1991; 1993; 1996b). Given Wilfrid’s career, and the fact that Ripon was his Deiran base at the period of the Synod of Whitby and before he became bishop of York, we would hope to find there sculptural evidence for the seventh-century church. We have it, including one capital or impost block (Ripon 10, see Chap. IV, p. 44 and Ill. 676), but it is disappointingly little in comparison with Hexham: enough survives to make us conscious of the quality of the work and the extent of the probable loss.

With this site, we must also consider the remains from the church at Ledsham. We know of this area, though not necessarily of this specific site, from Bede, in connection with a church built by Paulinus *in Campodono*, where there was also a *villa regia* which was burnt down by the Mercians under Penda, who killed King Edwin (see Chap. II, p. 10). While we do not know exactly where this was, the palace was rebuilt ‘in the region known as *Loidis* [the area around Leeds]’ (Bede 1969, 188, II.14). Faull and Moorhouse (1981, I, 157–63) argue strongly for Leeds as the site of *Campodunum*, and it does not seem unreasonable to suppose that the replacement royal residence was built in the same area. Leeds itself was clearly an important ecclesiastical centre in the later period, judging by its sculptural remains, and indeed there are some early pre-Viking fragments there, but the evidence from Ledsham (*‘hām in Loidis’*) suggests it was definitely an important centre in the early Anglian period, or at least a centre in a settled region with powerful early ecclesiastical and royal connections.

The very earliest piece from Ripon is the fragment of church furniture, Ripon 8 (p. 238, Ills. 665–9). It is unsurprising that this piece has been seen by some observers as Roman, on a site in which there is considerable evidence for the reuse of Roman building material in the crypt. Some pieces at Hexham have similarly been seen as possibly Roman, for example Hexham 22 (Cramp 1984, 186, pl. 182.972). However, Roman carving could have provided inspiration as well as a source of building stone, and the dating difficulty partly arises because the earliest Anglo-Saxon and continental carvers were following in the same late classical, early Christian tradition. The early Anglian date for this piece is strengthened not only by its similarities to work of the same date in Visigothic Spain, but also by the use of the same geometric plant motif on both it and the imposts and string-course around the chancel arch at Ledsham, no. 5 (see Chap. V, p. 50, and Ills. 471–5).

Also on the Ripon piece is a chevron ornament (Ill. 667) which relates it to one of the cross-head fragments from the site, no. 2 (p. 234, Ill. 637), and a simple type of miniature baluster ornament. Ripon 2 is linked in turn to a group of sculptures strongly influenced by contemporary metalwork, and which share features of chevron and pelleted borders, as well as small-scale baluster ornament (Chap. V, p. 46). These features are certainly found in Ripon on nos. 5, 6 and 11 (Ills. 645–54) as well as on nos. 1 and 23–27 at the Wilfridian centre of Hexham (Cambridge 1995a, fig. 33; Cramp 1984, pls. 169.900–3, 182.973–78, 183.983–95), and also on Northallerton 1 and 5 (Lang 2001, ill. 662–4, 672–6); Jarrow 8, 9, 15, 25–27, 29 (Cramp 1984, pls. 93.497–500, 101.537–42); Carlisle 3 (Bailey and Cramp 1988, ill. 210; Lancaster (Bailey 1996c, figs. 5a, 6e) and Heysham (Collingwood 1927, fig. 128). Lang (2001, 40–1) defined the Northallerton chevron pieces as part of a ‘chevron group’ and believed they provided evidence for cultural contacts between Northumbrian monasteries in the eighth century, as suggested by Cramp (1974, 136), rather than for the pre-eminence of any one of them. Sites such as Wearmouth/Jarrow had a similar range of cultural contacts with Rome and other continental centres to those of Ripon in the seventh to eighth centuries, and contact is likely between them; but the influence of Wilfrid and his monastic network, partly occasioned by the exigencies of his career, should not be under-estimated. The inscribed cross, Ripon 1 (p. 231, Ill. 632–6), for example, indicates continuing links between Ripon and the monastic centre of Whitby in the eighth century. As we have also seen, the examples with chevron, pellet borders and miniature balusters are linked by a number of decorative motifs, to which can be added ‘marigold’ patterns as on Ilkley 4a (p. 172, Ills. 345, 347) and perhaps on the reconstructed hood-mould of the door at Ledsham, no. 3, if the likelihood of this being an accurate reconstruction can be accepted (p. 194, Ills. 462, 468), and also certain fine-stranded interlaces, as on the impost from Ledsham, no. 4 (p. 196, Ills. 463–6). The shafts for the Ripon heads, nos. 2, 5 and 6 (pp. 234, 237 and Ills. 637–44, 647–9, 650–4), are all missing, but the links with the head of the major surviving early cross from Hexham, no. 1 (Cramp 1984, pl. 169.900–3), give cause for speculation as to the possible loss of early plant-scroll from the Ripon site. Whether Ledsham was simply of the same date as Ripon, or more closely connected, is not known from historical sources, but there are other clearly very early pieces, including the shaft, Ledsham 2 (p. 193, Ills. 470, 476–7), with its relationship to early manuscript styles in its interlocked birds (though in a medallion scroll which suggests some development),

and the probable string-course fragment, Ledsham 1 (p. 192, Ill. 469) with its early plant trail. The contacts implied by these early pieces seem very wide, including the whole of Northumbria, but in one sense they are very narrow and the view implicit in Lang (2001, 40–1) is right — whatever the importance of a figure like St Wilfrid for the West Riding, what we are looking at is the expression of a broader monastic culture with ‘common fashions and a regular exchange of models’ (Cramp 1974, 136).

