NOTES

SECTION I

(1) The church is discussed and illustrated by Smith 1913, who regards the doorways as early Norman and the interlace carving as showing a survival of Anglo-Saxon influence; the animal scenes represent the conflict between good and evil, the east face showing the dragon, symbolic of evil attacking the bird, while on the south face, it has been vanquished.

(2) Illustrated in RCHM I 1912 pl. 127, where it is stated that the church was known by 1140, to which date the doorway is ascribed. VCH II 279 recognises mid twelfth century work, but considers the south door earlier. Prior & Gardner 1912 129 date the tympanum on stylistic grounds to c.1125, and see Nordic influence on the lintel, St. Michael being represented in the style of Odin in conflict with the Helworm; the confronted dragons represent the souls of the righteous battenning on the tree of life.

(3) Inscription quoted by Keyser 1901 77, which he takes as an exhortation to copy the example of the animals feeding on the tree of knowledge and eagerly devouring the Christian precepts.

(4) Illustrated by Keyser 1927 fig. 39, who suggests that the left side animals represent a horse and a dog. VCH IV 377 establishes a date of c.1190 for the addition of south aisle
and arcade, while the tower, nave and small chancel were in existence by 1120.

(5) Illustrated in RCHM II 1913 pl.14, where the nave and south door are dated to c.1160, and the carving is described as two winged monsters and a small human with long ears. VCH IV 186 dates the south door to c.1120. Prior & Gardner 1912 120 think the doorway and capitals belong to c.1150, but that the tympanum is earlier; it is an example of carvings linking the tenth and twelfth centuries. Stone 1955 55 stresses the oriental influence behind the Gilgamesh iconography of the 'griffons'. He considers the carving an elementary piece, but links the lozenge shaped leaves and tendrils with the style of the Durham Castle chapel capitals.

(6) Illustrated by Blindheim 1965 pl. 149 (right side) and Clapham 1930 pl. 45a, who considers the tower characteristic of immediately pre-Conquest architecture. Baldwin Brown 1931 291 places it in his phase C 3, from the reign of the Confessor onwards, and the Taylors 1965 I 129 agree with a late Saxon date. However, Rivoira 1933 206 claims a post-conquest date, stressing Lombardic priority and influence. The issue is not so much whether the tower was built before or after 1066; the architecture is of the late Saxon style, while the felines compare closely with Anglo-Norman types, and this is surely a true example of the overlap of influences in the years around the Conquest.

(7) Discussed and illustrated by Zarnecki 1958 pls. 2 & 3; in
1093 the abbot Theo was replaced by Simon of St. Ouen at Rouen, and from this date the transepts are continued in a slightly different style, with closer parallels at Winchester, while the earlier style had showed the influence of Jumièges, with whose animal capitals those of Ely should be compared; the common source appears to lie in a two-dimensional manuscript of textile prototype. Stone 1955 also recognises the influence of an Anglo-Norman manuscript, but dates the capitals to the beginning of the twelfth century showing a reversion to the allegedly plainer work of that period.

(8) Church discussed by Hall 1909, who states that the eagle stone was found in the wall of the clerestory in 1987.

(9) Discussed and illustrated by Bu'lock 1959 and fig. VII; he regards the carving of the frieze and of a capital in the church as examples of the survival of the Urnes style after the Conquest when the wave of stone church building did not mean that the new models necessarily swamped the old, and considers the 'disciplined barbarism' at Southwell as a part of the same process.

(10) Keyser 1927 fig. 57.

(11) ibid. fig. 36.

(12) Discussed by Gilchrist 1935, and pls. 73-76; the stone was found in 1934 on the top of the wall dividing the nave from the north aisle. The acanthus panel was blunt and heavy Norman looking leaves, while the dragons are described as
Norman versions of Saxon dragons similar to those on Harold's standard in the Tapestry. Talbot Rice 1952, 145 suggests that the stone might have been a capital; the dragons show a certain Nordic survival, resembling the work at Durham, from which the stone might have come, and he dates it to the second half of the eleventh century.

(13) Calverley 1899 figs. 178, 179.

(14) Ibid. fig. 135; he accepts the carving as twelfth century, and finds parallels for the interlacing at Great Salkeld and Brigham. Cox 1913 118 thinks the stone might be eighth century, and that it should be associated with the early nunnery on the site.

(15) Illustrated by Keyser 1927 fig. 43, who suggests that the carving illustrates Psalm LXXXV: "the wild boar out of the wood doth root it up, and the wild beasts of the field devour it". Cox 1877A. 45 considers it the tympanum of the early twelfth century chapel, stylistically receiving a more classic treatment than Hognastone and Parwich.

(16) Illustrated and discussed by Cox 1875, fig. 242 who relates it to the church built soon after Domesday; Baldwin Brown 1931 394 also regards it as Norman because of its shape. Other writers however, on the grounds of the primitive style have considered the carving as pre-Conquest - Prior & Gardner 1912 153 date it to c.1000, describing it as an example of Norse influence, while Talbot Rice 1952 130 sees the influence
of Scandinavian motifs, and compares the animals with the centaur to Ringerike types; and Seaver 1939 598 speaks of the Manx treatment of the saint, also dating it to 1000.

(17) Single animal illustrated by Cox 1877 A. pl.VII; the pair by Cox 1905 pl.I, which he describes as a wolf attacked by a pelican, and considers that the two stones had formed part of the same sculpture, belonging to the Norman tympanum. Keyser 1827 "describes the pair as 'two fabulous animals, one of them a wyvern'.

(18) Keyser 1927 fig. 75, who describes the scene as a group of animals brought by the cleric to worship the Agnus Dei. Cox 1877 A. considers the church built soon after the Conquest; he identifies two of the nondescript animals as a fox and a wolf.

(19) The carving is mentioned by Cox 1877 B. 175 which he describes as the indistinct outline of a man on horseback blowing a horn; he regards the tympanum as the only remnant of the first Norman church, which was built soon after Domesday. Pevsner 1953 166 could only see 'traces of beasts'; the early nineteenth century drawing by Samuel Lysons, B.M. Additional Mss. 9463 f.34 shows the figure clearly.

(20) Cox 1877 A. pl. XIX; he describes the tympanum carvings as 'rudely incised, grotesque figures' and dates them to the first half of the twelfth century.

(21) Keyser 1927 fig. 52 b. He describes it as part of a lintel with various animals and birds biting each other. Cox 1877
b. 274 says that the now destroyed church was founded in the Norman period; the stone is 'quaintly carved, bearing an incomplete representation of two quadrupeds and some foliage.'

(22) Cox 1877 B. 472 suggests that the stone represents the lintel of the priest's doorway of the nearby chapel, several slabs from which are built into the farmhouse walls. There seems to have been a Saxon church on the site; the Taylors 1965 II 568 recognise Anglo-Saxon features, ascribing the church to their Saxo-Norman phase, while Baldwin Brown 1931 385 mentions it as an example of a Norman building incorporating Saxon remains.

(23) Described by Cox 1877 B. 495 as an interesting and well carved tympanum. Pevsner 1953 230 states that only the south west door and font survive from the Norman period, but that there are several fragments built into the east aisle wall. An unpublished sketch by Lysons exists, Additional Mss. 9463 f. 65.

(24) Mentioned by Keyser 1927 54; 'on the lintel is a conventional animal'. Cox 1875 391 describes it as a dragon with foliated tail.

(25) Keyser 1927 fig. 106.

