

Fragments of a Hanging-Bowl from Bekesbourne, Kent, and Some Ornamental Problems

By G. HASELOFF*

Professor of Archaeology in the University of Würzburg

THREE bronze objects, originally parts of a hanging-bowl, which have not up to now been noticed in the archaeological literature, are housed in the Royal Museum at Canterbury. They consist of two small discs, both of the same form, and a larger, partly damaged, openwork disc.

The three objects were found at Bekesbourne, Kent, in or about the year 1914.¹ More detailed particulars of the circumstances in which they were found are not available. It is, however, significant that no other finds were made on the site or in its neighbourhood, and they may, therefore, safely be regarded as a stray find. They are unlikely to come from a burial-deposit, since otherwise presumably some traces of the burial would have been discovered, and besides, nothing is known of any cemetery at the place.

The two smaller discs (reg. nos. 1950: 6/3 and 6/5; diam. *c.* 4·2 cm.; PL. VII, A, c) are of bronze with spiral patterns in red enamel on the upper sides. In the centre of each is a circular perforation, *c.* 1·4 cm. in diameter, giving the discs the appearance of open rings. Both discs are slightly convex, and the surface on which they were mounted must have had a similar convexity. Their upper surface is ornamented with a spiral pattern formed by a filling of red enamel which shows against reserve bronze. There are bands of tinned metal on the inner and outer rims of each ring-disc. The ornament itself consists, on each, of six spirals. These are each made up of three lines which come together in a triple whirl at the centre of the spiral and which form trumpet-patterns at the junctions of the separate spirals—sometimes a single strand forks to produce a trumpet-shaped expansion; sometimes two parallel-flowing strands diverge to give a larger trumpet-form. The red enamel contained in the cavities between the metal

* The Editorial Committee is greatly indebted to Mr. L. de Paor of University College, Dublin, for translating Dr. Haseloff's German text.

¹ Mr. F. Higenbottam, City Librarian and Curator of the Royal Museum, Canterbury, to whom I am greatly obliged for facilitating my examination of the find in October, 1956, has very kindly made further enquiries as to its exact circumstances and location. These have shown that the original account, in which it seemed that the find was made about or shortly before 1950 'in Mr. Jones's allotment in the valley of Bekesbourne' was not correct. Mr. Higenbottam writes: 'Mr. Jones, the donor, from Bekesbourne told Dr. William Urry, the Cathedral Archivist, "that he had found the items hanging on a nail in a hut on the aerodrome at Bekesbourne. It seems that the things must have been found by workmen putting up the buildings on the aerodrome. The site, therefore, of the find may well be assumed to be the foundations of one of the buildings there and the date of finding *circa* 1914. I don't know when the aerodrome was started but I have always imagined it was a product of World War 1." There seems to be a conflict of evidence here, but the probability is that it was found at the aerodrome at the top of the hill and not in Jones's allotment in the valley.'

strands is well preserved and it combines with the tinned bands to produce an extremely colourful effect.

The larger openwork disc (reg. no. 1950: 6/4; diam. 7.4 cm.; PL. VII, B) consists of a central circular panel, 3.3 cm. in diameter, joined to an outer ring, 1 cm. wide, by four heart-shaped panels in cruciform arrangement. The decoration, like that of the two smaller discs, is executed in enamel. It consists of three different forms of ornament. The central round panel is adorned with a geometrical circular pattern in the form of a six-petalled rosette, or 'marigold'. On each of the heart-shaped connecting-pieces there are two small spirals; and the outer ring has a continuous interlace pattern composed of two thin bands which give the effect of alternating S-shaped loops.

As already stated, the three objects probably belonged to a hanging-bowl. The two smaller discs most likely served as escutcheons together with a third one, now lost. The chief support for this view is provided by their slightly convex form, which would enable them to be attached as escutcheons to the curved surface of a hanging-bowl. The larger openwork disc may also be identified as part of a hanging-bowl although there do not seem to be any close parallels for the form. This, it would seem, must be explained as a mounting for the inner or outer surface of the bottom of the bowl, such as is to be found in somewhat similar form on a number of hanging-bowls. The bowls which come from Anglo-Saxon graves—and to this group belong most of the specially well-known pieces—as well as having escutcheons which serve as mountings for the hanging-rings, are further ornamented both on the interior and the exterior of the base by means of soldered roundels ('prints') which are very close in size, form and decoration to the escutcheons. So far as is known, such circular prints are always associated with the hanging-bowls from Anglo-Saxon graves. Besides this ornament of the base a further, separate, adornment is known on a number of hanging-bowls in the form of strips of metal running down from the escutcheons to a base-ring which is concentric with the print centred on the bottom of the vessel. Such rings are known, for example, on the following hanging-bowls:

Faversham, Kent (British Museum);²

Sutton Hoo, Suffolk (British Museum)³—the larger of the two smaller hanging-bowls;

Dover, Kent (Dover Museum);⁴

Mildenhall, Suffolk (University Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, Cambridge);⁵

Hildersham, Cambridgeshire (University Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, Cambridge);⁶

Lullingstone, Kent (British Museum).⁷

² Kendrick (1932), 170, pl. 3. For a list of works cited by author's name and date of publication, see p. 103.

³ Unpublished.

⁴ Smith (1907-9), pp. 66 ff., fig. 13.

⁵ *Ibid.*, fig. 6.

⁶ T. C. Lethbridge, 'Bronze bowl of the Dark Ages from Hildersham, Cambs.', *Proc. Cambridge Antiq. Soc.*, XLV (1952), 44 ff., pls. 9-11.

⁷ Kendrick (1932), pl. 4.

In all these examples, with the exception of the Lullingstone bowl, which will be discussed more fully below, the base-ring and the print are separate pieces, not joined together in any way. This method of setting out the furnishings of the hanging-bowl defines a unified type; a type which in my opinion was current in the first half of the seventh century and perhaps also in part of the sixth.

Only the Lullingstone bowl does not fall within this scheme. Both in the arrangement and in the richness of its ornament it is unique among the hanging-bowls. Besides having four instead of the usual three escutcheons, it has metal bands running down from them, but these, instead of stopping at the base-ring, butt against ornamented roundels which are, or were, fixed one in each of the quarterings of the hanging-bowl. Even where the roundels and parts of the ring no longer remain they have left a mark which may still be seen on the metal surface of the bowl. A similar trace on the metal is all that remains to show that there was also a circular print where the bottom of the bowl, within the circumference of the base-ring, was raised towards the interior of the vessel. So far the ornament of the bottom of the bowl conforms to the known scheme; but the base-print is enriched by the addition of four further mountings (only two remain but the traces of the others can be seen) in the form of cross-arms, broadening out and rounded on the outer ends. The otherwise normal layout of the simple base-print is thereby enlarged to a cruciform design. This cruciform shape is on the raised central part of the base and is not joined in any way to the ornamented ring, described above, which surrounds it.⁸

The base-mounting of the Bekesbourne bowl distinguishes it from the hanging-bowls which come from Anglo-Saxon graves through a variation in the layout whereby the decorative features—the roundel, or print, on the bottom, and the base-ring—instead of being distinct are cast as a single piece. A type intermediate between the two may be discerned in the Lullingstone bowl. It must be borne in mind that this piece is too exceptional to be regarded simply as representing a transitional phase in the development of the base-ornament. Nevertheless it suffices to show that this tendency towards enriching the ornament of the base existed. This point will be of significance when we come to consider the dating of the hanging-bowls and the relationship of the Bekesbourne to the Lullingstone bowl.

It may be taken, then, as a result of these comparative studies, that the Bekesbourne bowl represents something of a new departure. If we seek similar forms there seems to be only one comparable example—the well-known hanging-bowl from Miklebostad in Norway (Bergen Museum).⁹ The exterior of the base of this hanging-bowl is ornamented with a ring which displays red and yellow enamel besides decoration in millefiori glass. A richer mounting is fitted on the inside of the base; it consists of a central roundel connected with an outer ring by means of three lozenges. The ornament, like that of the exterior of the base, is in millefiori and in enamel of two colours. In view of the quite different character

⁸ Smith (1907-9) mentions a bronze vessel without escutcheons, but with the trace of a cross with expanded arms on the raised middle surface of the base, which was found in the Thames.

⁹ O. Rygh, *Norske Oldsager* (1885), fig. 727 a-d; Henry (1936), 240 ff., pl. 37, 1.

of the ornament it would be wrong to make too much of the similarity of the base-mounting of the Miklebostad bowl to that of the Bekesbourne bowl. Nonetheless a common trend is revealed in both pieces: the enrichment of the base-mounting from a simple roundel to a complex structure of inner roundel and outer ring with connecting pieces between.

At the same time the Miklebostad bowl shows that it was the interior of the base that bore the richer ornament. It may safely be assumed that this was true of the Bekesbourne base-mounting too. From there we pass naturally to the question why, in certain hanging-bowls, the interior of the base is more richly embellished than the exterior. The large hanging-bowl from Sutton Hoo,¹⁰ with its fish cast in the round and mounted in the interior, might here be cited, or the lost hanging-bowl from the river Witham, made known again by Kendrick from old illustrations, which had a figure in the round of a seated animal on the inside of the base.¹¹ This stress on the interior of the base leaves little doubt that it was the inner part which was most in view when the bowls were in normal use. With these examples in mind, one can hardly accept the view of Henry¹² and Radford¹³ that the vessels were used as lamps. This is not to deny that hanging-bowls were ever used as lamps, since they are so shown in some illustrations in illuminated manuscripts. But only small examples can have been so used. Large vessels such as that from Sutton Hoo would seem to be quite unsuitable. It seems to me that the most acceptable view of the use of the bowls is that advanced by Aslak Liestøl¹⁴ in his account of the employment of a vessel of this sort for hand-washing, either for profane or for liturgical purposes.

While the large Sutton Hoo hanging-bowl, dated by the closed deposit in which it was found, cannot be later than about 650 (in other respects too its whole character shows that it belongs to the group of hanging-bowls found in Anglo-Saxon graves), the Miklebostad bowl was deposited in a Viking grave in Norway in the first half of the ninth century. That this bowl was not made in Scandinavia but was brought as loot from Ireland is not open to doubt. A date in the second half of the eighth century therefore seems most likely for its manufacture. These two examples, however, provide only upper and lower limits for the date of the Bekesbourne bowl and a closer dating based solely on the form of the base-mounting is not possible.

While the typological consideration of the Bekesbourne mounting has merely made it clear that in the development of types it is more advanced than the bowls from Anglo-Saxon graves, i.e. than the bowls from the first half of the seventh century, the following examination of the *ornament* of the mountings should answer more closely the question of the stylistic position of the bowl and its date of manufacture.

The two escutcheons, in the first place, depart from the normal rule, in that

¹⁰ Bruce-Mitford (1956), p. 21, pl. 9 b.

¹¹ T. D. Kendrick, 'A late Saxon hanging-bowl,' *Antiq. J.*, XXI (1941), pl. 34.

¹² Henry (1936), pp. 211 ff.; *id.* (1956), p. 81.

¹³ Peers and Radford (1943), pp. 47 ff.

¹⁴ Aslak Liestøl, 'The hanging-bowl, a liturgical and domestic vessel,' *Acta Archaeologica*, XXIV (1953), 163 ff.

they do not form closed roundels but have central voids in which presumably other objects were fixed. Immediate parallels for this construction are not available but similar forms may be found. The largest of the three detached escutcheons found in grave 32 at Camerton, Som.,¹⁵ is ornamented with a developed trumpet-pattern¹⁶ and displays, in place of the usual spiral-, circle-, or dot-pattern in the middle, a circular hollowed panel which is now empty but was originally filled with enamel or some other embellishment such as millefiori glass. Much closer than this to the Bekesbourne escutcheons is a bronze disc (PL. VII, E), unfortunately of unknown provenience, in the Londesborough collection in the British Museum,¹⁷ which has a circular marginal band similar to those of the Bekesbourne pieces, with eight spirals linked by rudimentary trumpet-patterns, while the centre of the disc, like that from Camerton, is hollowed and was originally filled with some inlay. The slightly convex form of the disc and its unornamented under side make it likely that this too was a hanging-bowl escutcheon. A bronze disc from Whitby (PL. VII, D) is the most closely related to this escutcheon, and its convex form proclaims that it was fixed to the surface of a hanging-bowl. Radford¹⁸ has suggested that it was employed as a 'decorative plaque' like those, for example, on the Lullingstone bowl, but it might with equal probability be taken to be an actual escutcheon, even if this type with separately-applied ornament on the central portion is not attested from the known hanging-bowls. The middle panel of the Whitby disc has a rivet which seems to have originally secured an inlay. The spirals themselves are filled with red enamel. That hanging-bowl escutcheons were in fact employed in perforated disc or ring form is shown by the example from Capheaton, Northumberland,¹⁹ in which an escutcheon consists of a flat ring which probably held a disc-shaped inlay.²⁰ This example, however, has little similarity to the Bekesbourne discs.