However, another notable implication which arises from observation of the distribution of decorative elements relating to Ripon and Ledsham is that, within Yorkshire, and with one exception, they are all exclusive to these sites on the north-eastern edge of the West Riding and to an early part of the period. The link between these two royal and ecclesiastical centres is very much what one might expect of this period. In the next generation, the imposts from Ripon, no. 9 (p. 239, Ills. 671–5), seem to be a development from the fine-stranded interlaces as on the Ledsham 4 imposts, but the net of local parallels in the north-east of the West Riding and in adjacent areas of north Yorkshire is much wider. Adcock (1974, 92–114) identified sculptures with interlacing patterns similar in design concept and unit measure on Ilkley 4a–b (p. 172, Ills. 345–52) and Otley 2 (p. 219, Ill. 568), and in north Yorkshire on Croft 1, Cundall/Aldbrough, Easby 1, Kirby Hill 12, Masham 5, Melsonby 1 and Wycliffe 3, 8, 9, and saw them as all belonging to the Ripon sphere of influence (Lang 2001, ill. 151, 160–82, 204–6, 210–12, 369–70, 635–7, 654–61, 1109, 1116, 1120). This spread, however, also serves to emphasise the Deiran heartland connections of Ripon.

The exception in the West Riding distribution is that two probable string-course fragments from Darfield (which is much further south but relatively speaking still in the eastern lowlands of the region), nos. 1 and 2, also belong to this period. The patterns on Darfield 1 (p. 127, Ills. 186–7) relate to the earliest Ripon and Ledsham sculptures as discussed above, and the interlace on Darfield 2 (p. 128, Ill. 188) seems to relate to the slightly later phase, with its wider connections, represented by the Ripon 9 imposts. The relationship of Darfield with other West Riding centres is unknown, however, and Darfield 2 can also be compared to string-courses at Breedon in Leicestershire. Darfield 2 may represent the latest example of Ripon as a centre of influence in the wider region, however. The geographical spread, and the lack of followers in Ripon itself, is a pointer to the fact that either the centre of influence moved, or that there had developed a number of centres of great if not necessarily equal importance in the northern half of the West Riding in the eighth to ninth centuries.

THE OTLEY ESTATE AREA IN THE  
EIGHTH TO NINTH CENTURIES

It is clear that Otley is just such a centre, and the Otley 1 cross (p. 215, Ills. 552–63) has been long been shown to be not only one of the major fruits of a new range of developments apparently drawing directly on late classical, early Christian sources, but also a continuing source of influence within at least its own area, to the end of the Anglian period and beyond (Cramp 1970; Lang 1993; id. 1999). In this study, its influence has also been noticed on the form, layout and decorative programme on numerous later crosses (see Chaps. IV, V and VI). Nevertheless, Otley 1 remains distinctive: no other surviving cross in the West Riding, and probably not one in the whole of Northumbria, matches the classical naturalism of the busts on face A (Ill. 564), with their links to classical work surviving in north Italy, nor indeed their distinctive use of a technique in which a partial, roughed-out carving was then built up using gesso, to which colour was then added (Lang 2000, 114; and see p. 218).

The figural programme of empanelled saints, most probably apostles, and a figure who may be the evangelist Matthew accompanied by his angel symbol, but which may also symbolise the faithful monastic scribe (see p. 218 and also Chap. VI, p. 64) resonates with figural sculpture at other monastic or probable monastic sites in the area and beyond: within the area on, for example, Otley 2 (Ills. 577–8), Collingham 1 (Ills. 166–9), Ilkley 1 (Ills. 335, 337) and Ilkley 3 (Ill. 361), all of which are in some ways followers of Otley 1 in programme, layout or style. Other sites show the wider context of this iconography: Dewsbury 1–3 (Ills. 190–7), in the south of the West Riding, and Masham 1 and Easby 1 in north Yorkshire (Lang 2001, ill. 193–212, 597–603), which also show an interest in the depiction of apostles, or Christ with the Apostles (and see below, p. 72). Further afield, apostle groups are also found in Mercia, for example at Breedon in Leicestershire (see Cramp 1977) and at Reculver in Kent (Tweddle *et al.* 1995, 151–61, ill. 111–20). Clearly these have differences in style, and show the use of different, though still classicising sources for the figures (some using such sources mediated through Carolingian copies rather than directly, as has been posited for Otley 1), and also for the forms of the monuments (see Chap. IV, p. 39 and the discussion of Dewsbury below), but the inspiration behind such monuments must have been very similar.

Other indications that these themes were expressive of a more general monastic view include the fact that a connection is shown by monuments of different dates

and styles in the West Riding, not just through the apostle figures, but also through the similarity between, for example, the angel-accompanied figures on both Otley 1 and Dewsbury 9 (pp. 216, 141, and Ills. 575–6, 220), and that between the Virgin and Child on Dewsbury 4 (p. 133, Ill. 198) with the probable example on Collingham 1 (p. 119, Ill. 166, and see Chap. VI, p. 60). The plant-scroll on Otley 1 is also innovative in its area, having, however, many followers (see Chap. V, pp. 52–3). The medallion scroll on face C broken up into individual framing elements, and the sheathed flowers or seed pods in the lowest medallion (Ills. 552–4), are all elements shared with the Bewcastle cross in Cumberland (Bailey and Cramp 1988, ill. 90–115); and the latter feature is also found in the eighth-century St Petersburg [Leningrad] *Bede* (Alexander 1978, ill. 83–4); on eighth-century sculpture at Jarrow, co. Durham (Cramp 1984, 115, no. 20, pl. 98.525); and in north Yorkshire at Crayke, Masham 5, and Northallerton 2 (Lang 2001, ill. 145, 636, 665). These relationships and the use of classicising sources convincingly place Otley 1 in the later eighth century, showing Otley both very much as a successor centre to Ripon in power and influence, and as an important link in the eighth- to ninth-century monastic network.

The dress worn by the figures on the Otley cross is also interesting and distinctive, and is very carefully depicted. Its followers in the region all show a progressive hardening and stylisation, of this feature as well as others, so it is important to look at the original. All the figures on face A (Ills. 558–60, 564) wear a garment with a V or round neck which appears to be quite flat and smooth across the chest. In some, a plain border round the neck is indicated. This garment appears to be the classical tunic, which continued into Christian ecclesiastical dress as the alb. The over-garment in each case clearly lies around the shoulders and is draped over the arms, and in one case is draped over a hand: it is therefore cloak-like and not a sleeved garment. The edge lies in neat folds against the neck and down the front edges. It seems to be the upper part of a classical toga or perhaps rather a himation (the Greek, rather less voluminous version of the same garment) which became the standard dress for the depiction of Christ and saints in medieval art. It could be draped across the body, but this would not be shown on the busts of the Otley cross, which show only a part of the upper body. The depiction of dress on the Otley cross is therefore part of its determinedly classical style.