(26) Pevsner 1952 184 describes the carving as depicting serpent, tree of life and a cock.

(27) RCHM 1952 pl. 7; it is described as early twelfth century, and the inscription below is interpreted as 'Mahad Delegete.'
Alvi me fecit."

(28) VCH III 84 states that the chapel was begun in 1072 by Waltheof, Earl of Northumbria. Animal mask, felines, snake, horse, rider and hounds illustrated by Zarnecki 1951 pls. 3, 5-7; stag by Rivoira 1933 fig. 647; mermaid by Druce 1915 fig. 9. There is considerable disagreement about the artistic merit of the carvings. Baldwin Brown 1931 439 praises the supreme architectonic sense and spirit of the system which he describes as among the first examples of Norman decorative sculpture in England; and Zarnecki also, 12, stresses the successful decorative function of the ornament, recognising the import of several traits which can exactly be paralleled in Normandy. Rivoira however, 217, considers that some of the sculptures, those recognisable by the low grade of the work, should be attributed to English craftsmen, and the general impression is clumsy and rude. Gardner, 1935 61 sees however the first efforts at figure sculpture by the Normans 'extremely crude and absurdly childish'. This is also the view of Clapham, 1934, 125 - 'figures of crude and barbarous deformity'; Boase 1953 50 - 'animal figures of a ridiculous and crude inadequacy'; and Talbot Rice 1952 145, who finds no Saxon or French parallels, regarding the work as belonging to no particular family and only characterised by a lack of feeling for sculpture.

(29) Trans. B & C LXXXV, 1963, states that the church and priest are mentioned in the Domesday Book, and describe the carving
as a degraded form of Ringerike. Keyser 1911 147 compares it as a lion trampling serpents and attacked by Sagittarius.

(30) Illustrated by Keyser 1927, figs. 21 and 95 (north door), who describes the confronted animals as hares. Talbot Rice 1952 156 also considers them 'hare-like' and sees in it a version of the early Christian theme of two animals confronted by the cross as at Ravenna, transmitted by manuscript illustration. Clapham 1934 142 regards the south door as one of the earliest examples of pure Norman figure sculpture. Foll 1927 discusses the history of the church: it was known to be in existence by Domesday, for before this date it may have been added to the English possessions of the Benedictine monastery of Corneilles, which was founded in 1060. It was rebuilt and rededicated in the reign of Henry I, when it was given to the Abbey of St. Martin & St. Barbara, Normandy, to which period the carving of the centaur and beakhead on the jamb of the chancel arch belong. For the thrusting sword position, cf. BM Arundel 60 c. 1060, in Saunders 1928 pl. 24; and Wormald 1952 pl. 16a, for the open animal mouth symbolising hell, in BM Titus D XXVII fol. 75.

(31) Keyser 1911 fig. 14; he suggests that the sprigs represent the spread of evil from the demon's mouth, and compares it to the mask head with tree growing from it at Llanbadarn Fawr.

(32) Keyser 1927 fig. 139 a. Talbot Rice 1960 203 suggests the
motif is derived from some Anglo-Saxon bestiary, e.g. B.M. Cotton Tiberius B V, col030.

(33) Discussed by Daubeny 1921 76, who suggests that the first church was built c.1100 by Simon Fitzpoinz, who held one of the manors of Lower Swell from Domesday; it was then presented to the Abbey of Nutleigh, Oxon. VCH VI 171 describes the carving as unfinished.

(34) Trans. B & G XXXII (1909) II say that the church was founded by Walter Fitz Roger, who lived 1101-1131. Zarnecki 1951 pl. 31 dates the tympanum to c.1120, as do Prior & Gardner 1913 130, who regard it as part of the development from Scandinavian to Anglo-Norman art; while Gardner 1935 62 describes the dragon as truly Danish, carrying on the old Viking tradition, and Talbot Rice 1952 155 stresses this use of Nordic animal motifs in a religious composition. In contrast, Glapham 1934 141 thinks it shows the influence of the survival of Saxon low relief carving, while Stone 1955 45 sees a direct Saxon continuity, with Saxon ornamental details, copying some late eleventh century manuscript.

(35) Centaur illustrated in Trans. B & G. XLVI (1924) pl.X, and 53-5 the animals are identified as a manticore and a leopard, and described as late medieval work, dating from the fifteenth century.

(36) Blindheim 1965 32 and note 6.

(37) Keyser 1927 fig. 37; he identifies the snakes as trying to prevent the animals obtaining nourishment from the Tree of Life.

(38) The feline is illustrated by Cox 1929 pl. p.64; he dates
the church to c.1090, and suggests that it was built by Bishop Walkelyn of Winchester. He describes the capitals as of cushion, scallop and voluted forms, and identifies the animals as hyena, upside down cock, doves, human headed dragon and couchant asses. VCH II 480 confirms the 1090 date for the original chancel, nave and central tower.

(39) In the Domesday Book, the church is listed among those granted to the Abbey of Lire by William Fitzosbert, and Cox 1911 157 suggests that he built it; the slab was found during the restoration of 1854-60, and was perhaps part of the original tympanum. (VCH V 201)

§40) RCHM 1926 pl.34; the scene is described as a wingless griffin facing a lion. This is also how VCH III 40 regards it; the doorway is described as late twelfth century, with the earlier panel inserted. Keyser 1927 10 identifies the figures as dragon and lion.

(41) RCHM 1926 pl. 139; it suggests that the south doorway was rebuilt in the mid twelfth century, and identifies the figures as the Good Shepherd, Lamb and Wolf; Keyser 1927 33 describes them as prostrate animal facing the Agnus Dei and a human headed monster. Clapham 1934 142 does not define the subject but thinks it very early, among the first attempts at a pure Norman figural sculpture.

(42) RCHM 1926, pl.139; the existence of a pre-Conquest church is mentioned, but the doorway and tympanum are dated to the twelfth century. VCH III 102 however relates the slab to
the pre-Conquest church on the site. Keyser 1927 47 describes the animal on the left as having its foot on an altar, and the other as the Agnus Dei. He suggests that it illustrated the biblical text on the destruction of Babylon: 'Syrens and demons shall dance there, and herenacii and centaurs shall dwell in their houses'. (Isaiah XIII, 21)

(43) Keyser 1927 fig. 4 who however only describes the stag and ignores the bird. VCH III 450 mentions the 28 d. paid from the priests and church in the Domesday Survey. Payne 1925 3 describes the tympanum as Saxon-influenced and says the later church was constructed from the ruins of the early Norman building.

(44) Illustrated by Keyser 1905: he describes three small human figures in the fold of the saint's sleeve, but these can no longer be distinguished.

(45) Keyser 1927 fig. 77; he describes the feline in front of the cleric as the Agnus Dei. Pevsner 1960 243 asks sternly: "What is the meaning of this Germanic barbarity?"

(46) Discussed by the Taylors, 1965, I 48; they consider the window late Saxon, or Saxo-Norman, and describe the internal salient angles faced in ashlar in a manner more Norman than Anglo-Saxon. It is illustrated by Butler 1964 fig. 3, who compares the animal with those at Alveston and Stow Longa; while Fisher 1964 14 describes it as a good specimen of the Anglian beast. (!)

(47) The Taylors 1965 I 120 mention the Anglo-Saxon angles of the nave, but regard the south and north doors of the nave,
and the tympanum of the early Norman period. Keyser 1913 51 ( & fig. 154) relates the carving to the Saxon period. He stresses the unusual nature of the dedication, and suggests that the central medallion had once held St. Medard's relics, while the birds should refer to the legend of the saint being sheltered by an eagle. He describes the carving below as a horse and rider doing homage.