It is clear, therefore, that the Bekesbourne roundels are of a type that is not to be found among the hanging-bowls known to have come from Anglo-Saxon graves—with the probable exception of the escutcheon from Camerton. The conclusion to be drawn is that this group of escutcheons with open or inlaid central panels represents a later stage of development than do the hanging-bowls from Anglo-Saxon graves. The escutcheon from Camerton can hardly be separated from the latter group, although it is worth noting that the Camerton cemetery²¹ must be regarded as one of the latest Anglo-Saxon cemeteries both on the historical evidence of the late settlement of this region and on the evidence of the grave-goods.

While the escutcheon from the Londesborough collection cannot be used for dating purposes, the closely related example from Whitby offers greater

¹⁵ Ethelbert Horne, 'Saxon Cemetery, Camerton,' *Proc. Somerset Archaeol. and Nat. Hist. Soc.*, LXXV (1930), 107 ff., pl. 13; *Antiq. J.*, x (1930), 53; Kendrick (1932), p. 182; Henry (1936), pl. 33, 1.

¹⁶ The term 'developed trumpet-pattern' was first used by T. D. Kendrick to describe the characteristic ornament of a particular hanging-bowl group: Kendrick (1932), pp. 169 and 175 ff.

¹⁷ British Museum reg. no. 84,5-20,8. Henry (1936), pl. 33,6.

¹⁸ Peers and Radford (1943), p. 49, nr. 5, pl. 27 a.

¹⁹ J. D. Cowen in *Archaeologia Aeliana*, VIII (1931), 328-38 with fig.; Henry (1936), p. 229, pl. 28,9.

²⁰ Henry, *op. cit.* in note 19, note 71.

²¹ Leeds (1936), pp. 36 and 111 ff.

possibilities. Several fragments of hanging-bowls—escutcheons and mountings—have been found at Whitby.²² They are of great chronological significance, for the year 657,²³ the date of the foundation of the monastery, provides a *terminus post quem*, so that they cannot belong to a period earlier than the second half of the seventh century, and some of them may, perhaps, even belong to the eighth century.

But the ornament of the Bekesbourne escutcheons also allows of closer stylistic analysis. The six spirals connected by trumpet-patterns strongly recall, in the first place, a series of hanging-bowls with a standardized ornamentation of spiral- and trumpet-patterns. This is the series already mentioned, which was grouped by Kendrick under the designation 'developed-trumpet-pattern series'²⁴ and of which the well-preserved hanging-bowl from Winchester, Hants. (British Museum)²⁵ may stand as the typical example. On all of these escutcheons, and sometimes also on the prints, there is a pattern of three spirals arranged together in a circle and connected with one another and also with a central pattern—usually a spiral—by means of a trumpet-pattern.²⁶ This design has undergone transformation in the course of time. The basic form of the triskele—clearly recognizable on the earliest pieces—is lost to a greater or lesser extent by the degeneration of the spiral ornament of the central field, and only the three outer spirals, arranged circle-wise, are left, their trumpet-terminals filling the greater part of the middle of the escutcheon. To this already degenerate form belong, for example, the escutcheons of the Winchester bowl,²⁷ whose centres are filled with insignificant spots. Similarly the escutcheons found as detached pieces at Barrington, Cambridgeshire (Ashmolean Museum, Oxford)²⁸ and Oving, Bucks. (Aylesbury Museum)²⁹ display this tendency; the diminished size of the circle or dot indicates the dwindling importance of the central portion. The tendency is further advanced on the escutcheons of the hanging-bowl from Lowbury, Berks. (Reading University Museum),³⁰ where no ornamental stress whatever is laid on the centre, but the field is dominated by the three outer spirals with their trumpet-shaped links. With this the ground is already prepared for the arrangement of the spirals in an open circle, which we find on the Bekesbourne escutcheons, and the Londesborough and Whitby escutcheons.

In his publication of the escutcheon from Benniworth, Lincs., Kendrick³¹

²² Peers and Radford (1943), pp. 47-50, figs. 9-10, nos. 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 18, pls. 26 c, 27 a, b.

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 27. The destruction of the monastery by the Danes in the year 867 marks the end of the Saxon period; *ibid.*, p. 30.

²⁴ Cf. note 16.

²⁵ Kendrick (1932), pl. 6, nos. 1, 2 and pl. 7, no. 2.

²⁶ The following is a list of escutcheons with spiral and trumpet-patterns and with a centrally-placed spiral: Greenwich, Canterbury Museum, Henry (1936), pl. 32,1; Middleton Moor, Sheffield Mus., *ibid.*, pl. 32,2; Hitchin, Victoria and Albert Mus., London, *ibid.*, pl. 32,6; Chesterton, Warwick Mus., *ibid.*, pl. 32,7; Lède, Brussels Mus., *ibid.*, pl. 32,8; Camerton, Taunton Mus., *ibid.*, pl. 33,2; Find-place unknown, Victoria and Albert Mus., *ibid.*, pl. 33,7; Oxford, Pitt-Rivers Mus., Farnham, *ibid.*, pl. 33,9.

²⁷ Kendrick (1932), pl. 6,1.

²⁸ Henry (1936), pl. 33,5.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, pl. 33,8.

³⁰ Kendrick (1932), p. 172, fig. 7,5.

³¹ *Antiq. J.*, xvi (1936), 98.

showed that he was aware of the development outlined here when he wrote that 'it clearly represents a stage before the abandonment of this unnecessary machinery at the joints (i.e. "the machinery of design as perfected for circular compositions", "the complete repertory of details"), a simplification, that provides us with the cold logical sketches on the British Museum escutcheon from the Crosthwaite Museum at Keswick and on the end-panel of the Monymusk reliquary. We cannot dissociate this new piece (Benniworth) from the style represented by the Winchester bowl. . .'. The stress on closely set spirals, such as are dominant on the Bekesbourne and related pieces, may already be recognized on the print of the Winchester bowl, where the number of the outer spirals is augmented to six and the powerful trumpet-motifs are correspondingly subdued. A similar stage is represented by the Crosthwaite Museum piece cited by Kendrick.

The development completed here has led from the vigorous triple-whirl motif to an arrangement of spirals in a circle; from the verve of boldly swelling and contracting trumpet-motifs to patterns which are wholly made up of fine lines. It is true, indeed, that the artificer of the Bekesbourne escutcheons has not fully understood how to accomplish 'the abandonment of this unnecessary machinery at the joints', for the trumpet-motifs have not yet been relinquished: but they are lost in wiry lines, so that the *élan* which was once so characteristic of them no longer remains.

This striving to dissolve the strong swelling patterns of the metal bands in fine lines is exemplified on three pieces which belong to the developed-trumpet-pattern series. One is the Lullingstone bowl we have already mentioned, whose escutcheons³² bear patterns of fine metal lines; the second is an escutcheon from Middleton Moor, Derbyshire (Sheffield Museum)³³ with unusually fine metal strands; the last is an escutcheon said to be from near Oxford (Pitt Rivers Museum, Farnham),³⁴ where the suppression of the trumpets, which are in fine metal strands, is not as complete, as a result of the filling of yellow enamel. All these examples, which may be regarded as stylistically late in the developed-trumpet-pattern series, suggest that the development of the forms found on the Bekesbourne, Londesborough, and Whitby escutcheons, represents the end of a gradual transition from initial forms such as appear in the grave-goods of a period shortly before the custom of making burial-deposits came to an end. The chronological questions have been fully discussed above and the conclusions would suggest a date in the latter part of the seventh century for the examples here described.

* * *

If we turn now to the ornament of the base-mounting we come upon completely new decorative forms. On the round central panel, which corresponds to the prints of other hanging-bowls, there is a geometrical pattern which has been mentioned at the beginning under the description six-petalled rosette, or marigold.

The six-petalled rosette is a pattern not unknown on hanging-bowls. It occurs

³² Kendrick (1932), p. 172, fig. 7,3, pl. 4.

³³ *Ibid.*, p. 178, fig. 10 a; Henry (1936), pl. 32,2.

³⁴ Henry (1936), pl. 33,9.

on the fragments of a hanging-bowl from Basingstoke, Hants. (British Museum),³⁵ on the interior of the base, as a finely engraved pattern drawn with the aid of a pair of compasses. It appears again on the Capheaton bowl,³⁶ on the interior as well as the exterior of the base, where it is once more an engraved design. Here it is a simple six-petalled rosette enclosed within two concentric engraved circles, the space between which is filled with zig-zag lines. The pattern occurs also on the hanging-bowls found in Viking graves in Norway. It is engraved on the exterior of the base of the hanging-bowl from Skomrak, Vest Agder (Oslo Museum).³⁷ Finally—if this piece may properly be brought into the reckoning—the pattern in question is extensively employed on the hanging-lamp from Ballinderry I, Co. Westmeath (National Museum, Dublin), which differs from the usual hanging-bowls in form³⁸; it appears on it, for example, as a six-petalled rosette on the interior of the base, and again on the exterior, in part as a circular pattern and in part as a strip-pattern.

These examples reveal a special preference for compass-drawn ornament in that the embellishment of the base with this pattern is a characteristic of all the pieces cited. While all the instances of the pattern so far mentioned have been in the form of engraving, it is also known in enamel. The hanging-bowl from Baginton, Warwicks. (Coventry Museum),³⁹ provides a good example of this: on the exterior base-print the six-petalled rosette appears in red enamel, while the spirals spring from triple whirls in a concentric band around it. Finally, the pattern appears, again executed in enamel technique, on an escutcheon from Dover, Kent (Dover Museum),⁴⁰ where it occupies the central field of the escutcheon. So far as I know, this is its only occurrence on an escutcheon. On the Bekesbourne base-mounting the six-petalled rosette is also an enamelled pattern, but the individual lines are the strands of reserve metal, so that the character of the compass-drawn ornament is better revealed than on the Baginton bowl or the Dover escutcheon.

A great deal has been written about the history of this motif. Its wide distribution in western art from the late Roman period onwards vitiates its value as an aid to chronological research. Hencken gives a detailed discussion of it and a summary of its occurrences.⁴¹ On one special group of monuments, the so-called 'latchets', the pattern is found in a treatment closely related to that of the enamelled six-petalled rosette on the hanging-bowls. Smith⁴² and Henry⁴³ have already

³⁵ Smith (1907-9), figs. 18-22; Kendrick (1932), p. 167; Henry (1936), p. 229.

³⁶ Cowen, *op. cit.* in note 19, pp. 328-338; Kendrick (1932), pp. 161 ff.; Henry (1936), p. 229, pl. 28,9.

³⁷ Rygh, *op. cit.* in note 9, p. 37, fig. 726 a, b; H. Shetelig (ed.), *Viking Antiquities in Great Britain and Ireland, Part V*: Jan Petersen, *British Antiquities of the Viking Period Found in Norway* (1940), p. 90, fig. 95.

³⁸ H. O'Neill Hencken, 'Ballinderry Crannog no. 1,' *Proc. Roy. Irish Acad.*, XLIII (Sect. C, no. 5, 1936), 191 ff., especially 197 ff., 209 ff., figs. 42-46.

³⁹ E. T. Leeds, *Antiq. J.*, xv (1935), 109 ff., pls. 11 and 12; *id.* (1936), pp. 10 ff., pl. 6 c; Henry (1936), p. 226, pl. 26,4; H. E. Kilbride-Jones, 'A bronze hanging-bowl from Castle Tioram,' *Proc. Soc. Antiq. Scotland*, LXXI (1936), 217 ff., esp. 221 ff., figs. 5,2 and 7 c and d.

⁴⁰ Smith (1907-9), fig. 9; Kendrick (1932), p. 170, fig. 5; Henry (1936), pl. 26,1.

⁴¹ Hencken, *op. cit.* in note 38, pp. 197 ff., 209 ff., and further instances, *id.*, 'Lagore Crannog,' *Proc. Roy. Irish Acad.*, LIII (Sect. C, no. 1, 1950), p. 67, fig. 11, no. 142, p. 68, fig. 12, no. 883.

⁴² R. A. Smith, 'Irish Serpentine Latchets,' *Proc. Soc. Antiq. London*, xxx (1917-18), 120-131.

⁴³ Henry (1936), pp. 222, 226.

connected this group with the ornament of the hanging-bowls. The marigold is by far the commonest pattern on the lachets and is directly associated with the use of enamel. Since all the known pieces are without datable associations, the chronological position of this distinctive group cannot be closely estimated. Its distribution is worthy of note: all the lachets with the exception of one fragmentary piece⁴⁴ have been found in Ireland. Now, the Irish origin of the lachets has never been questioned. But this fact should lead, at this stage, to no firm conclusion about the place of origin of the hanging-bowls, since the distribution of a group of objects need not be identical with the area of its origin. The lachets, however, as accessories of dress, have a better claim to an origin in the region in which they were found than have objects of wider possible utility such as the hanging-bowls. Their significance for related treatments of the six-petalled rosette is therefore not to be underestimated, especially where these are also in red enamel.