Otley 2 (p. 219, Ills. 568–71) is an indication that this very fruitful, highly innovative period went on for some time in Otley. The two major crosses at this site have not generally been thought to be by the same hand, but

Otley 2 is of markedly similar proportions, is as fine a carving, at least on its principal faces, and shows awareness of Otley 1 in both iconography and style, as well as showing continuing links with Ripon. It is also equally innovative in its use of exotic animals, probably from rich imported textiles — and especially important to our understanding of this type of ornament, in that here one can see the beginning in Northumbria of the adaptation of such sources into line with local styles and taste (Chap. V, p. 56). The form of the shaft is also innovative at this site. In Chap. IV, p. 39, I have considered it in relation to other shafts in the area which while not round-shafted also show an interest in the two-part shaft with a wider base allied to a narrower shaft above. In discussing its layout, however (p. 220), I have compared it to the Rupertus cross from Bischofshofen, Austria (Webster and Backhouse 1991, 170–3, cat. 133), and one wonders whether the whole monument at Otley was conceived like a metalwork cross, with the base as the lower of the expanded arm terminals. The depiction of dress on at least one of the figures on the base (Ill. 577) is as sensitive to the depiction of classical dress as is Otley 1.

It is perhaps surprising that such a well-connected ecclesiastical site has produced no inscriptions, especially in a region with so many inscriptions relative to other areas. Ripon has one, Collingham, a lesser site within its area of influence, has two, while Dewsbury and its related sites, Thornhill and Kirkheaton, have an impressive number (see Chap. VIII, p. 79). However, Otley 1 has space for inscriptions in its panel frames, which may have been attached or painted, but which have not survived.

Otley in the eighth to ninth centuries was clearly a very major ecclesiastical centre: possibly monastic, in any case the centre of a major estate of the archbishops of York (see Wood, I. 1987; and Chap. II, p. 15). Ripon was also a York estate, but may have been decreasingly important in this period: certainly there is no trace there of either the classicising trend exemplified by Otley 1, nor the openness to new sources of influence such as rich textiles, exemplified by Otley 2. With the establishment of York as a metropolitan see at this period, and the connections with the Carolingian court through Alcuin (see p. 218), it is not surprising that many of the strongest connections with Otley lie at other Deiran ecclesiastical centres also with links to York, many but not all quite close to Otley geographically, such as Easby in the North Riding (see above and Chap. V, p. 52). Otley remained important within its own area: the local influence of Otley 1 and 2 in the pre-Viking period, whether in form, figural style or iconography, or in the development of plant-scroll (including plantiform frames) or animal patterns, can be traced on shafts such as

Collingham 1 and 2 (p. 117, Ills. 166–9, 170–3), and Ilkley 1, 3, 5 and 7 (p. 167, Ills. 335–8, 361–4, 375–8, 383–6), some of these taking the story into the overlap with the Anglo-Scandinavian period.

However, developments at Otley were not the only source of influence, even at Collingham and Ilkley. For example, the sculptor of Collingham 1 (p. 117, Ills. 166–9) was aware of other figural styles, involving full-length figures, necessarily within the constraints of the monument form in a more miniature style. This style, if influenced only by Deiran models, seems to look to Cundall/Aldbrough, or Masham, in north Yorkshire (Lang 2001, ill. 160–84, 597–631), or perhaps to Dewsbury (p. 129, Ills. 190–207), further south (see Chap. VI, p. 62, and below). The probability of influence on Collingham 1 from a centre such as Masham or Dewsbury is strengthened because the form of this monument, while the lower part is not exactly round, seems to show a striving to emulate those round-shafted crosses with a rectangular extension above.

For all the crosses looked at above, the developments discussed all refer to the copying or emulation of admired models at Otley, in the locally available stone and over a period in which taste and styles underwent a gradual process of change. There is insufficient evidence to indicate the work of single workshops, except in the case of Otley 1 and 2 — these are very similar in proportions and style of carving, and in their close adherence to their presumed imported models; and they are also quite distinct in these respects from works of the same date elsewhere. I am not sure that these two crosses would have been by the same sculptor, but they indicate a major centre for the design and making of sculpture at Otley over a short period; and that the authority and importance of this work was recognised can be measured in the number of details which continued to influence other sculptors over a much longer period. On the other hand, there are significant relationships between some pieces, such as Otley 1, with other major monuments of monastic sculpture, including for example the Bewcastle cross in Cumberland (Bailey and Cramp 1988, ill. 90–115). The relationships which come up again and again with quite far flung monastic or ecclesiastical sites suggest that sculptors, or groups of sculptors, may have been itinerant, and that in the early period the factor in their employment was royal and ecclesiastical patronage.

Two fragments from the western limits of the West Riding, the shaft fragment with an angel from Slaidburn (Ills. 696–9) and the free-armed head with a face at the centre from Low Bentham (Ills. 541–5), are from the end of the Anglian period, and have connections in iconography with other sculptures in the northern half

of the area, though both also represent developments in style and motif which continued into the Anglo-Scandinavia era. They seem a long way from centres such as Otley and Ripon, although, as discussed in Chap. II, the western extent of the Ripon and later Otley estates remains unknown.