(48) Cox 1910 205.

(49) Zarnecki 1951 pl.19; he dates it to c.1100, and describes the mixture of figural and geometric motives as typical of early Anglo-Norman sculpture. Talbot Rice 1960 203 regards it as late eleventh century, and typical of the transitional sculptural style at this period: the decoration of the upper row of stones recalls the work of tenthcentury crosses, while the lower row has parallels with other Norman work.

(50) Illustrated and discussed by Cox and Serjeantson 1897 fig. p.39; the church was founded by Simon of St. Liz after his return in 1099 from the First Crusade. The church is mentioned in a charter of 1116, but not in one of 1108, listing the gifts of St. Liz to the Clunian monks of St. Andrew, so that the building was probably interrupted by the Civil War, and finished between 1108 and 1116. They suggest that the carving represents the struggles of good and evil spirits for the human soul. Keyser 1908 259 compares the dragon to that at Ipswich, and suggests that the carving was sculptured in Saxon times.
(51) Keyser 1927 fig. 78. Pevsner 1957 305 suggests that the stone is shaped to form the head of a small window, and compares the horse to the White Horse of Uffington.

(52) Church discussed by Gill 1910 who considers it was built soon after the Conquest. Keyser 1907 145 regards the lower part of the tower earlier, possibly pre-Conquest.

(53) Keyser 1927 fig. 139. There is a certain amount of disagreement among the authorities over date and style, although a generally Scandinavian influence is recognised. Kendrick 1949 122 describes both sets of animals as Urnes, although with Ringerike foliate details. Clapham 1930 135 thinks it an example of the influence of the Ringerike style, which may possibly date from after the Conquest as the distinctive foliage is typical of the Saxo-Norman overlap; however by 1934 136 he describes it as definitely of pre-Conquest character. Talbot Rice 1952 155 stresses the use of a Nordic animal in a religious composition, and dates it to the early twelfth century; but he dates Southwell c.1030.

(54) Talbot Rice 1960 pl.VII B. The building history of the church is discussed by Dimock 1998: while the original foundation dates from the eighth century, and survived up to the Conquest, the main phase of Norman building was inaugurated by Thomas, Archbishop from 1109 to 1114. Art historians however seem to prefer a pre-Conquest date for the lintel, although scribing it to more than one style. Prior and Gardner 1912 130 date it to c.1000, and consider
it an attempt to reproduce a painted source, and Seaver 1939 598 also chooses 1000, in fact seeing the whole group of dragon combating saints as a part of Scandinavian influence. Talbot Rice 1952 130 considers the dragon a typical Ringerike beast, while the lion is more of a Jellinge type: he places the carving at c.1030. But in 1960 206, the carving is described as 'tout a fait dans le style d'Urnes'. Similar confusion is felt by Kendrick 1949 121; the carving is not later than 1050, and it represents a precocious piece of Saxon work, based on a Romanesque design, with the lion and dragon also showing Urnes traits. Boase 1953 52 thinks it is a re-used eleventh century tympanum, suggesting earlier Anglo-Saxon traditions, while the beasts dissolve into Viking ribbon patterns; and Stone 1955 48 describes the dragon as 'dynamic Urnes'.

(55) Keyser 1927 frontispiece. VCH VII 23 mentions the existence of an old chapel from the late twelfth century, while the unpublished church guide states that the church dates from the Saxon period. In Keyser's sketch there seems to be the head of another animal under the neck of the first hound, but this is not now visible on the carving.

(56) VCH VI 142 mentions a grant of tithes to the church in 1103, and suggests that the Scandinavian dedication might have been made in the eleventh century.

(57) History discussed by Paintin 1911 and pl. p.3; the tympanum is well preserved because it had been hidden
under plaster for many years.

(58) VCH VI 266 recognises a church by the mid twelfth century, but only foundations of the original walls survive. The bird is identified as a dove.

(59) Keyser 1927 fig. 24 identifies the animals as Sagittarius and Leo.

(60) RCHM 1913 III fig. 30; it is suggested that the tree growing from an animal mask represents the divine source whence the virtue of the tree of spiritual life and knowledge is devoured. Keyser 1911 84 compares the head to that at Dumbleton.

(61) Keyser 1927 fig. 28. Clapham 1933 399 considers that the doorway and arch belong to the building of c.1066, and the Taylors 1965 I 228 describe it as Saxo-Norman - although the church is usually described as Norman, its features are not characteristic; the outer arch is Norman, but it does not entirely fit the curve of the tympanum, which belongs to an earlier stage.

(62) VCH II pl. p.94.

(63) Keyser 1927 pl.27a. The surviving building dates from the end of the twelfth century; the Taylors 1965 I 453 give a pre-Norman date to the foundations, as there had been a nunnery on the site before the Conquest. Soon after 1080, Roger de Montmorency founded the Cluniac priory, and in 1101, the saint's remains were translated to the altar of the new church (Anderson 1864 239).
Zarnecki 1951 pl. 46.

Keyser 1927 fig. 49, who describes the lintel as a hunting scene of Saxon date, two of the animals being caught in a 'net'. The Taylors 1965 II 580 think that while the west wall probably survives from an earlier pre-Conquest church, the west wall of the nave and the west door belong to the Saxo-Norman period. The west tower is early Norman and built subsequent to the door, which it encloses. They suggest that the lintel is probably the original tympanum with its upper part hacked away. Pevsner 1958 297 suggests that the lintel is Anglo-Saxon, while the mask and diaper patterning are early Norman.

Zarnecki 1951 fig. 15, who dates it to the late eleventh century, and compares it to the carving at Newton in Cleveland. Pevsner 1958 306 considers it more Saxon than Norman in style. Cranage 1912 625 discusses the building history.

Cranage 1912 fig. 68 who describes it as 'birds pecking at large worms', and regards the nave and part of the north wall as pre-Conquest. The Taylors 1965 II 694 mention the existence of church with four priests at Domesday, but find the carved stone reminiscent of a Roman stone in the nave at Hexham.

Keyser 1927 fig. 142 b. Trans. B & G V (1882) 48 suggests a date of 1140 for the chancel arch and south door of the nave in the otherwise rebuilt church; and the carving seems to be of earlier date than the doorway.
(69) Keyser 1927 fig. 45. History of the church most recently discussed by Long 1963, who summarises the other arguments for its date: Clapham and Allen accept the 'Saxon' pilaster strips and triangular arches in the chancel south wall as evidence of a pre-Conquest date, while Baldwin Brown and Ponting do not think these prevent it from being early Norman. Long and Pevsner regard it as an example of Saxo-Norman overlap, the work begun within a very few years of the Conquest, with the tympanum, chancel windows and capitals all evidence of early Norman work.

(70) Capitals sketched in S.A.S. VIII (1858) pl. p.8; the church was given by William of Falaise to the Benedictine Priory of St. Mary's, Lonlay in a charter dated between 1100 and 1107, after which it was enlarged, so that the early Norman tower arches and chancel date from before this phase.

(71) Zarnecki 1951 pl.4.