It is difficult to describe the form of the four linking-pieces between the inner roundel and the outer ring of the Bekesbourne base-mounting. They derive from the conjunction of a large heart-shaped form with a smaller circular form, the outline of the whole approximating to an unbalanced figure-of-eight. In the wider of the two elements—the part which borders on the central roundel of the mounting—the outline fails to complete the curve of the figure-of-eight, curving inward in a pair of spirals to give the heart-shape. The treatment of the corresponding parts of the four pieces is not identical: in part, the spiral terminals appear as independent elements within the larger heart-shaped pieces. Here again the ground is of red enamel, and there can be no doubt of the Celtic character of the spiral motif.

The outer ring of the base-mounting bears a very characteristic ornament—an interlace-pattern. It is composed of two fine lines arranged in alternating S-shaped loops, and the wiriness of the strands is of special significance. The background, as before, is in red enamel. The mere presence of interlacing in the ornament of a hanging-bowl already marks it out as somewhat unusual. In the whole corpus of hanging-bowls, whether complete or fragmentary, interlacing, to the best of my knowledge, is extremely rare,⁴⁵ the sole example being on the Lullingstone bowl (p. 73 f.), which is exceptional in its whole scheme of ornament. On this bowl interlacing appears in isolated patches on the base-ring, but in greater quantity on the mountings, like cross-arms (PL. VIII, A), flanking the escutcheons. Here, apart from coarse or irregular passages, it is partly double-stranded and partly triple-stranded and so densely massed that it covers the ornamented surface without revealing any of the background. Dense multi-strand interlace such as is here employed occurs in Anglo-Saxon metalwork, as, for example, on the *phalerae* from Faversham, Kent (PL. VIII, B),⁴⁶ the Hardingstone (Northants.)

⁴⁴ British Museum reg. no. 1923.10-17.1, from Mildenhall, Suffolk; Smith, *op. cit.* in note 42, p. 125. It seems questionable whether this fragment belongs to the lachet group.

⁴⁵ The employment of embossed foil with an interlace-pattern on one of the smaller hanging-bowls from Sutton Hoo does not come into the question here, since it is the result of a repair performed by an Anglo-Saxon craftsman.

⁴⁶ Kendrick (1938), pl. 36, 1.

mounting⁴⁷ and the Caenby (Lincs.) mountings (PL. VIII, c)⁴⁸. This type of interlace, which came to the Anglo-Saxon workshops as the result of fresh influences from the Mediterranean in the course of the seventh century, seems to mark a distinct phase of style which had, however, but a short duration, unless the sole reason for the lack of a larger number of objects ornamented in this manner be the end of the custom of depositing grave-goods. At any rate, this phase was not of great significance for ensuing developments.

The fine-lined interlace of the type that occurs on our mountings from Bekesbourne is of very rare occurrence in the finds from Anglo-Saxon graves. I know of only four examples:

1. the great *gold buckle* from Sutton Hoo, the loop of which is ornamented with fine-lined interlace (PL. VIII, E);⁴⁹
2. a *gold bracteate pendant* from an inhumation-grave near Wye Down, Kent (PL. VIII, G);⁵⁰
3. the *gilt silver buckle*, ornamented with a fish in relief, from Crundale, Kent (PL. VIII, D);⁵¹
4. the *sword* with ornamented hilt, from Crundale, probably from the same grave as the buckle (PL. VIII, F).⁵²

The Sutton Hoo gold buckle (no. 1) bears on the bow an interlace-ornament which is quite different both in the regularity and in the wiriness of the pattern from the interlace usually employed in Anglo-Saxon work, and, indeed, from that on the large mounting-plate of the buckle itself. The interlace is made up of a continuous line, zoomorphized at one end by the addition of an animal-head, and composed in a pattern which has been called a 'knitting-stitch' by W. G. Collingwood.⁵³ It occurs again in Anglo-Saxon material on a drinking-cup from Farthing Down, Surrey,⁵⁴ also with an animal-head but not in the fine-lined interlace which is seen on the Sutton Hoo buckle-loop. Such regular interlace, especially of the fine-lined type which has been described, is something quite rare in Anglo-Saxon material. Its next occurrence is on Northumbrian stone crosses⁵⁵ which cannot be dated earlier than the middle of the eighth century.⁵⁶ The gold pendant from Wye Down (no. 2) includes in its ornament the so-called Celtic cross with four equal arms with expanded ends, filled with interlacing. The wiry interlace

⁴⁷ Pitt-Rivers Museum, Farnham; Kendrick (1938), pl. 36,2.

⁴⁸ (R. A. Smith), *Brit. Mus. Guide to Anglo-Saxon Antiquities* (1923), p. 27, fig. 104.

⁴⁹ Bruce-Mitford (1956), pl. 1.

⁵⁰ *Brit. Mus. reg. no. 93,6-1,187*.

⁵¹ Kendrick (1938), p. 86 and p. 102 (including note 3); G. Baldwin Brown, *The Arts in Early England*, III (1915), pl. 73,1; N. Åberg, *The Anglo-Saxons in England* (1926), fig. 222.

⁵² Kendrick (1938), pl. 33,4. References to the purchase of the Crundale sword and buckle in the archives of the British Museum reveal that it is highly probable that they came from the same grave. I am very much indebted to Mr. D. M. Wilson for this information.

⁵³ W. G. Collingwood, *Northumbrian Crosses* (1927), p. 131.

⁵⁴ *Victoria County History, Surrey*, I (1902), fig. facing p. 257; Leeds (1936), p. 64, fig. 15 b. I must express my sincere thanks to Mr. D. M. Wilson for the reference to the Farthing Down drinking cup which was mistakenly referred to by Collingwood (*op. cit.* in note 53) as 'the Croydon bucket'.

⁵⁵ It occurs for example on the St. Peter's York cross, Collingwood, *op. cit.* in note 53, fig. 146, and on the crosses at Leven, East Riding, Ingleby and Arncliffe.

⁵⁶ J. Brøndsted, *Early English Ornament* (1924), p. 48, fig. 36; for dating see p. 78.

forms a knot-pattern whose form in detail is determined by the cross-arms which it covers. The character of this interlace becomes especially clear when it is compared with ornamented surfaces of almost the same general appearance such as appear on the Faversham *phalerae* (PL. VIII, B) and the Caenby mountings (PL. VIII, C). It would be difficult to find a greater contrast. It is sufficient at this point to note that between the first group (Faversham, Hardingstone, Caenby) and Wye Down a fundamental change in style has taken place, a change for which a corresponding simultaneous chronological division should not be claimed. The inner and outer base-ornaments of the Ormside bowl⁵⁷ are the next parallel to the Wye Down pendant to be worthy of mention. The exterior (PL. VIII, J) bears a pattern which is embossed like that of Wye Down but is similar only in being complex, while the ornament of the interior (PL. VIII, H) is in filigree but is much closer to the design of the pattern on the pendant. On the Crundale sword-hilt (no. 4) the upper and lower parts of the hilt proper bear each a strip of gold foil with an interlace-pattern in filigree.⁵⁸ The wiry-lined interlace is composed of inter-linked twists of triple-loop form. The Crundale buckle (no. 3), which was probably found together with the sword-hilt, has, in beaded filigree, a continuous interlace of entangled knots ('Kringelknoten') with a serpent-head on one end. Finally one hanging-bowl can be adduced on which a fine-lined interlace is employed. It is that found in the Castle Yard, York, on which identical embossed interlace-patterns appear on discs on both the interior and the exterior of the base.⁵⁹

As to the dating of the examples of fine-line interlace cited above, only the Sutton Hoo buckle admits of precision. While some of the other items in the burial-deposit have been assigned an earlier date by some writers, this was certainly one of the newest objects at the time of burial, so that a date of about 650 is most likely.⁶⁰

There are only indirect possibilities of determining the date of the other examples—find-circumstances and associations on the one hand; stylistic and typological details on the other. One of the most important circumstances for dating is the fact that the gold pendant from Wye Down and the sword-hilt and buckle from Crundale were found in Anglo-Saxon graves. These objects, therefore, belong to that period of time when the custom of depositing grave-goods was still cherished, although they are the last, manifestly belated, examples of this burial-custom. Moreover, the animal-ornament of the Crundale pommel⁶¹ finds its closest parallel in the Book of Durrow,⁶² but it is also related to an impressed foil panel from Caenby⁶³ and an animal on the great gold buckle from Sutton Hoo.⁶⁴ On the basis of these observations, taking the Sutton Hoo buckle as a

⁵⁷ Cf. note 66.

⁵⁸ We have here an unusual type of filigree where beaded gold wire is replaced by a smooth wire of triangular cross section.

⁵⁹ Kendrick (1932), p. 167, fig. 3 a; Henry (1936), p. 232, pl. 30,2.

⁶⁰ Bruce-Mitford (1956), p. 42, with reff. *ad loc.*

⁶¹ Cf. note 52.

⁶² Bruce-Mitford (1956), p. 54, fig. 15.

⁶³ (Smith), *op. cit.* in note 48, p. 86, fig. 102.

⁶⁴ Bruce-Mitford (1956), pl. i, fig. 15,2.

chronological starting-point, one may derive the Crundale fish-buckle and sword-hilt therefrom and assign to them a date not earlier than 650, but not, in all probability, since they are grave-goods, as late as the end of the seventh century; although, judging from continental precedents, the custom of depositing grave-goods may have lingered on for some time if, as seems probable, the fact that the find was made 'in a grave-mound' indicates a single grave outside the scope of the *Reihengräber*-cemeteries.⁶⁵

The close relationship between the animal-ornament of the Crundale sword-hilt and that of the Book of Durrow is of great chronological significance, since it means that the Book of Durrow and the Crundale find must be nearly contemporary. The most likely date for both is about or shortly after the middle of the seventh century. Finally, the Wye Down pendant, also a grave-find, has such markedly Christian Celtic features that its origin—certainly within the province of the Anglo-Saxons—can be thought of only as a result of influence from the Irish mission.

The fine-lined interlace of the Ormside bowl is especially close—particularly that executed in filigree—to the Wye Down pendant. On the other hand, because of the absence of absolute evidence, it is extraordinarily difficult to make a satisfactory estimate of its chronological position.⁶⁶ True, its singularity is such that the bowl, because of the rich animal- and plant-ornament of its exterior, with its wholly oriental character, can only belong to that short period in which these elements made their way into Northumbria, namely, the second half of the seventh century.⁶⁷ It seems that until now too little attention has been paid to the interlace-ornament of the Ormside bowl in the discussion of its dating. The interlace in embossed technique in the form of a Celtic cross placed on the exterior is most unusual in its composition, with its narrow knots, its sharply broken lines, and its single long-winding strands. These are indications of that early phase of interlace-ornament which appears in the Book of Durrow, but which in the Book of Lindisfarne—whose dating has been almost certainly established as being close to 700—has been left far behind. One must bring the Ormside bowl, therefore, closer to the Book of Durrow, and thus to a date in the second half of the seventh century.

No chronological evidence is available for the interlace, also in embossed technique, of the hanging-bowl from Castle Yard, York, which has a simple pattern. This hanging-bowl, which does not come from a grave, departs so much in its general form and in the form of its escutcheons from the type found in Anglo-Saxon graves that it may be assigned a later date of origin.

To summarize the results of this comparative study of the interlace, we may conclude that wiry-lined interlace is first known on the loop of the Sutton Hoo buckle and that it appears on two further grave-finds which are close to the date of the Book of Durrow (Crundale and Wye Down). Finally, the Ormside bowl

⁶⁵ H. Zeiss, 'Spätmerowingisch-frühkarolingische Schildbuckel von Zuckerhutform,' *Reinecke-Festschrift* (Mainz, 1950).

⁶⁶ Baldwin Brown, *op. cit.* in note 51, v (1921), 318 ff., pls. 30-31; Kendrick (1938), pl. 60; Brøndsted, *op. cit.* in note 56, p. 87 f., figs. 72 and 73.

⁶⁷ Brøndsted, *op. cit.* in note 56, pp. 16 ff., 87.

provides a relationship between the Book of Durrow and the orientalizing Northumbrian phase of style in the second half of the seventh century.

In these considerations but little heed has been paid to the pattern of the interlace, and there are some individual points in connexion with it which should be mentioned. There have been many researches into interlacing and interlace-patterns.⁶⁸ The fine-lined strands which are our main consideration display a clear and precise design in a complex pattern. In this they are quite distinct from the first-mentioned group (Faversham, Hardingstone, Caenby, Lullingstone) in which the interlace was not complex but which throughout lacked clarity and precision. Simple knot-patterns do not occur in this group—at least not as motifs in the construction of patterns. These confused interlace-forms are in contrast to the assured elegant forms of the second group. One would hardly assume any direct connexion between the two were it not that, as has already been mentioned, relationship between the first group and the second is indicated by the narrowness of the chronological gap between them; indeed by the probability of an overlap.

The finds from Anglo-Saxon graves do not, however, reveal how the transition from the first group to the second was accomplished, especially since the available metal objects do not provide scope for the introduction of a greater repertoire of patterns. But there exists another group of monuments well fitted to supply this lack, namely the illuminated manuscripts, whose richer furnishing provides a better opportunity for a survey of the development of interlacing-forms.