#### ILKLEY 2 AND THE ‘UREDAL MASTER’

Ilkley 2 (p. 169, Ills. 357–60) may be a specific example of this movement. Rather earlier than developments at Collingham, it shows no dependency on the Otley crosses at all, although Ilkley is almost certainly part of the same estate even at this period (and other sculptures there show strong links with Otley, as an even earlier phase had shown links with Ripon). Ilkley 2 is the West Riding cross that Lang (2001, 43) thought most probably the work of the ‘Uredale master’, sculptor of Cundall/Aldborough, Masham 1, 4 and 5, and West Tanfield 1 in north Yorkshire (*ibid.*, ill. 160–84, 597–638). These sites have already been linked with Ripon, Ilkley and Otley through the use of a similar range of interlace patterns (above, p. 46), and West Tanfield 1 is from a site very close to Masham, and also possibly a pre-Conquest ecclesiastical site (Craig 2006). The similarities in iconography and sculptural style between these pieces are very striking, and this is one of the few cases in the West Riding when one can with some confidence say a number of works at different sites are by the same sculptor and/or from the same workshop. Ilkley 2, with its rectangular panels fitted to the shape of a tapering rectangular-sectioned cross-shaft, could be seen as more conventional than the Masham or Cundall/Aldborough examples. However, the use of panels of animal ornament, and the panels with a single element from an inhabited plant-scroll (also found at Cundall/Aldborough) probably were highly innovative at this period, while the plant-scroll is, as Collingwood (1915a, 188) said, not so conventionalised as on Ilkley 1 (Ills. 336, 338): it too should be seen as an innovative fore-runner to the heavy spiral scroll found at Ilkley and elsewhere up to the end of the Anglian period. The animal ornament, though experimental and innovative like that at Cundall/Aldborough, also, like it, shows awareness of developments of this type not only in Yorkshire but in Mercia.

Little Ouseburn, as its name suggests close to the river Ouse and very near York, seems to have been a centre of some importance: it has evidence for shafts with figural sculpture (Ills. 528–9), two sections of a plain, beaded shaft which could be eighth to ninth century in date (Ills. 525–7), and the remains of a large and very fine

cross-head, no. 5, with manuscript, metalwork, and York/Mercian connections (pp. 210–11, Ills. 530–5). This has a close link with the bush-scrolls on the Cundall/Aldborough shaft (see Figs. 13d–e, p. 51), and I would tentatively suggest it too may be the work of the same sculptor. Little can be said about the dress of the figure (to compare it with the Otley style, for example) as it is so damaged. The figure clearly had an over-garment which lay in edge-folds across his shoulders and draped over his arms: it may have come together in a V-shape over the breast but this cannot be determined.

If both Ilkley 2 and Little Ouseburn 5 are by the same sculptor, however, this could imply either that Uredale was not his base, or that he moved between sites by commission. Either speculation raises interesting possibilities, since we have to be aware that the few pieces we have cannot amount to a lifetime’s output for either one sculptor or a workshop. The wide-ranging connections of Ilkley 2, like those of Collingham 1, also show the growth in the number of centres with churches as the eighth century progresses: while many of these are on known ecclesiastical estates, or on sites known or believed to be monastic; and while all work of the period shows strong ecclesiastical input in iconography, the picture is already moving away from the very narrowly focused monastic network revealed by the earliest work. The strengthened role of the archbishopric with its regional and continental contacts probably played a part in this.

#### EIGHTH- TO NINTH-CENTURY CENTRES, OTHER THAN DEWSBURY, IN THE SOUTH OF THE REGION

Darfield on the river Calder has already been noted as an early site (p. 68 above). Its relationship with other centres is unknown, but already mentioned is an interlace fragment, no. 2 (Ill. 188), probably part of a string-course, showing apparent influence from Mercia, and a relationship to Ripon; and another piece, no. 1 (Ills. 186–7), which shows some connections with the earlier geometric flower pattern phase. There is also another possible architectural fragment, no. 3, with apparent York links of eighth to ninth century date (Ill. 189). Rothwell on the Aire south and east of Leeds also has early sculpture — two impostes or string-courses, different from most work of the period in the West Riding either to the north or the south (p. 242, Ills. 677–82). Its only local connection is some relationship in figural style with Crofton 1, further south and to the east of Wakefield (see below). The relationships otherwise of the Rothwell impostes seem to be entirely Mercian. On the other hand, Crofton is another example of a sculptural link with

Deiran monastic sculpture beyond the West Riding. The heads of the figures on Crofton 1 (p. 125, Ills. 183–4) show a connection with the figural style of Easby 1, in north Yorkshire, while no. 2 is so close to the same cross in its style of carving and ornamental repertoire as to raise the possibility that it is by the same sculptor: if not, it is a very close copy, particularly in its treatment of the plant-scroll (Ills. 180–1). These three sites suggest that the relationships of the sculpture in the eastern lowlands to the east of the Dewsbury area were similar to those in the north-east of the region.

The sculptures from Frickley and Royston (pp. 152, 244, Ills. 260–77 and 683–6), which take us into the overlap with the Anglo-Scandinavian period, and which show very close connections with each other, perhaps in this case imply a local sculptor or workshop: they are also in the eastern lowlands of the southern half of the county, and again seem to look to the north of the area rather than to Dewsbury, even sharing plant-scroll details with Ilkley (compare for example Frickley 3D with Ilkley 4A, Ills. 273 and 346, 350), animal ornament (compare the twist forming a small loop on Frickley 4A with Ilkley 3Cii, Ills. 274 and 363), a double twist (compare Frickley 2D and Royston 1B with Leeds 3B, Ills. 267, 506 and 685), as well as features such as large-scale meanders and simple twists which are part of the common currency of late Anglian sculpture. The Sheffield shaft (p. 246, Ills. 692–5) exhibits strong influence from Mercian Peak District crosses combined with features which link it to developments again in Ilkley (Chaps. IV, V and VI). Early work at sites in the relatively lowland areas circling the Dewsbury region, from the north round to the east, and to the south, therefore seem to show little connection with developments within Dewsbury, although their links are extremely varied.

#### THE DEWSBURY AREA FROM THE LATE EIGHTH TO THE LATE NINTH CENTURY

Dewsbury has sometimes been associated with Paulinus, but there is no contemporary evidence for any such association (see Chap. II, p. 20). It may be that this area, becoming part of the kingdom of Deira only as the seventh century progressed (see pp. 20–1), was not attractive to early unprotected monastic settlements; or was not securely enough in the gift of kings of Northumbria in the seventh to eighth centuries to be donated to the church, though later evidence suggests it was a royal estate, with a *villa regia* at Wakefield and possibly another at Dewsbury; or was simply very sparsely populated at this period anyway. However the minster status which has been suggested for Dewsbury also

implies that it was founded as a monastery, though there is no evidence that it was one at the end of the pre-Conquest period. Whatever the reason, the whole area south of Leeds and west of Wakefield has yielded no work earlier than the late eighth to early ninth century, and east and south of Wakefield the only early work is at the few sites mentioned in the section above (and it is probably significant that these are largely on the east side), which again marks the Dewsbury area as different even in the southern half of the West Riding.