(72) Tympanum illustrated by Keyser 1927 fig. 69. Henry 1964 217 compares it, together with Ribbesford and Kencott, with the north door of Cormac's chapel, Cashel, in the use of the archer-centaur to represent the struggle of good and evil. The Irish carving dates from 1134, and these English sources were presumably somewhat earlier. She sees Danish parallels for the English ones, and thinks they are perhaps of Lombardic origin. SAS LXXXV (1939) 66 dismisses the earlier imaginative theory that the theme
alluded to the contemporary struggle between Stephen and Matilda, Sagittarius being Stephen's emblem; and sees it as an allegory of Christianity, the centaur standing for the harrowing of hell, and routing the false pride of the lion. The birds in the tree are regarded as merely decorative.

(73) Keyser 1927 fig. 47, who describes them as fighting bi-peds. Kendrick 1949 122 considers it as an example of the rare survival of Urnes design.

(74) Keyser 1905 fig. 137, who thinks it has a particularly early look, and compares it to the Ipswich carvings; he describes it as the only example of the motif where the sword blade is driven home, the others being shown only in the act of striking.

(75) Church discussed and illustrated by Edwards 1949, pl. 1. The church was founded by Henry de Ferrers, who had begun to build a Benedictine monastery beside his castle of Tutbury from 1080, which is the date of the foundation charter (No. 51, Salt Library). In 1089, de Ferrers died and was buried near the High Altar of the church.

(76) Keyser 1927 figs. 44 & 45. Clapham 1934 36 considers the carvings pre-Conquest on the grounds of the Saxon inscription; and Prior & Gardner 1912 130 date it to c.1000 because of the characteristically Viking motive, while Gardner 1935 52 relates it to his 'Wessex' group of pre-Conquest carvings, seeing Danish influence in the spiral joints. However Kendrick 1949 123 regards the spiral joint of the dragon as Anglo-Saxon, although it has an
'urnes spiral' for a tail, while the boar has an 'extra¬vagantly mannered Urnes mouth'. Talbot Rice 1952 130 places it in the first half of the eleventh century, as beginning to show a feeling for figure sculpture.

(77) Zarnecki 1958 pl. 5 who dates it to c.1120, and sees the influence of the Ely nave capitals. Keyser 1927 42 suggests that it has been part of a former tympanum; Cautley 1937 309 thinks the church may date from before the Conquest, by the very early jambs of the priest's door in the south chancel.

(78) Cautley 1937 pl.3, who describes the whole church as early Norman, and describes the animals as two hounds. Marcouse 1940 23 considers it an early, crude attempt at the Anglo-Norman style, dismissing it as 'the tentative effort of an unskilled workman'.

(79) Zarnecki 1951 pl.12, who describes the style of carving as being an example of the artistic connections between England, Normandy and Dijon at this time, as the animal carved rectangular projection is first seen here in the early eleventh century (pl.14); the placing of the figures is characteristically determined by the shapes that they decorate. Talbot Rice 1952 145 compares the carvings to those at Durham, and considers them more sculpturally proficient. Pevsner 1965 118 considers the capitals as a perfect example of early Norman naivete. The church was built in 1073 as the chapel of a body of secular priests; in 1075, it was given to the Abbey of St. Florent, Saumur.
(80) The Taylors 1965 I 349 place the tower in their phase C 3, 1050 to 1100, the tower and quoining appearing Norman rather than Anglo-Saxon. Talbot Rice 1952 95 (and pl.10a) dates the carving to c.1050, stressing the purely Nordic spirit of the beasts in contrast with the more Mediterranean Christ; in 1960, 206, he identifies the interlace as Urnes, and compares the mixture of styles to that at Ipswich. Kendrick 1949 120 dates it to c.1100, belonging to the rustic style of the south and midland schools of post-Conquest sculpture, showing a survival of the Nordic animal tradition. Stone 1955 47 also dates it, on the style of the Christ, to the early twelfth century, and describes the animal on the left as owing "everything to Urnes influence".

(81) Livett 1904 pls. 2 & 4. History discussed in VCH 9 158, which however dates the nave, chancel arch and north west portion of the chancel to c.1100.

(82) Poole 1948 pl.1. The Taylors 1965 II 536 place the nave and chancel in their phase C 3, 1050 to 1100, but consider the carvings Anglo-Saxon rather than Norman, because of the device of using a monster's head on the upper corner, while the interlacing bodies cover the lower parts. Pevsner 1965 318 thinks the upper interlace Saxon, and the beast's head Viking inspired, and re-used by a slightly later Norman mason; as he sees more Norman than Saxon elements in the church - it is an example of a long overlapl

(83) Keyser 1927 figs. 64, 65. VCH III 286 mentions the land
held by the church at Domesday; the plain round headed door has been claimed as Saxon, but the Taylors 1965 II 214 think it Norman.

(84) Keyser 1927 figs. 143, 144. The Taylors 1965 I 415 describe the west and south doorways as Saxo-Norman and possibly pre-Conquest; they are earlier than the north door, which they date to c.1100 RCHM 168 dates the south door, tympanum and west wall to c.1100, and suggest a Saxon date for parts of the nave and north side. Calverley 1899 229 describes the mermaid as a variant of the motif of St. Margaret emerging from the dragon (cf. Bretforton); and the centaur as an ox with head and neck of a bird, which Allen 1887 369 regards as the serra of the Bestiaries which overtakes ships, and represent the Good man; and suggests that the work is by the school also seen in the midlands at Ault Hucknall and Stow Longa.

(85) Building history discussed by the Taylors, 1963; the thick walls and pilaster strips suggest an Anglo-Saxon date, and they compare the animals in a general way with the carvings at Somerford Keynes, but think that the differences in detail are evidence of a post-Conquest date. Thomson 1958 2 mentions the reference to the church and its land in the Domesday Survey, and the rebuilding by Westminster Abbey c.1080.

(86) Kendrick 1949 pl.XXXV who regards the carving as part of the south-western inhabited scroll group, comparable to
the Lambeth Aldhelm MS scroll (Clapham 1934 fig. 44) both of which he dates to c.1000. Clapham 1948 163 however would date this manuscript to the middle of the eleventh century, and regards the capitals of the chancel arch, the side shaft capitals and the tympanum of immediately pre-Conquest date, as the capitals are of a type not subsequently used by Norman masons. But Pevsner 1963 252 considers the chancel arch and side shaft capitals Norman, although describing the tympanum as Saxon; and the Taylors 1965 I 365 also think the capitals a simplified form of the Norman cushion capitals. Talbot Rice 1952 153 regards the architectural details and tympanum as pre-Conquest.

(87) WAM XXXV (1909) fig. p.387, where the carving is described as not later than 1120, because of the billet. Powell 1910 211 suggests that the tympanum carving represents St. Aldhelm, whose staff took root when he preached; and associates Little Langford with a group of churches associated with Osmund Bishop of Salisbury 1078 - 1099, who was a great admirer of Aldhelm; this group also includes Netheravon.

(88) The Taylors 1965 I 456 place the west tower in their period C 3, 1050 to 1100, and think the nave arch could have been erected shortly before or shortly after the Conquest. Pevsner 1963 216 regards the church as a particularly telling case of Saxo-Norman overlap; the
present west tower had been the central tower of the previous church which, in the later eleventh century, was altered to its present structure when the west door and nave arch were built, the arch bases being Saxon, but the volutes early Norman. Talbot Rice 1952 145 thinks the capitals of the same date but rather more sculpturally proficient than those of Durham, while Allen 1887 248 dismisses them as 'rude figures of beasts'. Ponting 1901 353 identifies them as a lion and an ape, and thinks they were carved in Norman times by a Saxon craftsman.