The Gospel-fragment in Durham Cathedral library, A II 10, the significance of which was first recognized by Nordenfalk,⁶⁹ may be taken as the oldest surviving insular manuscript with interlaced ornament. In the decoration of the colophon on fol. 36 (PL. IX, A)⁷⁰ such ornament may be seen in four different varieties, which serve well to demonstrate the types of interlacing which predominated at the time when the manuscript was produced. In the three D-shaped figures set one above the other there are broad bands interlaced so closely that none of the ground shows through. It calls to mind the Anglo-Saxon metalwork group—Faversham, Hardingstone, Caenby—the difference between the ornament of the metalwork and that of the manuscript being the enrichment of the pattern. All the patterns in the D-shaped fields are in principle based on the use of four bands. In the lowest field there is a simple form of a four-strand interlace. In the middle field a change is effected by means of 'breaks' so that a regular four-strand interlace becomes a duplicated two-strand interlace. In the topmost field, in place of the continuous uninterrupted strands, a completely new pattern is achieved by means of an ingenious employment of the breaks system. In the loop of the D, through the use of breaks, figures based on figures-of-eight are formed and are joined to one another by couplings. In the vertical member of the D there are complementary complex patterns formed of loops set alternately to right and left, and figures-of-eight. These patterns exhibit the rich inventiveness

⁶⁸ We can cite here only the most important references: E. Lexow, 'Hovedlinjerne i entrelacornamentikkens historie,' Bergens Museums Aarsbok, 1921-22, 1-92; W. Holmqvist, *Kunstprobleme der Merowingerzeit* (1939), pp. 15 ff.; Åberg (1943), 31 ff.; *id.* (1945), 88 ff.; *id.* (1947), 65 ff., 139 ff.

⁶⁹ Nordenfalk (1947), 141-174, figs. 20, 21, 24.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, fig. 20.

which is so fascinating in such manuscripts as the Book of Durrow and the Book of Lindisfarne. Likewise, in the angles formed by the divergent springings of the D-shaped loops, the predominance of complex knot-patterns marks the beginning of maturity. Nevertheless there exists a radical distinction between the interlace of the Durham fragment and that of the later manuscripts, with the Book of Durrow making the transition between the two. The interlace in Durham A II 10 is heavy in effect, whereas the later interlace is outstanding in its lightness and elegance. The root of this difference is that the Durham interlace is composed of broad bands so closely intertwined, as has already been said, that the background is no longer visible. This has the result that the ornament is perceptible only as a whole, and that its scheme is apparent only where, as in the bottom D, there is a restful symmetrical pattern. In the middle D the appearance presented is more obscure; and in the topmost D it is quite impossible, without going to pains to analyse the windings of the strands, to comprehend the complex patterns. In contrast, the interlace-knots in the angles between the Ds are important because they are more clearly constructed; the main point contributing to this being that the strands are more loosely arranged and that, because the ground shows between them, their individual twinings may be more readily followed.

The invaluable advantage the Durham Gospel-fragment possesses is that it provides us with a pattern-book of interlace variations, although only one page with interlacing is preserved. On the other hand the still-existing imperfections appear in the lack of clarity and lucidity in the structure. It is all the more valuable, therefore, that the manuscript which follows the Durham fragment chronologically, the Book of Durrow, allows us to follow step by step the transition to the fully-developed interlace of the later manuscripts, such as Durham A II 17, the Book of Lindisfarne, and others.

In the Book of Durrow⁷¹ interlacing forms by far the greatest part of the ornament and appears in astonishing variety, not only of pattern but of types of strand employed. A form that is specially characteristic is the broad band, the closest comparison for which are the knots in the angles between the D-shaped figures in the Durham fragment. In the Book of Durrow the use of a contour-line is constant, while in the Durham fragment this feature only occurs on those bands which are painted with dark colours and is not so clearly executed; it is absent from the interlace of the D-figures. Since contour-lines contribute substantially to the clarity of interlace-patterns of very close texture, the interlacing in Durrow appears clearer to the eye, although in part the patterns are of a most complex form.

As we have been able to show, the interlace-ornament of Durham A II 10 reveals (among other things) the artistic skill of the illuminator who invented complex patterns employing the breaks system, but in that manuscript the dense intertwining of the interlace vitiated the pattern. It is true that by the introduction of contour-lines, which in the Book of Durrow are employed on all the broad ribbons, a step was taken towards greater clarity. The critical step, however, which freed interlacing from its cumbersomeness and gave it the lightness and

⁷¹ Zimmermann (1916), pls. 160-165.

elegance of the later forms, followed with the change from broad ribbons to narrow fine lines. This phase of the development may be clearly seen in the Book of Durrow. The broad ribbon, it is true, preponderates, but the narrow line has already appeared and occurs beside and in conjunction with the wide bands. The initial IN on folio 78 r (PL. IX, c), provides an example of broad and narrow interlace-bands interchanging in a continuous pattern so that one emerges from the other. The fine-lined interlace is employed on a larger scale on folio 173 v, the page with the symbol of St. Mark⁷². It is noteworthy that most of this has retained the dotting of the lighter-coloured interlace-strands which is so characteristic of Durham A II 10, but which afterwards, with isolated exceptions,⁷³ disappears. This transitional phase, so clearly visible in the Book of Durrow, may be traced once more in the manuscripts of the so-called Echternach group (Paris, Bibl. Nat. 9389), and the Maihingen Gospel-book (1.2 (lat.) 4°.2), while in the Book of Lindisfarne the fine-lined style of interlace celebrates its triumph.

This account of the development of interlacing leads to a series of questions:

1. We may first ask, *whence* came the interlacing which occurs in the manuscripts? On this, it may be taken as firmly established by the research of recent decades that interlacing as such was not an invention of the Nordic peoples, but that its roots lie in the east,⁷⁴ and that from there it came to the west. While interlace-motifs play a certain part in the art of the Roman Empire, especially in mosaic floors, the penetration of western art, under Byzantine and eastern influences, by interlace-work, some of which is markedly oriental in character, is perceptible. It occurs in Italy, in the lands north of the Alps, in the metalwork of Anglo-Saxon England and in the manuscripts of the British Isles, as well as in Scandinavia. It would be an obvious conclusion to envisage a step-by-step expansion and to explain the interlacing in the manuscripts of the Irish-Northumbrian area as a borrowing from Anglo-Saxon art—a conclusion which could be supported by certain similarities in the character of the interlace and by parallel circumstances in other art-motifs. So long as the Book of Durrow retained its standing as the oldest manuscript with rich illumination, that conclusion could be regarded as being well-founded. But the discovery of the Durham fragment has radically altered the picture. For, as Nordenfalk has put it,⁷⁵ 'it is important to stress that Insular Christian ornament at this stage of development had not yet entered into any connection with the Teutonic art of the pagan goldsmiths'. The innovations introduced with the Durham fragment into the older Irish tradition, as it is known from the Cathach of St. Columba, all lie within the sphere of manuscript art and can most readily be explained by assuming direct influence of manuscripts of the Copto-Syrian art-province. This has already been most convincingly shown by Henry⁷⁶ for the Book of Durrow

⁷² Zimmermann (1916), pl. 161 b.

⁷³ Gospel-book, Maihingen 1.2. (lat.) 4°.2, fol. 55r (Zimmermann (1916), pl. 265 a); Gospel-book, Leningrad Public Library lat. F. v. I. N. 8., fol. 78r (Zimmermann (1916), pl. 326 a).

⁷⁴ Cf. note 68.

⁷⁵ Nordenfalk (1947), p. 173.

⁷⁶ Henry (1947), p. 64 f.

and by Nordenfalk⁷⁷ for the Durham fragment itself. Certainly, the analogies which the Syrian and Coptic manuscripts provide for the interlace are more than accidental. One must infer, therefore, that the illuminator of the Durham fragment borrowed his interlace-ornament from manuscripts of one or other of these east Mediterranean art-provinces. To be sure, he did not do this by slavish copying, but rather, as we have shown above, by further creative development, which already displays certain qualities that were to be characteristic of the Celtic ornamental art of the following period. This should be sufficient also to enable us to say that the painter of the Durham fragment was a Celt, which in the circumstances might be the same as to say that he was Irish.

2. The second question which presents itself is that of the *dating* of the manuscripts, since this is of great significance for the dating of the interlace-types. Nordenfalk⁷⁸ closely relates the Durham fragment to the cross-slab at Fahan Mura,⁷⁹ for which Henry⁸⁰ proposes a date in the second half of the seventh century. Nordenfalk depends on the Greek inscription on the cross-slab, which provides, as a *terminus post quem*,⁸¹ the year 633, and argues for a date about the middle of the century.⁸² The interlace-ribbons of Fahan Mura with their clear contour-lines and the method of their knot-formation are undoubtedly closer, typologically, to the Book of Durrow than to the Durham fragment, the interlace of which, viewed as a whole, reflects an earlier phase of development. If, following Nordenfalk, one dates Fahan Mura in the middle of the century, then the Durham fragment must be referred back to the first half of the century. This raises the question of the date of the Book of Durrow. The dates previously suggested fluctuate between 650 and the eighth century.⁸³ Since its interlacing corresponds more or less to Fahan Mura it should most likely date from about the middle of the seventh century. This view is strongly supported by the animal-ornament on folio 174 v, which, as has often been pointed out,⁸⁴ is closely related to certain animal-figures in Anglo-Saxon metalwork. The parallels

⁷⁷ Nordenfalk (1947), p. 172.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 170.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, fig. 25; Henry (1947), pl. 20.

⁸⁰ Henry (1947), p. 59.

⁸¹ R. A. S. Macalister, 'The inscription on the slab at Fahan Mura,' *J. Roy. Soc. Antiq. Ireland*, LIX (1929), 89-98.

⁸² Nordenfalk (1947), p. 170. Cf. also R. B. K. Stevenson, 'The chronology and relationships of some Irish and Scottish crosses,' *J. Roy. Soc. Antiq. Ireland*, LXXXVI (1956), 93 ff. Stevenson proposed a tenth-century dating for the Donegal group (Fahan Mura, Carndonagh).

⁸³ Below, with no pretensions to completeness, are some opinions about the date of the Book of Durrow:

Salin (1904) c. 600	Mahr (1941) 650-700
Romilly Allen (1904) eighth cent.	Leask (1941) c. 650
Zimmermann (1916) c. 700 (beginning of eighth cent.)	Åberg (1943) c. 650
Lexow (1922) c. 650	Masai (1947) c. 700
Boeckler (1930) c. 700	Nordenfalk (1948) last 3rd of seventh cent.
Nordenfalk (1932) c. 650	Bieler (1948) beginning of eighth cent.
Lowe (1934) eighth cent.	Henry (1948) 670-680
Henry (1936) c. 650	Hencken (1950) late seventh cent.
Kendrick (1938) c. 650	Henry (1950) 650-700
Holmqvist (1939) c. 650	Bruce-Mitford (1956) beginning of eighth cent.
Henry (1940) after 664	Nordenfalk (1957) seventh cent.

⁸⁴ B. Salin, *Die altgermanische Thierornamentik* (1904; 2 ed. 1935), pp. 338 ff.; (Smith) *op. cit.* in note 48, p. 86; Åberg, *op. cit.* in note 51, p. 175 ff.; *id.* (1943), pp. 60 ff.; Kendrick (1938), pp. 81 ff.; *id.*, *IPEK*, ix (1934), 66 ff.; Henry (1947), p. 63; Bruce-Mitford (1956), p. 54.

already cited (p. 81)—the gold Sutton Hoo buckle,⁸⁵ the Caenby silver disc,⁸⁶ the Crundale sword-hilt⁸⁷—together with the mountings from Suffolk (Moyses's Hall Museum, Bury St. Edmunds)⁸⁸ display these relationships, in which undoubtedly the Germanic part was that of the giver, the Celtic that of the receiver; but—and this must be clearly and emphatically stated—the Anglo-Saxon animal-ornament provided only one, although admittedly the essential, stimulus. For the Durrow animals are not identical with the Anglo-Saxon animals; they have their own characteristic singularities, and these follow the animal-forms known in Celtic art, especially the dolphin, as it occurs in the Cathach of St. Columba,⁸⁹ on hanging-bowl escutcheons (Faversham,⁹⁰ Benty Grange⁹¹), and other Celtic objects.⁹² The Anglo-Saxon parallels for the animal-ornament of the Book of Durrow are not closely datable with the exception of the Sutton Hoo buckle, for which a dating, based on coin-evidence, of about 650 is most likely.⁹³ This points to a mid-seventh-century date for the Book of Durrow. The trend of the development shows that the later manuscripts, the Echternach gospel-book⁹⁴ and its related manuscripts and the Gospel-fragment in Durham, A II 17,⁹⁵ which was written in another centre, date from the second half of the seventh century—the period before the Book of Lindisfarne, whose origin about 700 will be generally acknowledged.