When sculpture does appear there, however, in the late eighth century, Dewsbury seems to be a centre as innovative and as well-connected as Otley. Moreover, although the results are different in style, the ultimate sources of influences were from late classical, early Christian art, though perhaps, unlike Otley 1, mediated through Carolingian art. Dewsbury 1–3, 4–5 and 8–12 (Ills. 190–7, 198–207, 215–27, 230–4) imply the existence of several major monuments, produced to proclaim and enhance the theological and liturgical programme of a literate monastic community (see Chap. VIII and catalogue for the important inscriptions from this site, Chap. VI and catalogue for the importance and extent of its figural sculpture). The choice of the *Traditio Legis* (on Dewsbury 1–3, p. 129, Ills. 190–7) with its baptismal associations, reveals the community's role and mission; the choice of scenes drawn probably from readings for the Feast of the Epiphany on Dewsbury 4 and 5 (pp. 133, 135, Ills. 198–201, 202–7) seem to underline the theme of revelation and proclamation. The wide monastic connections of such themes have been partly discussed under Otley above.

Other distinctive features of the site include the ubiquity and, even more, the variety of the cable-moulded edge, a metalwork technique prominent on nos. 1–3, 4, 5, 9, 10, 12 and the late shaft no. 6 (Ills. 190–211, 218–20, 225–7, 230–4). Cable moulding is found in the north of the West Riding, but not on its most influential sculpture, Otley 1. It does, however, feature on Collingham 1 and Ilkley 2 which are in some ways closer to Dewsbury than the other major sculptures in their area (Ills. 166–9, 357–60, and above, p. 70). It is also found on sculpture from many of the sites in the southern half of the West Riding around Dewsbury (though not at Thornhill).

The figural style at Dewsbury is also distinctive. All the panels that have survived show full-length figures, and all surviving examples, whether of Christ and paired apostles under arches on Dewsbury 1–3 (Ills. 190–7), or those on nos. 4, 5, 8 and 9 (Ills. 198–201, 202–7, 215–17, 218–20), and, again, even the Crucifixion on the late shaft no. 6 (Ill. 208), all in some way attest to the manifestation of God in Christ, and to the giving and

transmission of this revelation (see pp. 131, 134 and 139). The suggestion that nos. 4 and 5 specifically relate to the Feast of the Epiphany is relevant here (below and Chap. VI, p. 61). This is quite different to the larger scale (within their shafts), and also more monumental, empanelled half-figures and busts of Otley 1 and its followers: but there is a relationship in scale and proportion with the side panels of Collingham 1 (Ills. 167, 169), and Masham and Cundall/Aldborough in north Yorkshire, as Cramp (1970, 60–1) noticed (see p. 119). This similarity extends to Ilkley 2, if panel Ai is indeed a figural scene (p. 169, Ills. 353, 357), as well as the seated figure in the centre of the cross-head, Little Ouseburn 5 (p. 209, Ill. 534), and it takes in the more detailed and complex drapery and the drilled eyes which feature on all these sculptures. The dress on the Otley figures, in keeping with the possible early sources suggested above for these figures (p. 69, also Ills. 564, 577–8), appears more severely classical, but at Dewsbury and on Collingham 1, there seems to be a real interest in portraying the detail of ecclesiastical dress. Bailey and Cramp (1988, 71) noted the central folds of the garment of the angel on Dewsbury 9, face A (Ill. 220) and thought it represented a version of the *pallium* otherwise found only on the Bewcastle cross (p. 141). However, although the complex folds of the overgarments are shown, there is also the beginning of the stylisation of these folds as they drape over the knees of Christ on Dewsbury 1 (Ill. 190) or over the feet on Dewsbury 3 (Ills. 196–7), and this is also evident in the figure of the angel: I am not convinced that any garments more specifically ecclesiastical than the tunic and himation are intended.

Another interesting feature of this site is that two fragments (though both possibly parts of the same shaft), Dewsbury 4 and 5, both have connections to Lindisfarne, in one case through its iconography: the Virgin and Child on no. 4 (Ill. 198) with its links to the same scene on the seventh-century coffin of St Cuthbert at Durham; and the combination of scenes on no. 5 (Ill. 207), which suggest a knowledge of liturgies in which the Baptism of Christ, the Wedding at Cana and sometimes the Feeding of the Five Thousand was commemorated on the Feast of the Epiphany, as practised at Lindisfarne in the seventh century, but not in the Roman liturgy (see Chap. VI, p. 61 and Bullough 1998, 114–15). There is a known early Lindisfarne connection with the West Riding, but at Ripon, not Dewsbury, apparently severed on the arrival of St Wilfrid (see Chap. II, pp. 13–14). Some of the sculptural connections of Dewsbury suggest there may have been other contacts, now lost to history.

In some ways as interesting a monument is Dewsbury 10 (p. 142, Ill. 230–4), a fragment of a very small cross-head

with no figural ornament but an inscription possibly commemorating a child: a much more personal note than is struck by any of the earlier monastic sites in the north of the region, and which may give some further indication of a difference in origin or association of the site — royal rather than ecclesiastic. Nos. 1–5 and 8–12 (Ills. 190–207, 215–27, 230–4), if not the work of a single sculptor, are certainly the work of a single and very local workshop working directly, and apparently only, for the central site of Dewsbury itself. There is an obvious link with Masham 1, north Yorkshire, in the pillared shaft with figures under arches (and on the same theme), and with the heavily though differently cable-moulded Ilkley 2: it may be that sculptors trained in that area or well aware of the work there, moved to Dewsbury when that was established.

Dewsbury 7, 14 and 15 (pp. 139, 146, Ills. 212–14, 235–6, 237–9) show that work following closely in this tradition continued until the end of the ninth century; and the house-shrine (no. 15) and the slab-like shaft (no. 7) have features which become very important in the Anglo-Scandinavian period — in the monument form in one case, and in the increasingly stylised bush-scroll with its ‘stopped’ rather than interlacing branches in the other.