(89) History of church and parish discussed by Lloyd 1967 and pls. p.42; the castle was built by Robert d'Abitot in 1086-87, who also probably built the church; the original portions were the nave and chancel, but it was drastically enlarged in the thirteenth century. VCH III 343 mentions the original stonework surviving in the present nave, including herringbone work on the south side, and the eleventh century stones built into the porch.

(90) VCH III 323 describes the building as a ruinous mid twelfth century chapel, and the dragon as a wyverne. Noakes 1968 103 regards the lower part of the tower as early Norman.

(91) VCH IV fig. p.313; it is stated that the church was built c.1100, and the north wall, door and south door are of this date. Prior & Gardner 1912 153 however consider the tympanum as dating from well on in the twelfth century,
although representing a survival of the Norse school. Zarnecki 1951 B places it in the first quarter of the century, in the style of the embryo Hereford school.

(92) VCH IV 347 mentions the surviving nave of the mid twelfth century church, identifying the feline in the nave as the lion of Judah, which Keyser 1927 46 regards as a wolf, and suggests was originally over the north door.

(93) Keyser 1927 fig. 100. The lintel would seem to date from no earlier than the middle of the century.

(94) Keyser 1908 fig. p.258; he thinks the outer medallion animals are the Evangelical Lion and Eagle, and describes the central figures as two serpents entwined in deadly combat. VCH II 85 describe the late eleventh or early twelfth century aisleless chancel and nave, while the rest was rebuilt c.1150.

(95) VCH II fig. p.238; Keyser 1909 488 suggests that the slab was the head of a former doorway.

(96) VCH I 416 describe the present west tower, nave and small chancel as belonging to the original early twelfth century church; the lion and another stone carved with a sundial in the outer wall are described as 'early'.

(97) Zarnecki 1951 pl.13, who dates it to the late eleventh century. Church discussed in VCH II 275.

(98) VCH II fig. p.5; it is suggested that the carved stones and capitals originally belonged to the south doorway, and that the capitals resemble those of the jambed shafts of
the chancel arch. Pevsner 1966 275 describes them as 'early Norman fragments' too early for the foundations of the Abbey.

(99) Collingwood 1907 fig. p.387, who regards it as part of a Norman tympanum; VCH II 491 places it amongst the many pre-Conquest fragments built in to the church, and describes it as a man riding a beast. Pevsner 1966 341 identifies it as a Norman relief of Samson and the lion.

(100) The Taylors 1965 I 20 place the window head in their period C 3, 1050 to 1100, comparing the carving to that at Barnetby-le-Wold, VCH III 13 says that Gerard, Bishop of York, who died in 1108, gave the church to the prebend of Langton; and in 1115 it was given to St. Martin's Abbey. Paulson 1841 14 (& fig.) says that the carving is not done on the same stone as that used in other portions of the original building, and that there is an inscription of c.1066 on a stone in the aisle. Keyser 1909 166 suggests it is of pre-Norman date, belonging to another church.

(101) Keyser 1927 fig. 103 D; he describes the animal winged, though no trace of this apparently survives. Pevsner 1959 194 identifies them as lamb and dragon.
NOTES

SECTION II

(1) De Paors 1958 173 ff.: "from some time early in the eleventh century, Dublin sent priests to Canterbury to be consecrated as bishops, and the archbishops of Canterbury began to take an interest in the Irish church". St. Anselm wrote to Muirchertach, King of Ulster, in 1093 and 1103 concerning reform, and in 1110 the constitution drawn up at the national synod reflected the influence of Canterbury in the number of sees.

(2) Henry 1964 II 224 & figs. 28, 29; ibid 1933 pl. 87 for comparisons.

(3) Henry 1933 129 ff. regards the combination of religious and secular scenes characteristic of this period: in Celtic countries there were no barriers between mythology and ecclesiastical history; pagan heroes were translated into Christian symbols – Epona is seen on the cross of Ilrea, and Cernunnos on a fragment at Clonmacnoise. (pl.42) The deer hunt became a symbol of the beginning of the trials of the hero figure, ultimately signifying resurrection and redemption; Allen 1897 331 thinks the shafts of the high crosses so biblical that secular subjects were placed on the base for contrast, to indicate the actual world upon which the spiritual world stood.

(4) Henry 1940 figs. 41, 42.

(5) ibid 1964 pl. 81.
Stokes 1899 A pl. p.34.

Henry 1964 III 162; illustrated by Crawford 1926 pl.XLII.

Ibid pl. XL.

Ibid pls. XLVIII & XL; Henry 1933 pl. 18.

Ibid 1964 I 156 ff.

ibid 292.

Anderson & Allen 1903 fig. 250. Radford 1942 13 dates it to the mid ninth century, and Stevenson 1955 123 to the late ninth. The 'Drosten' inscription does not necessarily provide a firm date.

Anderson & Allen 1903 fig. 434 A.

For example, in the crypt at Layrac, Evans 1950 pl.10a; Trani Cathedral, Bertaux 1904 fig. 198.

The scheme established by Anderson and Allen in 1903 is still the basis of any discussion of Pictish Art.

Thomas 1963 57; the tattooing theory is disputed by Henderson 1967, who provides no satisfactory alternative.

Henderson 1967 144 points out such sources in detail, suggesting an ultimately Byzantine origin for the Meigle 2 Daniel scene, reaching Scotland through the many iconographical types of Ireland; however, she dismisses Curle's (1936) Byzantine-Sassanian-Coptic interpretation of the St. Andrew's sarcophagus by finding closer parallels in Mercian art of the late eighth century. She attributes the variety of monstrous animals to a manuscript such as
the Anglo-Saxon Marvels of the East, (B.M. Cotton Ms. Vitellius A XV) in preference to Anderson's suggested Physiologus, illustrated versions not being known till after the ninth century.

(18) Nash-Williams 27 ff. Margam has a base panel carved with a hunting scene resembling those of the Manx crosses; at Bulmore, a backward looking, crouched beast is like those of Danish Yorkshire, while another is seen from the top with arms and legs bent upwards, of recurrent Scandinavian type. cf. Klindt-Jensen 1966 pl. 3d for the same motif in metalwork, of the seventh century.

(19) Comprehensive study by Lindqvist 1941.

(20) Studied by Oxenstierna 1956; Henderson 1967 144 compares them to the Gundestrup cauldron; the style is that of the first century Gaulish metalworkers, and its motifs are used for the Horns, and for many Pictish carvings.


(22) Anderson & Allen 1903, fig. 391.

(23) Nash-Williams 1950 II 40 n.

(24) This is the theory of Henderson 1967 136, with particular reference to the Aberlemno stone.


(27) The group examined by Drummond 1881.

(28) For summaries of the views on dating, Stevenson 1961.

Re-examination by Thomas 1963 and 1964 confirming Radford's fourth or fifth century date for the beginning of the Class
I stones.

(29) The only study in depth is that of Kermode 1907, whose survey catalogues each stone – it is his notation that is still in use, e.g. Jurby 93, Braddan 108, the name referring to the parish in which the stone was found, and the number to its order in the original catalogue. Shetelig 1920-25 made a re-assessment of the stylistic development and chronology, and a few authors have touched upon the subject in connection with more general studies.

(30) Shetelig 1920-25, fig. 2.

(31) Kermode 1907, pls. IVII & IVIII.

(32) These details discussed by Wilson 1966 112 ff., who defines the Mammen features as a separate style which he dates from 950 to 1025; he considers the Manx group among the early examples of the true Mammen style, and the most purely Scandinavian type in the Manx series.