The conclusions of this chronological sketch, in so far as they refer to the dating of interlace-types, may thus be summarized:

A *first* phase, in the first half of the seventh century, typified by the Durham Gospel-fragment A II 10, was characterized by contacts between Ireland and Copto-Syrian culture, especially in manuscript art.⁹⁶ From this contact the art of manuscript illumination came to Ireland, having been previously known there only as the minor art of embellishing small initials. With it came one of the ornamental motifs which predominated in the east, interlacing, whether in simple form or with breaks. The *second* phase, in the middle of the seventh century, is typified by the Book of Durrow and the Fahan Mura cross-slab. The interlace is already Celticized. The wide bands, now with contour-lines, are handled with great assurance in bold patterns, and form complex intertwinings. Moreover, the fine-lined interlace, which was in a short space of time completely to replace the broad ribbon, now makes its first appearance. A *third* phase, occupying the second half of the seventh century, is typified by manuscripts such as the Echter-

⁸⁵ Cf. note 49.

⁸⁶ (Smith), *op. cit.* in note 48, fig. 102.

⁸⁷ Cf. note 52.

⁸⁸ Åberg, *op. cit.* in note 51, figs. 288-289; Leeds (1936), pl. 18 e.

⁸⁹ Nordenfalk (1947), fig. 14 a, c.

⁹⁰ Kendrick (1932), p. 168, fig. 4 c; Henry (1936), pl. 25, 2.

⁹¹ Kendrick (1938), fig. 22.

⁹² Bronze ring-headed pin decorated with two dolphins, from Arnoy, Co. Antrim. Brit. Mus. reg. no. 98.6-18.21.

⁹³ Cf. note 60.

⁹⁴ Zimmermann (1916), pls. 255-258, 260-261.

⁹⁵ Zimmermann (1916), pls. 221, 222.

⁹⁶ Henry (1947), p. 61; Nordenfalk (1947), p. 172.

nach Gospel and the Durham fragment A II 17. In it the broad-ribbon interlace still occasionally appears, although in refined form, but the emphasis has passed to the fine-lined interlace which in the *fourth* phase, about 700, typified by the Book of Lindisfarne, rules almost alone and has attained its zenith both in execution and in composition.

3. The third question raises the problem of the relative parts played by, and the mutual dependence and influence of, the Anglo-Saxon-Germanic and the Celtic developments of interlacing. Both cultural areas received interlace-patterns, which were something quite new to their artistic traditions, at about the same time—perhaps about 600. In the Germanic area, including the Anglo-Saxon, the development⁹⁷ may be followed in the numerous decorated metal objects from grave-finds. For these, thanks to the richness of the material and the presence of closed finds, we may establish a chronology which is reliable at least in its main outlines.⁹⁸ Moreover, the development of Germanic interlace-ornament has been the subject of much research, so that its type and essential character are well known, not least as a result of the thorough investigations made by Åberg.⁹⁹ As to the relationship between Anglo-Saxon and Celtic interlace-ornament, it is of significance that the Anglo-Saxon, following the general trend of the Germanic development, tends towards irregular, confused compositions. Together with the zoomorphizing tendency, which in practice means the addition of head- and foot-forms to interlace-compositions without essentially altering their character, all Germanic interlace-work has a tendency to lack of clarity, which can often lead to a confused and disordered appearance. The Faversham *phalerae*¹⁰⁰ and the Caenby discs¹⁰¹ provide a good illustration of this. The zoomorphized interlace of the Sutton Hoo gold buckle,¹⁰² apart from the ornament of the loop, also typifies this. In contrast, Celtic interlace-work from the very beginning (Durham A II 10) is strictly regular. Its scheme of composition is always discernible; there are no free ends and no unorganic dismembered strands squeezed into vacant space. All is constructed according to a well-thought-out principle. It is only to be expected that a taste which strove for this clarity of form should comparatively rapidly have superseded the broad ribbons and replaced them with its own creation, the fine-lined interlace.

How then are Anglo-Saxon and Celtic interlace-ornament interrelated?

We must first ask: Has either of these cultural areas borrowed its interlace-ornament from the other? We believe that this question can be given the answer 'no'. There remains no doubt today that Anglo-Saxon interlace came with Style II from the continent; it came, in fact, from Lombard Italy, where it had been borrowed by direct contact from Byzantine and east Mediterranean art.

⁹⁷ N. Åberg, *Die Goten und Langobarden in Italien* (1923); *id.*, *Die Franken und Westgoten in der Völkerwanderungszeit* (1922); W. Vecck, *Die Alamannen in Württemberg* (1931); J. Werner, *Münzdatierte austrasische Grabfunde* (1935); Åberg, *op. cit.* in note 51; Åberg (1943, 1945, 1947).

⁹⁸ Cf. especially Werner, *op. cit.* in note 97.

⁹⁹ Åberg (1947), pp. 65 ff.

¹⁰⁰ Cf. note 46.

¹⁰¹ Cf. note 48.

¹⁰² Cf. note 49.

Celtic interlace, on the contrary, as it appears on stone monuments and in manuscripts, probably reached the Celtic area as the result of direct contact with Mediterranean cultural areas, especially the Copto-Syrian. A directly dependent relationship between the Anglo-Saxon and the Celtic areas may therefore be ruled out.

In what way, however, could the Celtic world come in contact with Mediterranean art? Direct evidence for such contacts is, indeed, lacking, but indirect evidence is more readily forthcoming. Trade relations between Ireland and the west coast of Britain on the one hand and the Mediterranean on the other are sufficiently well attested for the fifth and sixth centuries through the numerous finds of late *terra sigillata* in the Celtic area,¹⁰³ but similar testimony is lacking for the seventh century. For this we must depend on historical accounts, which indicate a link between Ireland and the Mediterranean. We have, in the first place, the Irish mission to the continent, with its southern centre at Bobbio. Here in Italy the Irish were subject to the same conditions which brought the Lombards into contact with Mediterranean art. Thus it would be a short step to assume that the Irish monks had obtained interlace-work through Bobbio and had passed it on to the motherland, and a certain plausibility is given to this view by the close relations which Bobbio maintained with Ireland up to and into the eighth century. It remains only to estimate how far Bobbio itself fulfilled the function of an intermediary between the Mediterranean and Irish worlds. So far as the oldest surviving Bobbio manuscripts¹⁰⁴ allow one to form a conclusion, it seems that Bobbio received foreign stimuli and was ready to accept foreign influence, as the earliest examples of ornamented pages, the employment of fishes for the embellishment of initials and other traits suggest. But the necessary creative process by which the eastern prototypes were transformed by Celtic taste from Copto-Syrian to Celtic forms took place, there can be little doubt, on Celtic soil in Ireland itself. The significance of Bobbio is not diminished thereby, since it may have played the essential part of a cultural clearing-house. The fact that these relations were by way of Italy, even if Bobbio itself need have taken no permanent part in them, is a point whose significance Åberg¹⁰⁵ has recognized. The arrival of Columbanus in Italy in the year 613 and the foundation of Bobbio in 614 coincide with two very important historical events which are relevant to the understanding of the new connexions between the Celtic world and the Mediterranean. The first event is the shift, beginning about 600, of the main trade-route for the transfer of goods¹⁰⁶ from the east to the lands north of the Alps from the line Mediterranean ports-Marseilles-Gaul to the line Northern Italy-Alps-Rhine.¹⁰⁷ The second was Islam's conquest of the east Mediterranean area—Syria in 612; Palestine in 614; Egypt in 617—and the consequent flow of

¹⁰³ C. A. Raleigh Radford, 'Imported pottery found at Tintagel, Cornwall,' in *Dark-Age Britain* (ed. D. B. Harden, 1956), pp. 59-70, and reff. *ad loc.*,

¹⁰⁴ Françoise Henry, 'Les débuts de la miniature irlandaise,' *Gazette des Beaux-Arts*, xxxvii (1950), 5-34.

¹⁰⁵ Åberg (1945), p. 76.

¹⁰⁶ Werner, *op. cit.* in note 97, pp. 42 ff.

¹⁰⁷ Åberg (1947), pp. 19 ff., 28 ff., 31; H. Jankuhn, 'Der fränkisch-friesische Handel zur Ostsee im frühen Mittelalter,' *Vierteljahrschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte*, xl (1953), 204 ff.

displaced monks and artists who found refuge in Italy and other parts of the western world. It goes without saying that Italy was not the only point of entry¹⁰⁸ for influences from the east. The Marseilles route certainly continued to play a certain part,¹⁰⁹ and in the connexions between the Celtic world and the Mediterranean the route Narbonne-Bordeaux-Ireland, so important in the fifth and sixth centuries, will have continued in use to some extent. Direct contacts between Ireland and Egypt also existed.¹¹⁰ There are not lacking possibilities, therefore, for contact by various routes between the Irish monasteries and the east Mediterranean area. But for all that, the main centre of these communications will have been in Italy. That the entry of the Irish mission into Italy was in fact one of the prerequisites for the rise of Irish art in the seventh century is made likely by the fact that the first examples of new style-traits and motifs from the east are later in time than the arrival of Columbanus in Italy. If—taking the uncertainty of dating into the reckoning—the Fahan Mura slab, as expounded above, is to be dated after 633, the Durham fragment A II 10 in the second quarter, and the Book of Durrow in the middle of the seventh century, then the development revealed in these monuments is in full chronological agreement with the view that communications were established through the foundation of Bobbio.

Let us return to the interlacing in the Celtic and Anglo-Saxon cultural provinces. As has already been explained, there exists between the related interlace-forms of seventh-century Anglo-Saxon art, as it occurs on metalwork from burial-deposits, and of Irish art, as it occurs on the Irish monuments, a fundamental distinction which cannot be explained as being due to the different media employed, but must be a result of the different endowment and spirit of the artists—the difference between Celtic and Anglo-Saxon taste. We can investigate the adaptation, with basically different methods, of the same Mediterranean style by the two art-provinces.

This brings us back to the question of the ultimate dependence of one group on the other. That the Anglo-Saxons received their interlace-work from the continent—that is, from the related Germanic tribes there—is today beyond question.¹¹¹ We know the routes by which these motifs reached Germanic art, and that the principal way was through Lombard Italy, over the Alps, and along the Rhine. In contrast, the routes of the Irish missionaries and of communications between the monasteries are not so well known. As has already been mentioned, communications by way of Gaul played a certain part, as well as the Alpine-Rhine route. The difference between Celtic and Germanic interlace supports the view that the two provinces independently drew upon Mediterranean sources—the Anglo-Saxons clearly also on nearer continental sources. So long as a detailed chronology is lacking for the Anglo-Saxon grave-finds, only an approximate estimate can be made of the date at which interlacing arrived. Judging by the

¹⁰⁸ Åberg (1947), p. 39.

¹⁰⁹ Åberg (1947), p. 20; Holmqvist, *op. cit.* in note 68, p. 97.

¹¹⁰ A. Kingsley-Porter, 'An Egyptian legend in Ireland,' *Marburger Jahrbuch für Kunstwissenschaft*, v (1929), 1 ff.; *id.*, *The Crosses and Culture of Ireland* (1931), p. 86 f.; Åberg (1943), p. 10; Henry, *op. cit.* in note 104, p. 30.

¹¹¹ Salin, *op. cit.* in note 84, pp. 326 ff.; Åberg (1943), pp. 57 ff.; Åberg (1947), pp. 65 ff.

continental development, it would probably be right to suggest a date about 600. Thus it seems that interlacing came to England rather earlier than it came to the Celtic area—to Ireland. Nonetheless, it seems to me, for the reasons already stated, that a borrowing of Celtic interlace from the Anglo-Saxons, or through the medium of the Anglo-Saxons, is most unlikely, even if there were already occasional contacts between the two areas before the beginning of the Irish mission to the Anglo-Saxons. An essential support for the view here expressed is provided by the often-cited Durham fragment A II 10 and by the cross-slabs of Fahan Mura and Cardonagh, of which Nordenfalk expressly affirms that they belong to a phase of style when there was as yet no contact between Christian Celtic and heathen Germanic art. 'The Irish cross-stones,' he states, 'and the Durham manuscript agree in that neither yet knows the developed trumpet-pattern, geometric goldsmith fretworks or Nordic animal-ornament.'¹¹² Since Nordenfalk is of the opinion that the interlace-work of the Irish group of monuments was borrowed from manuscripts of the Copto-Syrian area, he excludes, for it also, the idea of an Anglo-Saxon origin or a borrowing through the medium of the Anglo-Saxons.¹¹³

On the other hand, there were undoubtedly influences proceeding in the opposite direction—from Irish interlacing to Anglo-Saxon art—even if they are known from but a few examples. The difficulty of establishing this lies in the ending of the custom of depositing grave-goods and the resulting lack of pertinent finds. The few metal objects betraying the influence of Celtic interlacing belong without exception to grave-goods which were among the very latest to be deposited in Anglo-Saxon burials.

Celtic influence in interlacing was first recognized by Åberg on the loop of the great gold buckle from Sutton Hoo.¹¹⁴ The type which occurs here is the fine-lined interlace already described, zoomorphized in accordance with Germanic custom but organized in a regular design—the so-called 'knitting-stitch', a pattern which is found also on the rim-mounting of a drinking-cup from the Farthing Down¹¹⁵ cemetery, again with an animal-head, but with broader ribbons, closer to the usual Anglo-Saxon type. In the other instances of the occurrence of fine-lined interlace in Anglo-Saxon art, those on the finds from Crundale Down and Wye Down, described in more detail above, Celtic influence has already been able to produce a more marked effect.