It is interesting that the sculptures from surrounding related sites, apart from Wakefield (p. 267 Ills. 773–6) where the shaft seems to have been started in the eighth century but altered at a later period, all appear to date from the ninth century: none has anything which can be claimed to belong even to the end of the eighth century. This suggests these sites were indeed later and subsidiary foundations. The main site is Thornhill (pp. 256–65, Ills. 723–65), a site within walking distance of Dewsbury, which appears to have flourished at the end of the ninth century. There are links with Dewsbury (see below), but the sculpture in general is quite different in design concept and in style, and like Dewsbury 1–5 and 8–12, it appears to be an internally coherent body of work dating from a relatively short period. The differences as well as the links between the two sites should also be noted. There is for example no figural sculpture at Thornhill. The surviving inscriptions from Dewsbury are all non-runic, and include inscriptions labelling figural scenes, as well as one memorial text; those from Thornhill are mainly runic and all appear to be memorial texts, including one in which both the donor and the commemorated are female (Chap. VIII, pp. 80–1). The implication is that the sites served different functions. Dewsbury has been identified as a probable minster (see Chap. II, pp. 20–1), but in the absence of other records it is difficult to see what Thornhill was, though the

probability is that it was a monastic site. Could it have been a double monastery in the late ninth century?

The impression, looking at the body of work from both Dewsbury and Thornhill as a whole, is that the sites overlap in date, but with Thornhill as a later foundation. It is interesting that only a few Dewsbury sculptures date from the period most strongly represented at Thornhill. Some of the sculpture from Kirkheaton (pp. 189–92, Ills. 444–61) seems to date from the same period, and the runic inscriptions from there and Thornhill (see Chap. VIII) indicate that these too were literate communities. It is interesting that figural sculpture within the area of influence of Dewsbury in this period is found only at Kirkheaton (p. 190, Ill. 448). Connections between these sites and surrounding sites in the area are strong, however, in some non-figural aspects of monument type (i.e. cross-bases) and ornament; as for example in interlace and some aspects of layout (see Wakefield 1 and Thornhill 2 (pp. 258, 267, Ills. 728–31, 773–6)); and the development of the bush-scroll (Chap. V, pp. 53–4), on both shafts and cross-bases in the surrounding area (for example Dewsbury 6A and C (Ills. 208, 210) and Thornhill 6A (Ill. 747), also Birstall 1 (Ill. 70), Hartshead (Ill. 310) and Rastrick 1 (Ills. 626–7) — see below). Another factor linking several of the sites above is the importance of monuments with decoration confined to one face, and the use of multiple mouldings on otherwise plain faces (Chap. IV, pp. 40–1).

The cross-bases around the edge of the Dewsbury area (Birstall, Hartshead, Rastrick and the plain example from Woodkirk, Ills. 841–5) seem to have been made at various dates in the ninth century, and must once have held cross-shafts (Chap. IV, p. 43). As decorated bases are fairly rare they must be taken to have had a particular significance for the community which set them up: whether proclaiming its mission or only marking out the donated area. The cross-bases have features in common with the sculptures at Dewsbury, Thornhill and Wakefield, but they are also more eclectic in their choice of motifs and layout, with features which link them to the sculpture of Deira more widely, including the north of the region, especially Wharfedale.

#### CENTRES OF INFLUENCE IN THE ANGLO-SCANDINAVIAN PERIOD

Much of the late sculpture from the region falls under the general heading of ‘Anglo-Scandinavian’, distinguished by large-scale versions of earlier patterns, as for example on the shaft from East Riddlesden Hall (p. 148, Ills. 240–4); the use of outsize twist, step patterns

and meanders, especially for the sides of crosses (see for example faces C and D of Kirkby Wharfe 1, p. 185, Ills. 442, 443); the use of templates (see for example the discussion of Ilkley 5, p. 174, Ills. 375–8, or the description of Leeds 1Aiii, p. 200, Ills. 478, 491); and in some cases, completely garbled attempts at rendering earlier abstract and animal interlacing patterns (for example Frickley 2A, p. 153, Ill. 264; Otley 3B, p. 221, Ill. 580; Guiseley 1D, p. 159, Ill. 306). The use of closed-circuit elements, especially loose rings in interlace or twist patterns, have for long also been seen as symptomatic of the increased stylisation of late pre-Conquest sculpture: indeed loose rings appear on some obviously post-Conquest work (see the discussion of the probable font, Bingley 2, in this connection, p. 102, Ills. 64–8). Not all of the sculptures with these features can be shown to be part of a coherent body of work, although the attempt to render earlier patterns in a more stylised form can often show regional groups through the continuing influence of an admired earlier piece in an area, as in the case of the crossing medallion scroll on Guiseley 1 just mentioned (Ill. 308). These relationships are explored further below, but there are also some sculptures with more distinctive innovations in iconography, form or decorative programme, some confined to only one site, but others which again show local connections between sites.

#### NORSE-IRISH OUTPOSTS? BURNSALL, KIRKBY MALZEARD, GARGRAVE AND MIDDLESMOOR

The crosses and hogbacks from Burnsall are from one of only four sites with surviving monuments which are distinctively Scandinavian in form, and all appear to relate to the Norse-Irish arrival in the area and take-over of York in the early tenth century (Chap. II, p. 17). The hogback is one of three distinctive monument types at Burnsall (see Chap. IV, p. 36, and p. 113, Ills. 127–38): the others include one or two of the cross-heads, especially no. 10, the ring-head with plate infill with its westward connections (Chap. IV, p. 42, and p. 112, Ills. 123–6), and the ‘round-shaft derivative’, no. 6 (Chap. IV, p. 41, and p. 110, Ills. 109–10, 116–17). In the decoration from this site the only distinctively Scandinavian (as opposed to Anglo-Scandinavian period) features are the vertebral ring-chain on no. 1 (p. 107, Ill. 85), and the ‘vandyke’ on the shaft no. 6 (p. 110, Ill. 109). Hogbacks appear to have been developed in north Yorkshire, in the district of Allertonshire (Lang 1984, 87–90). If one looks at the overall distribution of this form in north and east Yorkshire and co. Durham (ibid., fig. 3), it becomes immediately clear that Burnsall, and Kirkby Malzeard, with its recorded though now missing hogback (p. 185, Ill. 429),

mark the western edge of the main Norse-Irish settlement in Yorkshire (see Chap. II, p. 17).