(33) ibid. III and fig. 151.

(34) Kermode 1907 pls. XXIII, XXIV; he compares the monstrous figures to those of Kells and Glassonby.

(35) ibid. pl. XXVII.

(36) cf. Winwick cross fragment and Stanwick cross, Collingwood 1927 fig. 165, 112; he considers the Winwick cross an intrusive late type, dating perhaps from the eleventh century; and sees Danish-Norse fusion on the latter.

(37) Haverfield & Greenwell 1899 fig. p.119.

(38) A possible period for this wave of Scottish influence is 990-1014, when Man was under the domination of the Earl of Orkney; he was converted to Christianity in 995, which
might have supplied a particular impetus for the erection of Viking crosses. Marstrander's study (1932) of the runic inscriptions of Man also postulates a date not before the latter half of the tenth century for the crosses, since the mixture of Gaelic and Norwegian names on them suggests some time lag before the fusion of the settlers with the Gaelic Christian population.

(39) Binns 1958 5 ff.

(40) Wilson 1966 104 suggests that the local craftsmen, trained in the Anglo-Saxon manner were attempting to adapt the completely foreign Viking animal style, and "ultimately succeeded in obliterating almost all traces of the native Anglo-Saxon animal motifs".

(41) Examined by Bušlock 1959.

(42) Wilson 1966 146; he totally disagrees with Holmqvist's (1951) English origin for the style, but sees a logical development from the Mammen aspect, with foreign influence only from the acanthus elements of late tenth century English manuscripts.

(43) Zarnecki 1951 pls. 17, 18.

(44) Collingwood 1927 fig. 184. Wilson 1966 107 describes the 'hart and hound' - which he prefers to regard as a wolf - as an Irish motif used in Northumberland, and symbolising the struggle between good and evil. Binns 1958 24 suggests that the stag had a particularly totemistic significance for the Vikings; while Berg, 1955, 39, in connection with the
Irish influence on the Gosforth cross sees the use of hunting motifs as a part of the stories of Arthurian and Fenian legend of common Celtic tradition, a symbolic battle for the protection of the land against all evil forces.

(45) Kendrick 1959 pl. XLIII 2; he dates it between 995 and 1083, and sees Urnes elements in the hind leg and serpent tail.

(46) ibid fig. 5; he dates it to the early eleventh century, and compares it to the late Welsh Penmon and Maen Achwyfan, with Celtic influence in the arrangement of panels. Collingwood 1927 158 describes it as late tenth century Scandinavian type with an Anglian source.

(47) Baldwin Brown 1937 pl. XXXVIII I; Collingwood 1927 fig. 216; Haverfield & Greenwell 1899 fig. p.119.

(48) cf. Nunburnholme, Collingwood 1927 fig. 152, which he dates to the first quarter of the eleventh century.
NOTES

SECTION III

(1) Wormald 1965 recognises 8; Chefneux 1934, 9; Goldschmidt 1947 12. And Herrmann 1964 claims to identify 42, but see Appendix C.

(2) Goldschmidt, quoting Babrius 106. Chefneux prefers the story of the delegation of the lion's power to the wolf, with the consequent downfall of the monkey.

(3) It is here that Wormald disagrees with Chefneux; he does not think they represent a fable, but that they are derived from calendar illustrations, for example, B.M. Cotton Ms. Claudius B iv. f.26b. Maclagan 1943 15 thinks they merely illustrate rural pursuits.

(4) Chefneux identifies the human figure as Beowulf descending into the abyss to fight Grendel's mother and other monsters of the deep; the curious sword shown is his magic blade. Wormald suggests that the horizontal position of the figure is derived from constellation illustrations, and the whole group represents the constellations of Pisces, Serpens, Bootes, Arcturus Major (?), Aquila, Lepus (?), and Centaurus; the weapon is a transformation of Bootes' club.

(5) Leve 1919 122.

(6) Verrier 1946 7.

(7) cf. B.M. Arundel Ms. 91 f.47 b. an initial of c. 1100, illustrated by Wormald 1965 fig. 19.
For example, Verrier 1946 6 suggests that the B 8 - 15 group are all stories of violence and treachery, hinting at the adventures and character of Harold - an interpretation which hardly agrees with the character presented in the central panel - while the fables A 88 and 89, above his return to London show his disappointment at having to give up his claim to the throne. But these fables, Wolf and Crane and Fox, Crow and Cheese are also among the 'treachery' group on the lower border; while surely the whole point of Harold's treachery was that he had no intention of giving up his claim to the throne. Leve 1919 121 thinks that the predatory groups B 123, 174, 198, 199 symbolise violence signifying the preparations for the start of the battle.

Chefneux 1934 claims to identify 9 fables; and by studying the choice of fable and the aspects of the scenes depicted, finds their closest parallels in the illustrations to the twelfth century collection of Marie de France. These being obviously too late to be the source of the Tapestry illustrations, as well as differing slightly in certain respects, although less than any other version, she concludes that they have both been inspired by the same source - that is - the collection of fables translated from the Latin for King Alfred, which Marie mentions as the source of hers. This conclusion rests too heavily on the assumptions that Alfred's version really existed, that it was an illustrated version and that it survived so as to be copied in England in the
late eleventh century and France in the late twelfth. Nor can the identification of exactly nine fables, on which the case depends, be wholly accepted. While she accepts the farming groups as a fable, she ignores the two ass and wolf groups and the scenes with human figures, although Aesop's fables do not deal exclusively with animals. Herrmann 1964 starts with the conclusion that the designer was copying the 40 fables in the 4 Aesopian Books of Phedros, with the addition of 1 from Cato and 1 from Horace, and then works backwards, twisting his facts to fit the case.

(10) See Wormald 1965 30 ff. and figs. 4-21. He mentions B.M. Cotton Tiberius B V as a manuscript of the type that might have served as a model for the borders.

(11) Discussed by Goldschmidt 1947; he modifies Thiele 1905 in the suggestion that the Leyden Ms. is a direct copy of a work of c.500 A.D.; but accepts that it is ultimately derived from a late classical source — the variegated unnatural colours are the result of a later version of the original black and white type.

(12) Discussed and illustrated by Eitner 1944.

(13) Gaillard 1944 pls. V, VII.

(14) Deschamps & Thibout 1951 21; also see figs. 16-18 for purely decorative animal motifs in mural painting.

(15) Gough 1964; 1965 fig. 1.

(16) James 1929 for detailed study of three such illustrated manuscripts; Evans 1896 for general discussion of the
influence in art; Woodruff 1930 on the Physiologus of Bern; MacCulloch 1962 on Medieval Bestiaries.

(17) Biddle 1965 329-332 and pl. He attributes one of the scenes to the Volsunga saga, and suggests that the frieze was erected in the reign of Knut to celebrate the shared origin of the English and Danish royal houses: the slab was found in the fill of the rubble trench of the east crypt, and it was in the eastern arm of the Old Minster that the royal burials, including Knut's, lay.

(18) Quirk 1961 for detailed discussion and interpretation.

(19) e.g. the apse frieze at Selles-sur-Cher, Focillon 1963 48; panels at St. Restitut, Le Maitre 1906.

(20) Digby 1965 51, and full discussion of pre-Romanesque textile traditions in the north west; also Branting & Lindblom 1932 and Engelstad 1952 for illustrations and account of Scandinavian hangings; Dimand 1923 for the suggestion of eastern influence on them as a result of Viking trade through Russia; Kurth 1926 and Schuette 1927 discuss German medieval hangings, the recurrent narrow strip marking the survival of earlier traditions; for England, Christie 1938, Symonds & Preece 1928.