I am aware of the objection which might be raised to my thesis: that the argument here developed for Celtic influence on Sutton Hoo, Crundale and Wye Down may not represent the historical truth, but that on the contrary it is Irish art which displays Anglo-Saxon influence, since this must be true of animal-ornament (p. 87 f.) and other motifs such as the imitation of cloisonné work¹¹⁶ in

¹¹² Nordenfalk (1947), p. 173.

¹¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 172.

¹¹⁴ Åberg (1943), p. 59: 'On the other hand, the interlace on the hoop of the buckle has apparently a more insular tendency and might therefore conceivably be linked up with Irish quarters. But the execution is nerveless and appears rather like the work of a beginner in comparison with an interlace such as is found in the Book of Durrow.' See also Åberg (1947), p. 152.

¹¹⁵ Cf. note 54.

¹¹⁶ Salin, *op. cit.* in note 84, p. 338, figs. 718-720.

the Book of Durrow. The flow of art-influences in this period of the height of Irish missionary activity in Anglo-Saxon England, 635-664, was to and fro, so that mutual influence is quite likely. But we possess incontrovertible evidence that not only Irish-Celtic motifs but Celtic techniques, too, were borrowed. This is to be seen in the employment of millefiori and its imitation by Anglo-Saxon craftsmen in the Sutton Hoo find.¹¹⁷ Besides garnet-ornament, blue, white and red millefiori is employed on the purse, the clasps and the pyramids. Millefiori technique was for long foreign to Anglo-Saxon art. Previously, in the lands north of the Alps, it is known in the early middle ages only from Ireland, where raw materials, workshops, and numerous traces of working have been found.¹¹⁸ In Sutton Hoo the appearance of this new technique is 'incontrovertible evidence that Irish millefiori . . . had for the first time been received in Anglo-Saxon Art'.¹¹⁹ It is certainly no coincidence that the first fine-lined interlace on an Anglo-Saxon find also occurs on one of the splendid objects from Sutton Hoo and thereby supports the thesis of Irish-Celtic influence.

Northumbria has usually been assumed to be the contact-zone in which this interdependence of Irish and Anglo-Saxon art came into being, because the main centre of gravity of the Irish mission was here and a considerable number of the illuminated manuscripts is associated with this area.¹²⁰ The Sutton Hoo find, however, shows that southern England was not untouched by this development. In this connexion Bruce-Mitford¹²¹ has pointed out that in the year 635 the Irish missionary St. Furseay came to East Anglia, that he was received with honour by the king and founded a monastery in Burgh Castle, near Yarmouth, which was endowed with buildings and gifts by king Anna (d. 654), for whom, possibly, the Sutton Hoo cenotaph was set up. In further development of this idea Henry¹²² has made the suggestion that the Sutton Hoo hanging-bowls could have been made in this Irish monastery in East Anglia by the monks, or at least that they may well have been brought there from Ireland. To explain the occurrence of millefiori in what is certainly Anglo-Saxon work she suggests that the Anglo-Saxon goldsmiths may have become acquainted with this technique in Burgh Castle. There existed, at any rate, direct relations between Ireland and East Anglia and its royal house, in the light of which the significance of the archaeological connexions here examined becomes clearer.

We must draw attention again to the fact that the archaeological evidence shows quite clearly that the interrelationship of Irish and Anglo-Saxon art began in the middle of the seventh century. The years 635-664 have already been

¹¹⁷ Bruce-Mitford (1956), p. 53.

¹¹⁸ S. P. O'Riordain, 'The Excavation of a large earthen ring-fort, Garranes, Co. Cork,' *Proc. Roy. Irish Acad.*, XLVII (Sect. C, no. 2, 1942), 118 ff.; Hencken, *Lagore (op. cit. in note 41)*, p. 9; Henry (1956), p. 76 f.

¹¹⁹ Åberg (1943), p. 56. Champlevé enamel, according to Åberg, is not present on the objects in question. Cf. Bruce-Mitford (1956), p. 59, note 3. The blue and white millefiori was surely imported as raw material, whilst the red and white millefiori represents an Anglo-Saxon imitation, the millefiori effect being achieved by sealing a suitable piece of garnet in a white glass mass.

¹²⁰ Nordenfalk (1947), pp. 173-174.

¹²¹ Bruce-Mitford, 'The Sutton Hoo Ship-Burial, Recent theories and some comments on general interpretation', *Proc. Suffolk Inst. Arch.*, xxv (1949), 26; Åberg (1943), p. 8.

¹²² Henry (1956), p. 81 f.

specified for this period; the year of the beginning of the Irish mission to Northumbria on the one hand, and the year of the synod of Whitby on the other. The Irish mission was at its height within this period, but its influence and significance lasted beyond the synod of Whitby. The archaeological evidence further indicates that this influence was also felt outside Northumbria, in other parts of England: this fact has been clearly demonstrated, for the first time, by the Sutton Hoo find.

* * * * *

In the foregoing discussion of the origin and emergence of the fine-lined type of interlacing, the pattern of two alternating S-shaped loops employed on the Bekesbourne mounting has so far not been examined in detail. Similar interlace-patterns made up of alternating S-shaped loops are not foreign to insular art, and their distribution is of special significance. Romily Allen¹²³ in his analysis of interlace-patterns has assembled the forms based on S-loops and has recorded their occurrence on the monuments. The simplest form, as it is illustrated in his no. 544, is that which occurs at Bekesbourne. There are also more complex forms in which the S-form is enriched by further windings. These, however, appear only in manuscripts, where more play can be allowed to linear patterns than is convenient on metal objects or stone monuments. As the earliest example, the complex pattern of broad ribbons (no. 545) in the Book of Durrow, folio 245 v (PL. IX, B),¹²⁴ may be regarded as valuable in that it shows that by the date of the production of the manuscript (for which we have, above, proposed the middle of the seventh century) patterns of this type belonged to the established repertory. While the complex pattern appears again only in the Book of Kells and in the St. Gall gospel-book, the simpler form, as at Bekesbourne, is more often found. The Book of Lindisfarne and the Tara brooch may be taken to be the examples next in chronological order. The ornament of the Book of Lindisfarne is certainly not Anglo-Saxon but Celtic, notwithstanding all arguments to the contrary. The value of Brøndsted's observations on this controversial point remains undiminished today.¹²⁵ The Tara brooch is the complement in metal of the Book of Lindisfarne, and its date should be the same as that of the manuscript, that is, about 700. That the Tara brooch is an Irish product is incontrovertible, since the brooch-type is Celtic and typically Irish, and it bears ornament which is

¹²³ J. Romilly Allen, *The Early Christian Monuments of Scotland* (1903), pp. 213 ff., figs. 544-546.

¹²⁴ Zimmermann (1916), pl. 261 a.

¹²⁵ Brøndsted, *op. cit.* in note 56, p. 92: 'It (*sc.* the Book of Lindisfarne) is, however, a purely Irish work in its ornamentation. . . I see nothing which entitles us to call the Book of Lindisfarne Northumbrian. So far as I can see, this merely causes a confusion in terminology. The whole animal and line ornamentation in the Book of Lindisfarne is as truly and characteristically Irish as anything can be. . . The latter (Book of Lind.) has nothing else in common with the art of the North of England but its provenance. The same distinguished author (Baldwin Brown, *The Arts in Early England*, vol. v, p. 377) talks of the "deeprooted superstition that anything conspicuously good in art that is found in Britain must in some way or another have come from abroad". But it is no improvement on this for one prejudice to be replaced by another and patriotic considerations are rarely beneficial in serious research. That "everything good in England is autochthonous and originally English" might be just as dangerous a proposition as the reverse. Here as often elsewhere the truth lies betwixt and between: the independent resolution of foreign material into a national style.' See also, recently, C. Nordenfalk, *Das frühe Mittelalter* (1957), p. 124: 'Der Rückzug der irischen Kirche nach der Synode von Whitby führte nur langsam zu einer Schwächung ihrer künstlerischen Position in Nordengland; auch unter englischer Leitung wurde auf Lindisfarne "irisch" illuminiert.'

certainly identical with that of the Book of Lindisfarne. This makes it quite clear that this style was distributed in Ireland and in the Irish monastic foundations in Northumbria. The S-formed interlace appears again in the Ardagh chalice and on a series of penannular brooches from Ireland and Scotland, as well as in the stone-carving of Ireland, south Wales and western Scotland. Romilly Allen¹²⁶ has already called attention to the peculiarities of the distribution of this pattern:

‘The geographical distribution of the S-shaped knot is remarkable. Although common in Ireland, S. Wales and the West of Scotland, it is almost entirely absent in other parts of Great Britain. It occurs in the MSS. and on the metalwork of the best period A.D. 700-750.’

Romilly Allen knew only one example in English stone-carving—a cross-shaft from Crowle, Lincs., which, according to W. G. Collingwood,¹²⁷ is in the style of the late tenth century. Since interlacing is so common in northern English stone-carving the absence of this motif is in fact striking. But it occurs in the manuscripts which in all likelihood are to be localized in Canterbury, the Psalter Cotton Vespasian A 1 and the Codex Aureus in Stockholm (Royal Libr. A 735). These manuscripts, however, in the ornament of their initials and in their interlacing, are under strong Irish-Northumbrian influence.¹²⁸ The Psalter Vesp. A 1 is estimated to be the oldest¹²⁹ of the Canterbury manuscripts and to date from the second quarter of the eighth century, while the Codex Aureus would belong to sometime after the middle of the century. Interlacing with S-knots, therefore, if we except the Canterbury manuscripts, is strikingly limited to the Celtic area, including the area of the Irish-Celtic mission. Throughout that area, wherever Irish influence is especially manifest, as in south Wales and the west of Scotland, the S-formed interlace also occurs. We may therefore consider it to be a motif which is characteristic of Irish art.

In possessing this motif, therefore, the hanging-bowl fragments from Bekesbourne display a striking connexion with the Irish art-province. Before following this train of ideas, however, let us examine the wider distribution of the S-shaped knot.

It is a very interesting fact that fine-lined interlacing with S-knots, which has its home in the Irish-Celtic art-province of the British Isles but is foreign to the Anglo-Saxon area, was adopted eagerly in Scandinavia. There it occurs not only as an S-formed interlace, but also simply as a fine-lined interlace with various patterns among which the S-knot plays a not insignificant part. Olsén¹³⁰ has paid special attention to the occurrence of this interlace in the Vendel culture. It appears in the so-called Vendel Style C, where it sheds the broad, always zoomorphic interlace-band of Vendel Style B and appears alone as well, unconnected with animal-ornament. The S-formed pattern appears in this guise

¹²⁶ Romilly Allen, *op. cit.* in note 123, p. 214.

¹²⁷ Collingwood, *op. cit.* in note 53, p. 135.

¹²⁸ C. Nordenfalk, *op. cit.* in note 125, p. 124.

¹²⁹ David H. Wright, *The Vespasian Psalter and the Eighth Century Renaissance* (Thesis submitted to Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1956), pp. 193-194 of manuscript.

¹³⁰ P. Olsén, *Die Saxe von Valsgärde* (1945), pp. 92 ff., fig. 72.

on the strap-mounting from Vendel I,¹³¹ on the sword from Aura in Finland,¹³² and on the picture-stones of Group C in Gotland.¹³³ The fine-lined interlace appears so suddenly in the Nordic area that it does not seem to have originated there. In Vendel I, which can be dated to about the end of the seventh century,¹³⁴ it is fully developed, while in Vendel XII, about 650, it 'is still quite unknown'. The earliest occurrence, according to Olsén, is in Vendel VII, which is dated between XII and I, i.e. in the second half of the seventh century. Narrow-lined interlacing is comparatively widely distributed in Nordic art. As a result of recent researches by Örsnes-Christensen¹³⁵ we can distinguish between an east- and a south-Scandinavian group. Scandinavian research has unanimously explained the rise of these style-groups as the result of influences from western cultural areas, especially the British Isles. The term 'Anglo-Irish'¹³⁶ which is often used here should be taken as describing the whole area in which the prototypes occur. The Scandinavian writers draw their comparisons essentially from the manuscripts of the insular art-province, in which fine-lined interlacing finds its chief employment. These manuscripts, as we have seen above, have to do with a large area of the British Isles, namely, Ireland, Northumbria, and southern England (Canterbury). Olsén¹³⁷ even goes so far, in referring to the Canterbury group, as to postulate a seventh-century southern English manuscript-group with fine-lined interlacing, which he regards as the prototypes of the Scandinavian Style C. This attempt must be viewed as misguided. We possess no southern English (Canterbury) manuscripts of the seventh century. Were there such, they would certainly be in a style corresponding very closely to that of the Codex Amiatinus, i.e. in an 'Italo-Saxon' style. However, when there is little to go on, one erroneous speculation should not be posed against another. We know, however, that the Canterbury manuscripts, the earliest of which, the Psalter Cotton Vespasian A 1, dates from the second quarter of the eighth century, are strongly influenced in their initial-ornaments and in their interlacing by the 'Hiberno-Saxon' manuscripts,¹³⁸ so that the group in this respect cannot come into question as prototypes for the Scandinavian Style C. Lexow,¹³⁹ and more recently Örsnes-Christensen,¹⁴⁰ have shown that the parallels between the Scandinavian patterns and the insular manuscripts are already to be found in the Book of Durrow. As we have tried to show above, the development of fine-lined interlace with knot-patterns or 'breaks' took place in *Irish-Celtic* art, from which it was first borrowed by the Anglo-Saxon art-province about 650 (the Sutton Hoo gold buckle), and appears

¹³¹ P. Olsén, *Die Saxe von Valsgärde* (1945), p. 93, fig. 316.