The Burnsall sculptures (shafts and cross-heads as well as hogbacks) are also unusually plain for the types they represent. Lang (1984, 99) called the hogbacks the 'vestigial' type for this reason, but although there are rare and scattered examples of this type elsewhere, the plainness is characteristic of this site and suggests a local workshop aware of the fashionable trend but out of the mainstream. Much of the decoration and several of the cross-head types at Burnsall are simply late Anglian. The hogback at Kirkby Malzeard is different, in that it appears to be a rough copy of a type otherwise found confined to the Tees Valley and to Allertonshire.

Gargrave (p. 155, Ills. 278–96), Fountains Abbey (p. 152, Ills. 259–9) and Middlesmoor (p. 212, Ills. 538–40) also have cross-head types (forms of circle-head, ring-head and hammerhead) found otherwise only in Cumbria, the west side of Lancashire and Cheshire, or south-west Scotland; and decoration (a form of exploded scroll based originally on an Anglian plant-scroll), again characteristic of Norse-Irish work in Cumbria. They seem almost the reverse of Burnsall and Kirkby Malzeard, in that they are the furthest east examples of their characteristics. All however demonstrate the east-west routes of the Norse-Irish arrivals, and all would appear to show that the main areas of Scandinavian settlement in Yorkshire outside York were to the east of the present area of study.

#### OTHER NORSE-IRISH INFLUENCED SCHOOLS

This is not to say, however, that the later sculpture in the north-eastern part of the West Riding — the area that includes the major ecclesiastical estates of the Ripon and Otley areas — was devoid of Scandinavian influence in the tenth century. In fact, there is nothing to suggest an avoidance of these areas by people with distinctly Scandinavian or Scandinavianised tastes, for there is some evidence of sculpture commissioned by, or intended to appeal to such people. These include free-standing heads and shafts with figural scenes drawn from Scandinavian mythology, on Leeds 1 and 2 (pp. 201–2, 203, Ills. 485–7), and Ripon 4 (p. 236, Ill. 662). The first of these sculptures, however, is also looking back to the earlier Anglian tradition of cross-design established in the area on Otley 1, in its layout and an iconography including saints and apostles (Ills. 478–81, 552–63). Placing Weland and possibly Sigurd in this context can only be designed to point up parallels for a newly Christian elite. These compare closely with similar developments in York, for example York Minster 34, and in the East Riding, for

example at Nunburnholme and on Sherburn 3 (Lang 1991, 37, 71–2, 189–93, 203 and ill. 145, 147, 728, 768).

Other scenes expressive of Scandinavian taste, and also revealing a probable Irish connection (see Chap. II, p. 17 and Chap. VI, p. 65), include the hunt scenes at Harewood (p. 161, Ill. 332) and Staveley (p. 254, Ills. 714–15), and possibly on Barwick in Elmet 2 (p. 94, Ill. 28) and Gargrave 2 (p. 156, Ill. 282). Most telling, however, are the memorial stones, adapted from reused earlier carvings, commemorating Scandinavian warrior figures, in one case accompanied by a female, at Otley, no. 6 (p. 223, Ill. 608) and Weston, immediately across the river Wharfe from Otley (p. 268, Ills. 777, 781). The siting of these two stones is particularly interesting, in one case at the very centre of the ecclesiastical estate. This does not suggest a complete re-settlement of this site, for the problems of keeping it within the control of the archbishopric of York seem to belong to the late tenth century, not to the period of Scandinavian control (Chap. II, p. 19). It does point up the alliance which developed between the archbishops and the Norse-Irish kings, and it may also be a pointer to the developing role of churches as parish or local churches, regardless of their monastic origins. It is also notable that Otley and Ripon both have sculpture going on into the tenth and even eleventh century, but at Ripon none of it is of the quality of the early period, here perhaps implying a change of status for the site, although it seems to have continued as an archiepiscopal estate (Chap. II, pp. 18–19). On the other hand, the eleventh-century sculpture from Otley includes more than one fragment with Ringerike detail (no. 12, possibly 11 and 16, pp. 225, 226, 228, Ills. 601, 606, 622), from which it is clear that patrons, of whatever ethnic origin, aware of fashionable trends in design, were still very much in the area. There is nothing in any of these late pieces which suggests that these might not have been secular patrons.

Other developments in the north-eastern part of the West Riding, although not at these centres, show the emergence of lively local schools. One of these must be Leeds, especially on the evidence of nos. 1 and 2 (pp. 198, 202, Ills. 478–81, 493–504), for however much the impulse to combine Christian and mythological scenes is found elsewhere, including York, its particular expression in style and layout at Leeds is quite original: the appeal to admired early local sculptures such as Otley 1 has already been pointed out. The deployment of the Mammen-style interlace knots, alongside more traditional Anglian knots, is also quite distinctive (Ills. 491–2), and while the two-dimensional figural style is based on the use of templates, the line of curves in the garment folds, or the flourish which finishes off hair or halo, have a

controlled elegance (Ills. 482–4). There is little trace of this particular virtuosity in the West Riding outside this site, however.

Lesser groups include those with ‘right-angled crossing’ interlace in the head, on Aberford 3, Collingham 5, Kirkby Wharfe 1 and 3, and Saxton 1 (Chap. V, p. 49, and Ills. 11, 164, 432, 440, 688). These pieces are also linked by the same cross-head type (see Chap. IV, p. 42). Collingham 3A (p. 122, Ill. 153) is also linked to Kirkby Wharfe 2 (p. 187, Ill. 436) by an angular, lattice-like version of the medallion scroll, probably ultimately derived from the medallion scroll on Otley 1 (Ills. 561–3). It seems that one workshop, and, in the case of Collingham 3 and Kirkby Wharfe 2, possibly one sculptor, is responsible for this work at all four sites, all close together in Wharfedale south of Otley.