(21) An exception, resembling the Tapestry style is seen on the borders of the Bamberg girdle, with animal and foliage motifs separated by diagonal lines, Wormald 1965, figs. 2, 3 and p. 28.
(22) These examples and others listed by Thomson 1930 41 ff.
(23) See Wormald 1965 30 ff. for detailed discussion of this point.
NOTES

SECTION IV

(1) Ghirshman 1954 318.

(2) Ackerman 1938 684 discusses the astral motifs surviving in Sassanian art; the animal combat groups represent a sun-summer, moon-winter contest, the hunting scenes symbolise the passage of the sun through the sky in its annual course, the sun-sky god being the hunter. The popular roundel, frequently associated with animal ornament, is itself a solar symbol.

(3) These aspects listed by Rostovtzeff 1922 201 ff.

(4) For example, Brondsted 1924, Fettich 1930, 1932, Forssander 1937; however, while the Sarmatian influence behind the finds of Ostropataka, Herpaly, Petrossa and Szilagy Somlyo is undeniable, these did not inspire Germanic animal ornament but represented the survival of the eastern style contemporary with it.

(5) As demonstrated by Shetelig 1949, Holmqvist 1955, Hawkes 1961, Hawkes & Dunning 1962; the style developed in the Rhine and Danube Roman workshops in chip-carved metalwork of the second and third centuries, and was adapted into early Germanic art.

(6) Baltrusaitis 1938 630.


(9) Described and illustrated by Rudienko 1960.
(10) For example, Orbeli & Trever 1935 pl.16.
(11) See Herzfeld 1927 for the wall-paintings at Samarra which are characterised by their use of Sassanian textile motifs, but date from the ninth century; Pope 1938 pls. 193 A, 193 B for the survival of the style on pottery decoration.
(12) Holmvist 1939 in fact regards Coptic art as responsible for the spread of Sassanian elements into west Europe in the Merovingian period, rather than the Sarmato-Gothic factor; this would also help to account for the early oriental motifs on the Irish crosses. But while there was certainly east Mediterranean influence on the west at this period, much of this came from Syria.
(13) The origins and style of the ivory group discussed by von Falke 1929.
(14) Described and illustrated by Beckwith 1960.
(15) The Sassanian elements in Mozarabic manuscripts defined by Builmain 1960 who however suggests that they may have come from the north, through the orientalising aspects of Merovingian and Carolingian art. However Grabar and Nordenfalk 1957, 161-176 think the source lies in oriental models of the eighth to tenth centuries, derived from the Sassanian source of the first Moslem art. And see also Grabar 1950 for the adaptation of Sassanian-Islamic traits by the Christians of the Levant, from the seventh to eleventh
centuries; and pl. CLXVIII for Sassanian iconography in the Gerona Beatus showing the survival of Sassanian traits after they had been abandoned by the Moslems.


(17) Male 1923 for the particular significance of Cluny; Lambert 1934 on the duality of Islamic influence in pre-Romanesque Spain.

(18) Group defined by Colt 1939.

(19) Textiles listed by Kendrick 1922 49-51; Capella Palatina mosaics, 1132-40.

(20) Der Nersessian 1945 claims that this use of sculpture is primarily architectural, imitating the carved bands round the doors, windows and wall slits, with occasional figures on the tympanum and parts of the facade. However Pocillon 1964 50 denies that that style is architectural; the Romanesque sculptors used the same Sassanian-based animal style, but made for the first time architecturally functional.

(21) This is suggested by Der Nersessian 1965 33, in her detailed discussion of the decoration and architecture.


(23) Chubinashvili 1950 for the woodcarvings of the tenth and eleventh centuries; pl. 26 shows a senmurv.

(24) General survey of Georgia and Armenia, and the continuity of the animal style from Sumerian times, Baltrusaitis 1929.
and 1934. Aladashvili 1957 on Nicorzminda church, built 1010–14, with griffins in roundels, winged horses and senmurvs, pl. 35 for felines on either side of a doorway; Bachkiroff 1931 on the Kubatchi reliefs; Marr 1934 on Ani.


(26) Feher 1931, discussing the art of the proto-Bulgars, thinks that Sassanian influence reached them through the Caucasus, because of their seventh century kingdom there. However, Mavrodinev 1936 sees it resulting from the spread of the Sassanian style to central Asia as a part of the third to fifth century trade.

(27) Described and illustrated by Alfoldi 1951.

(28) Examined by Mavrodinev 1943; he regards the casket as a product of Eurasiatic and specifically Sarmatian influence, which is not present in the Treasure; this represents the newer Persian-Byzantine style that the migrating tribes had some contact with.

(29) Discussed by Grabar 1928, who stresses the seventh to ninth century conserving of Sassanian motifs as a part of Christian art; the Patleina style is purer than that of the deforming Byzantine textiles.

(30) As at Stara Zagora, Prilep, Amida, Drenovo, Chilandari, Ochrid etc., Filow 1919, who recognises the Sassanian
influence. Millet 1919 considers the style came via Georgia and Armenia.

(31) The group described by Bihalti-Merin & Benac 1962.

(32) Swedish-oriental relations discussed in detail by Arne 1914; also Nerman 1934.

(33) Geijer 1938 for oriental textiles in Sweden.

(34) This is also the view of Aberg 1941. But Holmqvist 1951, while recognising certain 'Magyar' influences, sees closer analogies to monuments of the Jellinge stone type in English works like Desborough, the St. Paul's stone and Knook (!) and does not think that the oriental trade contributes to the Ringerike style.

(35) e.g. Talbot Rice (T) 1965 pls. 7-10 for Scythian and Sarmatian examples. Holmqvist 1939, while recognising a large amount of Coptic influence on the west European style, also stresses the Sassanian traditions that it enshrined.

(36) Brondsted 1924 35; figs. 13, 14, 15, 16.

(37) Runciman 1942 40, and account of the early pilgrimage movements.

(38) Sabbe 1935 for a detailed study of the textile trade, and disproving Pirenne's thesis of a decline in the ninth and tenth century: the only difference was that Orientals and Africans tended to replace the Syrians as middlemen.

(39) Goldschmidt 1914-18 for numerous examples; ibid 1930 for Byzantine ivories.
Particularly the Ottonian manuscripts of the Echternach school; e.g. Boeckler 1933, pls. 36, 37 for full page ornament of Sassanian or Islamic birds with fluttering scarf ends and carrying bells in the Codex Aureus. Also Jantzen 1947 pl. 94 for a frieze of animals in the border of a Regensburg work, early eleventh century, including lion and griffin; this strikingly resembles the style of the Tapestry borders.

Sabbe 1935.

Fully discussed and illustrated by Robinson & Urquart 1955.

Battiscombe 1956 for detailed account of the relics of St. Cuthbert.

Boase 1953 90.

Alleged strongly by Adhemar 1939, who attributes to this classical influence the use of centaurs, sirens and hunting scenes in Romanesque art. But while it undoubtedly did play some part, the use of such animals in sculpture is more likely due to the inspiration of manuscripts, influenced by the classical revival of the Carolingian period.