¹³² *Ibid.*, fig. 326; H. Salmo, 'Ein Reitergrab der Merowingerzeit auf dem Pappilanmäki im Kirchspiel Eura,' *Suomen Museo* XLVII (1940), figs. 2-3.

¹³³ S. Lindqvist, *Gotlands Bildsteine*, I (1941), figs. 78, 96, 116, etc.

¹³⁴ Åberg, 'Vendeltida förbindelser med fastlandsk-germanska och insulära kretsar,' *Forvännen*, 1948, p. 113; Olsén, *op. cit.* in note 130, p. 113; about 700.

¹³⁵ Mogens Örsnes-Christensen, 'Kyndby. Ein seeländischer Grabplatz aus dem 7.-8. Jahrhundert nach Chr.,' *Acta Archaeologica*, xxvi (1956), 110 ff., esp. p. 125.

¹³⁶ Olsén, *op. cit.* in note 130, p. 95 f.; Örsnes-Christensen, *op. cit.* in note 135, p. 125.

¹³⁷ Olsén, *op. cit.* in note 130, pp. 99 ff.

¹³⁸ Cf. note 128.

¹³⁹ Lexow, *op. cit.* in note 68, p. 66.

¹⁴⁰ Örsnes-Christensen, *op. cit.* in note 135, p. 125.

there in other finds whose date cannot be absolutely fixed (Crundale, Wye Down). I believe it to be possible to show also that the further extension of fine-lined interlacing is a borrowing from Irish-Celtic art. Thus, if Anglo-Saxon objects were indeed the prototypes for the Scandinavian Style C, they played the part of intermediaries. Since Ireland occupied a paramount position in the seventh century as a centre of education for the Anglo-Saxons and other nations, we need not be surprised if such strong impulses in the field of ornament also emanated from there. It is surely not by chance that Style C in Scandinavia begins in a period when the development of Irish art in the second half of the seventh century had attained its highest point. Åberg¹⁴¹ has examined the question of the arrival of western impulses in the Vendel culture and leaves no doubt of the importance of Ireland.

If after considering the more distant effects of Irish-Celtic interlacing we return to the Bekesbourne bowl, the point already established must be noted, namely, that fine-lined interlacing with S-knots indicates the Celtic area. This permits of a dating of a sort for the Bekesbourne bowl, since such a form is impossible before the middle of the seventh century and is unlikely to be earlier than the second half of the century. It provides, of course, merely a *terminus post quem* and in no way excludes the possibility of an eighth century date. On the other hand the escutcheons, as we were able to show above, while they represent a development more advanced than that of the hanging-bowls from Anglo-Saxon graves, can yet be seen to be in a continuous line of development from them, so that they should not be set too far apart in time. The hanging-bowls from Anglo-Saxon graves belong essentially to the first half of the seventh century, at least in so far as a dating from closed grave-groups is possible, so that from this viewpoint also a date in the second half of the seventh century for the Bekesbourne bowl seems likely to be valid.

It is much more difficult to try to determine where the Bekesbourne bowl was made. There we enter upon a field which is highly controversial and must openly state that no satisfactory solution to the problem has yet been found.

The following points must be laid down as firmly-based premisses:

1. By far the majority of all the known hanging-bowls, including fragments, were found in the Anglo-Saxon area, a considerable number of them in Anglo-Saxon graves. Hanging-bowls are almost entirely absent from those areas of Britain which did not come under Anglo-Saxon rule—those which remained British.
2. The technique of the ornament of the hanging-bowls—enamel and mille-fiori—is not Anglo-Saxon but Celtic.
3. The ornament of the hanging-bowls is likewise not Anglo-Saxon but Celtic.

On the basis of these generally acknowledged facts various attempts¹⁴² have

¹⁴¹ Åberg, *op. cit.* in note 134, pp. 111-122.

¹⁴² Kendrick (1932), 161 ff.; A. W. Clapham, *Antiquity*, VIII (1934), 43 ff.; E. T. Leeds, *Celtic Ornament in the British Isles down to A.D. 700* (1933), pp. 144 ff.; *id.* (1936), pp. 3 ff.; Henry (1936), pp. 209-246; Kilbride Jones, *op. cit.* in note 39, pp. 206-247; Henry (1956), pp. 79 ff.

been made to solve the problem. All agree that the possibility that the bowls were manufactured in Anglo-Saxon workshops need not be considered and that the hanging-bowls could have had their origin only in a 'Celtic milieu'.

It has been believed that the distribution of the hanging-bowls in Anglo-Saxon graves could be explained on the grounds that they found their way to the Anglo-Saxons as loot from Anglo-Saxon raids into the British areas of the country. The hanging-bowls would, according to this view, be products of the British population, whose artistic activity was not affected by the Anglo-Saxon invasion. Thus, the hanging-bowls will have come from a British art-province, continuing La Tène traditions, which retained its independence beside the Anglo-Saxon art-province dominating the east of the country. A second hypothesis, not differing in essentials from the first, is that the hanging-bowls were not necessarily loot from the west of the country, but that they could have originated in the Anglo-Saxon area, in the workshops of the native British people who retained their individuality under Anglo-Saxon rule. Both hypotheses have the same basic theme, that the hanging-bowls originated in British workshops, whether in 'Free Britannia' in the west, or in the area of Anglo-Saxon overlordship.

Now there are serious objections to these attempts at explanation. The weightiest is that Celtic art, in a taste conforming to La Tène tradition, had not lived on in Britain beyond the second century A.D. The few exceptions do not redress the balance.¹⁴³ Celtic (La Tène) art in Britain was overwhelmed by the provincial-Roman style which, from the third century on, dominated the Roman-occupied parts of the island. If the hanging-bowls, as the first hypothesis suggests, were produced in west Britain in the sixth and seventh centuries, one must postulate for this area a sudden revival of a long-vanished style—an extremely unlikely occurrence from both the archaeological and the art-historical points of view. Had such a revival occurred some evidence of it and of where it took place must have emerged. Nor will the fact that the Britons, following Christian custom, did not deposit grave-goods explain this absence of material and justify the theory of a revival of Celtic (La Tène) art, since in Ireland, where grave-goods are likewise unknown, great numbers of dress-ornaments (penannular brooches, hand-pins, lachets and pins) are found, which give clear evidence of the style dominant in Ireland. The early Anglo-Saxon cemeteries show that in fact the new masters of the land did not totally reject the native art. They certainly acquired the products of the native workshops; but these were objects in the provincial Romano-British style,¹⁴⁴ not in La Tène tradition. Finally, if one were

¹⁴³ R. E. M. Wheeler, 'The Paradox in Celtic Art,' *Antiquity*, vi (1932), 293: 'We are faced then, with two individual phases of art which are at the same time linked by an essentially similar informing spirit and divided by a hiatus of three centuries of time. Such a hiatus is rare in the history of a single school of art, and some special explanation must be sought. It is not, in England at least, due to any lack of archaeological material within the missing centuries. Dated material of the third and fourth centuries, if not of the fifth, is abundant, and its negative evidence on this point is finite. A few scattered links may accumulate as time goes on: we have the semi-Celtic triskele on the Kyngadle patera, found with late third-century coins, and a bronze Celtic triskele from a fourth-century stratum at Verulamium. But strays such as these merely emphasize the barrenness of the land. There is in England a definite hiatus of three centuries in the history of Celtic art, nor is there at present any satisfactory evidence for this period either from Scotland or from Ireland.'

¹⁴⁴ E.g. the quoit-brooches, buckles and mounts illustrated by Leeds (1936), pls. 2-3.

to take the view that these Romano-Britons working in the Anglo-Saxon area returned in the sixth and seventh centuries to their Celtic traditions and produced hanging-bowls in the developed-trumpet-pattern style, then some other remains of this art, apart from the hanging-bowls, should surely have been found. But no such remains are found. One can draw but one conclusion: the hanging-bowls are a foreign element in the Anglo-Saxon area.

Where, then, can the hanging-bowls have been made, and how did they reach Anglo-Saxon England? It is more convenient to examine the second question first. A widely-held view, mentioned above, sees the hanging-bowls as loot.¹⁴⁵ This opinion is presumably suggested by the analogy of the objects of insular provenience in the Viking graves of Norway where,¹⁴⁶ *inter alia*, large numbers of hanging-bowls belonging to the time of the Viking raids and of a later type than that dealt with here are found. The hanging-bowls found in Anglo-Saxon graves of the first half of the seventh century can be explained as loot only if their place of origin was the British part of the island, bordering on the Anglo-Saxon. Up to now, however, as we know, all evidence for this is lacking, so the idea of loot must be abandoned. The solution to the problem can probably be found by considering another group of objects which have even been found together with hanging-bowls, namely, the 'Coptic' bowls.¹⁴⁷ Nobody has ever suggested that these vessels were obtained as loot. Today, much more is known of the ways in which these bowls came from the Mediterranean to England, and there is no doubt that they came as articles of trade. We know from the grave-goods that the Anglo-Saxons were very fond of bronze vessels, and the view that they obtained by way of trade not only the Coptic bronze dishes, rare and costly as they certainly were, but also the hanging-bowls, seems very much to the point here, especially since we know that the hanging-bowls did not necessarily serve as lamps but were primarily of daily use.¹⁴⁸

With this, however, the question of the place of origin of the hanging-bowls becomes especially pressing. In setting forth the premisses for discussion (p. 97) I have stressed that the ornamental techniques, enamel and millefiori, as well as the ornament itself, are Celtic. As a result of the researches of the past twenty-five years, enamelling and millefiori-working, two prominent characteristics of the hanging-bowls, are now known to have been practised in Ireland since the fifth century, at least. The excavations at Garranes,¹⁴⁹ Ballycatteen,¹⁵⁰ Garryduff,¹⁵¹

¹⁴⁵ Kendrick (1932), p. 182; Bruce-Mitford (1956), p. 24, note 1; Henry (1936), p. 224 f.

¹⁴⁶ Shetelig/Petersen, *op. cit.* in note 37, pp. 83-111.

¹⁴⁷ R. S. Conway, *Proc. Soc. Ant. London*, xxx (1918), 63; Åberg, *op. cit.* in note 51, pp. 102 ff.; J. Werner, 'Italisches und koptisches Bronzegefäß des 6. und 7. Jahrhunderts nordwärts der Alpen,' *Mnemosynon Theodor Wiegand* (1938), pp. 74-86; J. Strzygowski, *Koptische Kunst* (Cat. Mus. Cairo, 1904); O. Wulff, *Altchristliche und mittelalterliche, byzantin. und ital. Bildwerke I* (1909); O. M. Dalton, *Catalogue of Early Christian Antiquities in the Brit. Mus.* (1901); P. de Palol Salellas, *Bronces hispanovisigodos de origen mediterráneo*, I. *Jarritos y palenas litúrgicos* (1950, 1952).

¹⁴⁸ Cf. note 14.

¹⁴⁹ S. P. O'Riordain, *op. cit.* in note 118, pp. 77-150.

¹⁵⁰ S. P. O'Riordain and P. J. Hartnett, 'The Excavation of Ballycatteen Fort, Co. Cork,' *Proc. Roy. Irish Acad.*, XLIX (Sect. C, no. 1, 1943), 1-43.

¹⁵¹ M. J. O'Kelly, 'Excavation of a ring-fort at Garryduff, Co. Cork,' *Antiquity*, xx (1946), 122-126.

Lagore,¹⁵² Carraig Aille,¹⁵³ Cahercommaun,¹⁵⁴ Letterkeen,¹⁵⁵ and Ballinderry I¹⁵⁶ and II¹⁵⁷ have made it known that these techniques were commonly practised over a wide area in Ireland from the fifth century onwards into the middle ages. These results, however, were not available when Kendrick¹⁵⁸ published his views on the hanging-bowls in the year 1932; when Clapham¹⁵⁹ sought the origins of Hiberno-Saxon art in 1934; or when Wheeler,¹⁶⁰ whom we have already quoted, wrote: 'There is in England a definite hiatus of three centuries in the history of Celtic art, nor is there at present any satisfactory evidence for this period either from Scotland or from Ireland.' Today there can be no more talk of a hiatus in the Celtic art of Ireland. For what has been revealed in the meantime about bronze-founding and enamel-, millefiori- and glass-manufacture, is valid also for 'Celtic' ornament. As the Garranes button¹⁶¹ shows, Celtic motifs in the trumpet style were employed in Ireland in the fifth and sixth centuries, as were the fine spiral-patterns to which the great number of penannular brooches,¹⁶² latches,¹⁶³ hand-pins¹⁶⁴ and pins¹⁶⁵ bears witness. The distribution of finds of these objects, designed as they were for a specific form of dress, will correspond with the area of production.