The ‘tendrill pattern’ with its Mammen associations is found in much the same area, on Barwick in Elmet 1 (p. 92, Ill. 25), Guiseley 1 (p. 159, Ill. 307), and Spofforth 1 (p. 250, Ill. 711), but although in two cases this is also found with versions of the lattice/medallion scroll (Ills. 22, 308), the style of this is different from those described above, with the more rounded form of medallion scroll found also at Addingham (Ill. 14). These pieces imply much copying from admired originals, old and new, and/or influence from the same sources, but cannot be comfortably fitted into the same workshop which produced the Lower Wharfedale group described above. However, the two groups are linked by developments in figural sculpture, as shown by innovative iconography: for example in scenes showing veneration of the cross, at both Addingham and Kirkby Wharfe (Chap. VI, p. 61 and Ills. 12, 440), which have parallels of the same date elsewhere in Northumbria. The ‘tendrill pattern’ group may however be the product of the same workshop which briefly flourished at Bilton in Ainsty in the tenth century, and which was capable of the delicate workmanship on the ring-head of no. 1 (p. 95, Ills. 32–4) and the very traditional cable moulding on no. 2 (p. 97, Ills. 46–9). It also used the typical late basket-plait on several of its pieces, and was clearly strongly influenced by figural themes found on Irish high crosses, and indeed the highly modelled style of those crosses. The sculptures Barwick in Elmet 2 and Bilton in Ainsty 4, both with a scene representing the Fall though the latter is very much more worn, could well be by the same hand (Chap. VI, p. 60, and Ills. 30, 31). Perhaps even more telling, the stone from both sites is identical and is local to the area around Barwick, but not to Bilton. Innovative scenes with Irish parallels, which can be interpreted as depictions of the Arrest and Trial of Christ, are also found on Bilton in Ainsty 2 and 3 (Chap. VI, p. 61, and Ills. 39, 40).

These sites, outside the known ecclesiastical estate centres though often close to them, imply increased opportunities for local workshops, and must reflect changing patterns of patronage, with more secular, elite but not royal, input.

Two sculptures on the western edge of the West Riding have no exact parallels in the region. The cross-head and -shaft from Todmorden (Ills. 769–72) may be at the beginning of a series extending into Cheshire to the west (though it also has parallels in north Yorkshire). The Stansfield shaft (Ills. 717–20) is very interesting in its eclectic mix of animal styles, with parallels for one in Mercia, one in the West Riding and one from northern Yorkshire, put together in the self-consciously eclectic manner of the carver of Brompton 3, north Yorkshire (Lang 2001, ill. 37–40). The proximity of these two shafts is interesting, though there seems no evidence for any early church or other centre in that area. Both are clearly outside the Dewsbury area of influence.

#### THE SOUTHERN HALF OF THE WEST RIDING IN THE ANGLO-SCANDINAVIAN PERIOD

It is not true to say, as did Collingwood (1915a, 297, but see Chap. I, p. 2) that there is no Scandinavian-influenced sculpture south of Leeds, but the fact that there is little of it is both a reflection of the relative thinness on the ground of any sculpture, with rarely more than one piece at any site, and some other factors making the area unattractive to the incomers, as implied by the relative dearth of Scandinavian place-names in part of the area (Chap. II, p. 18). High Hoyland, however, has two or three late cross-heads suggesting Scandinavian influence (nos. 2a–b and 3, pp. 165–6, Ills. 315–16), and one fragment with a free-style animal (no. 4, Ill. 317), possibly part of a hunt scene. It is interesting that these heads are as plain as those at Burnsall, but apart from the evidence for Scandinavian influence, there seems to be no connection between them. It is worth noting that this site is in the same area as Kirkheaton and Kirkburton, therefore lying beyond the western limits of the area with few Scandinavian place-names.

Further west again, sculptures on three sites, Penistone, Ecclesfield and Cawthorne, between the rivers Don and Dearne, show some connection to each other in a very simple type of ornament, the so-called ‘D pattern’ (pp. 114, 150, 229 and Ills. 139–40, 140–2, 146–7, 150, 247, 631); while the strange bear-like figure on Cawthorne 4 (Ill. 142) possibly suggests influence from the hogback monument type, strangely transferred to an upright sculpture. The Penistone piece and Cawthorne 1, 2 and 4 are similar enough to appear to be from the

same workshop, but the Ecclesfield shaft looks at the very least by a different hand. All other pieces seem to be isolated in their areas, including the small monument from Mirfield (p. 214, Ills. 546–51), which has connections with Anglo-Scandinavian sculpture from York, carrying on the links between the eastern lowlands, York and east Yorkshire observable in the early period.

The only distinctive development in this area is that of the staff-crucifix, found at Dewsbury, no. 6 (p. 139, Ill. 208) and at Kirkburton (p. 183, Ills. 417, 423). There is no evidence of this particular innovation in both form and iconography, in the northern part of the area. They jointly suggest that Dewsbury was still able to produce monuments of a high quality in the Anglo-Scandinavian period. In spite of the flatness of the style, however, Dewsbury 6 is very traditional, even conservative, in its overall design (Ills. 208–11). Kirkburton, however, is a fine monument in a more modelled style, and with an

interlace element which could be either an appeal to tradition or a reflex of the kind of elaboration seen on interlace knots in more obviously Scandinavian-influenced areas. The extreme plainness of this cross, with no decoration on its back or sides (Ills. 416–24), links it to late Anglian developments at Dewsbury (see no. 7, Ills. 212–14) and also to several examples at Thornhill, for example, nos. 3, 4, 8 (Ills. 733–6, 739–42, 755–8), and the double mouldings also link it to Thornhill 6 and 7 (Ills. 747–50, 751–4). It appears to be very close to the late Anglian cross-head from High Hoyland (no. 1), another site within the Dewsbury/Thornhill sphere of influence: this also has the double moulding and a rather similar plainness (Ills. 318–28). There are sound iconographic reasons for seeing Kirkburton as later in the tenth century, but it clearly has strong links with the Anglian past. There is no other late work, in any style, associated with the Dewsbury centres, however.



FIGURE 15  
 Vernacular memorial inscriptions in western Yorkshire and the north,  
 with other inscriptions in western Yorkshire