'The fat patterns of the Winchester type'¹⁶⁶ seem to be represented in Ireland to a lesser extent, and Henry has referred to the Irish manuscripts as proof of their occurrence. It is true that these manuscripts, the earliest of which is the Book of Durrow, about 650, are later in date than the hanging-bowls with developed trumpet-patterns which, so far as they are datable, came into Anglo-Saxon graves in the first half of the seventh century. Trumpet-patterns are not unknown in Ireland. The 'scratcher'¹⁶⁷ in the Museum in Dublin already has a pattern of the trumpet-type, which appears in much finer and better execution on the Garranes button, where it differs from the hanging-bowl escutcheons of the developed-trumpet-pattern series only in that the multi-spin whirls are

¹⁵² H. Hencken, *op. cit.* in note 41, pp. 1-247.

¹⁵³ S. P. O'Riordain, 'Lough Gur excavations: Carraig Aille and the "Spectacles",' *Proc. Roy. Irish Acad.*, LII (Sect. C, no. 3, 1949), 39-111.

¹⁵⁴ H. O'Neill Hencken, *Cahercommaun: a stone fort in County Clare* (Extra volume of the Roy. Soc. Antiq. Ireland for 1938).

¹⁵⁵ S. P. O'Riordain and Máire MacDermott, 'The Excavation of a ring-fort at Letterkeen, Co. Mayo,' *Proc. Roy. Irish Acad.*, LIV (Sect. C, no. 4, 1952), 89-119.

¹⁵⁶ Hencken, *op. cit.* in note 38, pp. 103-239.

¹⁵⁷ H. O'Neill Hencken, 'Ballinderry Crannog No. 2,' *Proc. Roy. Irish Acad.*, XLVII (Sect. C, no. 1, 1942), 1-76.

¹⁵⁸ Kendrick (1932).

¹⁵⁹ Clapham, *op. cit.* in note 142.

¹⁶⁰ Wheeler, *loc. cit.* in note 143.

¹⁶¹ O'Riordain, *op. cit.* in note 118, pp. 89 ff., fig. 3, pl. 23, 1.

¹⁶² R. A. Smith, 'Irish brooches of five centuries,' *Archaeologia*, LXXV (1914), 223 ff.; H. E. Kilbride Jones, 'The evolution of penannular brooches with zoomorphic terminals in Great Britain and Ireland,' *Proc. Roy. Irish Acad.*, XLIII (Sect. C, no. 13, 1937), 413 ff.

¹⁶³ R. A. Smith, *op. cit.* in note 42, pp. 120-131.

¹⁶⁴ R. A. Smith, 'The evolution of the hand-pin in Great Britain and Ireland,' *Opuscula Archaeologica Oscari Montelio dicata* (1913), pp. 281-290.

¹⁶⁵ E. C. R. Armstrong, 'Irish bronze pins of the Christian period,' *Archaeologia*, LXXII (1921-22), 71-86.

¹⁶⁶ Henry (1936), p. 224.

¹⁶⁷ *Christian Art in Ancient Ireland*, I (1932), pl. 41,5; Henry (1936), pl. 35,4.

lacking. The Garranes button,¹⁶⁸ however, is older, dating from about 500.¹⁶⁹ Multi-spin whirls are also at home in Ireland, occurring on the penannular brooches, already mentioned, of which one group¹⁷⁰ displays these tightly-coiled spirals in superlative quality. The union of trumpets and tightly-rolled spirals—the occurrence which led to the developed-trumpet-pattern and ultimately to the developed art of the seventh century—seems, so far as can be gathered from the Irish finds, to have been effected only at a comparatively late date. The developed trumpet-pattern must therefore be viewed, as most researchers have done, as a creation pertaining to the Celtic renaissance: the expression ‘revival’, which is not in accordance with the historical facts, should be avoided. But in Ireland we can find only the prototypes of the developed-trumpet-pattern. When and how the pattern itself came into being is not clear in the present state of research, and we cannot make the statement that it came into being in Ireland, even if the prototypes, as we have seen, occur there and nowhere else. The developed-trumpet-pattern is suddenly in existence in the first half of the seventh century—this dating is assured by the hanging-bowls in Anglo-Saxon graves—but we cannot follow the course of development which led to it. From this it is not possible to identify the area in which the developed-trumpet-pattern originated and in which the hanging-bowls in developed-trumpet-pattern style were produced.

So long as research depends on finds from the excavation of dwelling-sites or on finds of accidental character, as the absence of grave-goods makes inevitable in Ireland, the number of ornamented objects will always remain small in comparison with the number from areas where grave-deposits were the rule. When the evidence of the finds is so different in character, one should draw conclusions neither from the quantitative nor from the geographical distribution. The frequency of workshop-finds, however, speaks in Ireland’s favour. In contrast, the other areas which have been suggested as places of origin for the hanging-bowls have nothing nearly so convincing to show. Savory¹⁷¹ has been able, by means of brooch-types, to show the sub-Romano-British development in the British west, and has clearly expounded the relationship of this area with Ireland:

‘It cannot, moreover, be denied that in the sixth century Irish types of pin and penannular brooch were reaching Welsh coasts and spreading from the Severn valley into Saxon areas: such are the pins with double spiral heads and zoomorphic derivative penannulars with splayed terminals from Pant-y-Saer (Ang.), Kenfig Burrows and Kempston (Beds.). Some of the English hanging-bowls, therefore, may have been imported from Ireland by the same route, and passing from Welsh hands into Saxon ones through the same channels as the products of Welsh craftsmen, would have the same midlands distribution as the latter.’

¹⁶⁸ Cf. note 161.

¹⁶⁹ O’Riordain, *op. cit.* in note 118, pp. 140 ff.

¹⁷⁰ Kilbride Jones, *op. cit.* in note 162, fig. 11, nos. 32, 34, fig. 12, no. 33.

¹⁷¹ H. N. Savory, ‘Some sub-Romano-British brooches from south Wales,’ *Dark-Age Britain* (ed. D. B. Harden, 1956), p. 55.

As the result of recent research in England and Ireland, Ireland now has the chief claim to consideration as the centre of origin of the hanging-bowls. In recent years a number of hanging-bowls have come to light in Ireland.¹⁷² They apparently span a relatively long period of time and are not quite identical with those from Anglo-Saxon graves. But they show that hanging-bowls were in use in Ireland, so that the argument so often put forward against the view of an Irish origin, that no bowls have been found in Ireland, is no longer valid.

Finally, space may be given to another idea. The rise of Irish art in the sixth and seventh centuries was—there can be no doubt about it—closely connected with the growing activity of the Irish Church. The Irish missionary centres were places where the arts of manuscript production and illumination were cultivated, but other arts were also cultivated in them, as descriptions of the monasteries make known to us. It would therefore not be sufficient to try to study the spread of Irish art only in those activities of the inmates of the monasteries which had to do with writing and book-painting. In the colophon of the Book of Lindisfarne¹⁷³ it is explicitly stated that the book-casing was made in goldsmith-technique by an inmate of the monastery. Would it then be too much to suppose that metal- and enamel-workers also came from Ireland to the English mission-centres, and there continued the activities which they had practised in Ireland? Such an event would correspond with what happened in the case of the manuscripts. We have already noted (p. 93) Henry's view,¹⁷⁴ arising from the occurrence of millefiori at Sutton Hoo, that hanging-bowls were produced in the Irish monastery at Burgh Castle in East Anglia and that the technique of millefiori could have been passed on from there to the Anglo-Saxons. The fortunate concurrence of historical information and archaeological evidence shows that this is quite likely to have happened. As a result of this, one must seriously consider the possibility that hanging-bowls were also made in the monasteries founded on English soil as a result of the Irish mission.

Aidan, the founder and first bishop of Lindisfarne (635), founded the monastery of Hartlepool in the year 640, and Whitby was founded from there as a daughter-house in the year 657. All these monasteries were planned according to Irish custom and under Irish influence.

The excavations at Whitby¹⁷⁵ have brought to light a number of hanging-bowl fragments, one of which has already been cited (p. 76) as being similar to those from Bekesbourne. But certain other fragments are of interest if considered together with the Bekesbourne fragments. They are the escutcheons which are nos. 2 and 9 in Raleigh Radford's enumeration. No. 2¹⁷⁶ (PL. VII, F) is a 'heater-shaped escutcheon with plain hooked head'. 'The edges of the escutcheon and the design, an interlace knot with pendant ends, are in metal, while the field is

¹⁷² Henry (1956), pp. 79 ff.

¹⁷³ 'And Billfrith, the anchorite, forged the ornaments which are on it on the outside and adorned it with gold and with gems.' Cf. A. S. C. Ross and E. G. Stanley, *Codex Lindisfarnensis*, introductory vol., forthcoming.

¹⁷⁴ Henry (1956), p. 82.

¹⁷⁵ Peers and Radford (1943), pp. 47 ff.

¹⁷⁶ Peers and Radford (1943), p. 49, fig. 9, pl. 26, c.

filled with red enamel.' We have here an escutcheon which in its technique and in its ornament, an interlace of fine-lined knots, is directly related to the Bekesbourne base-mounting. The second escutcheon referred to, no. 9¹⁷⁷ (PL. VII, G), is also heater-shaped. The ornament consists of a Greek cross, standing upon a quatrefoil knot, with slightly expanded terminals to the arms, while each of the four fields between the arms is filled with a trefoil interlaced knot. The contours of the pattern are metal strands; the figure itself is filled with red and the ground with yellow enamel. These two escutcheons provide the nearest parallels for the base-mounting of the Bekesbourne hanging-bowl. The three hanging-bowls, thus represented, are linked together as members of a single stylistic group in which the escutcheon or print, no. 5 (p. 76),¹⁷⁸ which is also closely related to the Bekesbourne pieces, is to be reckoned as a fourth member.

This group of hanging-bowls now emerges as a new division in the series of bowls so far known. Its distinctive characteristic, which separates it from the earlier groups, is the use of interlacing; while the wiry spirals, whose origin in the developed-trumpet-pattern series is, as has been shown, unmistakable, demonstrates anew that it is connected with the earlier series. Moreover, the examples found at Whitby, because of the *terminus post quem* of 657 provided by the foundation-date of the monastery, date this new group to the second half of the seventh century or the beginning of the eighth century.

As we have seen, the surviving fragments of this group show Irish connexions in their ornament and in their enamel technique; but, since it has been demonstrated that a transplanting of the practice of Irish art to the missionary foundations is quite likely to have taken place, it is not possible to locate precisely the place of origin of the group, though it can certainly be placed in some centre of Irish art, whether in Ireland itself or on Anglo-Saxon soil.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Åberg (1943) .. N. Åberg, *The Occident and the Orient in the Art of the Seventh Century*, I. *The British Isles* (1943).
 Åberg (1945) .. *Id.*, II. *Lombard Italy* (1945).
 Åberg (1947) .. *Id.*, III. *The Merovingian Empire* (1947).
 Bruce-Mitford (1956) R. L. S. Bruce-Mitford, *The Sutton Hoo Ship Burial, A Provisional Guide* (1947: 5 ed. 1956).
 Henry (1936) .. F. Henry, 'Hanging Bowls', *J. Roy. Soc. Antiq. Ireland*, LXVI (1936), 209 ff.
 Henry (1947) .. F. Henry, *Irish Art* (1940: 2 ed. 1947).
 Henry (1956) .. F. Henry, 'Irish enamels of the dark ages, and their relation to the cloisonné techniques,' *Dark-Age Britain: studies presented to E. T. Leeds* (ed. D. B. Harden, 1956), 71 ff.
 Kendrick (1932) .. T. D. Kendrick, 'British hanging-bowls,' *Antiquity*, VI (1932), 161 ff.
 Kendrick (1938) .. T. D. Kendrick, *Anglo-Saxon Art to A.D. 900* (1938).
 Leeds (1936) .. E. T. Leeds, *Early Anglo-Saxon Art and Archaeology* (1936).
 Nordenfalk (1947) .. C. Nordenfalk, 'Before the Book of Durrow,' *Acta Archaeologica*, XVIII (1947), 141 ff.
 Peers and Radford (1943) Sir Charles Peers and C. A. Ralegh Radford, 'The Saxon monastery of Whitby,' *Archaeologia*, LXXXIX (1943), 27 ff.
 Smith (1907-09) .. R. A. Smith, in *Proc. Soc. Antiq. London*, 2 ser. XXII (1907-09), 66 ff.
 Zimmermann (1916) E. H. Zimmermann, *Vorkarolingische Miniaturen* (1916).

¹⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 49, fig. 10,9, pl. 26, c.

¹⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 49, pl. 27, a.