Grodocki 1950, in his study of the early eleventh animal-carved capitals at Bernay, an early, isolated example of the use of 'art mobilier' animal decoration applied to architectural sculpture, cites the carvings at St. Jean de Latran, Sigvald's altar and Cividale as intermediate examples of the same process. cf. Coutil 1930 for recurrent Byzantine influence of stone carving, including the sixth century
Ravenna sarcophagi, and the Carolingian crypts of Dijon, Marseilles and Jouarre with carved capitals.

(47) e.g. Flemming 1935 pl. XII fig. 4, Sassanian, sixth-seventh century.

(48) Pope 1930 146.


(50) The group defined by Ackerman 1936 90.

(51) These textiles discussed by Kitzinger 1946.

(52) Brehier 1936 pl. LXXXIII.

(53) Beckwith 1960 fig. 28, who regards such silks as prototypes for the very similar designs on the Cordoban caskets.

(54) See note 81.

(55) Talbot Rice 1965 fig. 94.

(56) Macler 1924 pl. XV, fig. 30.

(57) Goodenough 1958, chapter 5, for detailed account of the rosette symbolism and its history in art. Kantor 1957 for a discussion of the joint star on lions in Achaemenid art and beyond, and cf. Porada 1965 fig. 119, for an eight-pointed rosette on the shoulder of a lion on a Sassanian silver jug which she cites as an example of the extraordinary continuity of Iranian art.

(58) The group as a whole is discussed by Stern 1962, with more specific examples described by Stern 1954 (Thiers) and Blanc 1957 (Valence). The types most closely resembling textile ornament are the peacock at Thiers which Stern compares to an eleventh century Spanish Islamic textile,
pl. LXIX; and the lion leaping sideways on to its prey, at Lescar an ibex, and Valence a deer. For a Byzantine silk example of the haunch rosette, Flemming 1935 pl. XVI, I, tenth-eleventh century.

(59) These origins and the influence of the woven silks on the Romanesque bestiary are discussed by von Blankenburg 1943 and Bernheimer 1931. For more specific examples, Farr 1956 on the capitals at Conques, and Evans 1950 47 ff. on the textiles at Cluny and their influence on stone carving, who considers that "there is a strong probability that in almost every instance the decoration of a manuscript served as an intermediary between silk and stone".

(60) For the Christian interpretation of animal motifs, Reau 1955 chapter II, and for the pre-Christian symbolism, Good-enough 1958 passim, a most remarkable study of the survival of symbolic motifs through various religions.

(61) The group defined by Ackerman 1936, who ascribes the sudden popularity of the lion and also the eagle to the conquest of Cappadocia in the 930s, where they had long been dominant features of the local iconography; it is possible that they can be attributed to the introduction of the local weavers to the imperial looms.

(62) For example, Moccas, Hereford, RCHM I 1931 pl. 194; the motif also occurs in Scottish and Irish carvings - Iniscealtra, Crawford 1926 pl. XL 117; Newton Woods,
Anderson & Allen 1903, fig. 481, Inchinnan, ibid. fig. 478.

(63) It appears on a mosaic floor at the Palace of Khirbat al-Mafjah, c. 743; Talbot Rice 1965 pl.15. Textile examples: Flemming 1935 pl. XVI, 19, a Syrian or Byzantine fragment, c.600 now at Cologne Cathedral; ibid. XVI 35 where the griffin replaces the lion, Byzantine, eighth century. A late example is that on the coronation mantle of Roger II, made in Norman Sicily where the eastern motifs still dominated, Talbot Rice 1965 fig. 156; like the Tapestry, it is actually embroidered, but shows the symmetry of a woven fabric.

(64) For full discussion of the Daniel motif, its origins and various versions, Deonna 1949, who illustrates examples in Carolingian, Irish, Armenian, Coptic and Merovingian art. The Sutton Hoo and Torslunda representations of the theme have a pagan interpretation but are ultimately descended from the same Iranian source, reaching the Baltic from the steppes. (Salin 1959, Chapter XXXV.)

(65) For example, the eleventh century Seljukid mask head with confronted dragons (Jairazbhoy 1965 fig. 33) bears a striking resemblance to the lintel at Much Wenlock.

(66) This type occurs for example in the Anglo-Saxon herbal B.M. Vitellius C iii.

(67) Baur 1912 figs. 6, 8, 11 and further examples of centaurs in Greek art. For the early history of the centaur, Bayet 1954; medieval aspects, Druce 1915: a pre-Conquest example
of bestiary influence on the centaur is seen on the early eleventh century cross at Nunburnholme, where a female centaur is shown suckling its baby, Baldwin Brown 1937, pl. XCII.

(68) For medieval sirens, Druce 1915, Jalabert 1936 (and p. 458 for list of examples in French Romanesque sculpture), Shepherd 1940 on the Babylonian and Syrian type; Faral 1953 for their transition from classical into Christian art.

(69) Brozzi and Tagliaferri 1961 pl. XI.

(70) Frankfort 1940 stresses Syrian priority from the second millennium for the development of the griffin type that survived into medieval art, while Leibovitch 1955 stresses the importance of Egypt. Goldman 1960 thinks that although the elements were present in the east, they synthesised further west. In Merovingian art, resulting from Caucasian influence, Salin 1959 Tables A & B, 160-161; In Sassanian silver work, Orbeli & Trever 1935 pl. 22; Byzantine tenth century silk, now at St. Martin's, Liege, von Falke 1930, pl. 172; Armenian sculpture, der Nersessian 1965, pl. 28, Baltrusaitis 1929 pls. 67-70.

(71) e.g. Sassanian silk, Robinson & Urquart 1934 fig. 9, Sassanian silver work, Orbeli & Trever 1935, pls. 28, 29, for birds plucking at leaves. Eleventh century Islamic silk, von Falke 1936, fig. 135. Tenth and eleventh century Islamic ivory caskets, Beckwith 1960 pls. 5, 14 etc. Also
popular as marginal ornament on Coptic manuscripts, Hyvernat 1888 pls. III, XIII. Further parallels with the Tapestry may be seen between the birds with scrolls growing from the head, A 208, 209 and those in an eleventh century Armenian manuscript, der Nersessian 1963, pls. I, III; birds with knotted necks A 28, 29 with those on an eighth century Byzantine marble panel, Lasteyrie 1912 fig. 218, and those in the tenth century Bible of St. Martin de Limoges, Evans 1950, pl. 69; a pair with the necks entwined, A 43, with an early eleventh century Mozarabic manuscript, Migeon 1927, fig. 155; and on a Hispano-Moresque ivory, Beckwith 1960 pls. 27, 31.

(72) Defined and discussed by Jalabert 1938.

(73) For discussion and origins and distribution of bird and fish motif, Thomas 1964, 70-74 and fig. II; also Oxenstierna 1956 in connection with the Iranian influences on the Gallehus horns. In Georgian and Armenian sculpture, Baltrusaitis 1929, pls. 83-87; and for Sassanian influence on Carolingian and Ottonian manuscripts, Boeckler 1933 figs. 31, 166, 179; Islamic survival, Pope 1938, pl. II B, eleventh century Aghand ware.

For examples of the bird on bird motif, Minns 1942, pl. XXVII A1 and A2, comparing the Sutton Hoo purse with Sarmatian metalwork in the Seven Brothers Kurgan. In Sassanian silver, Orbali & Trever 1935, pls. 33, 37; and on an Islamic Rayy vase, Pope 1938 pl. 514 c; carved on
the Achtamar facade, der Mersessian 1965 pl. 23. For the bird on deer, a tenth century Mozarabic Beatus manuscript, Beckwith 1960 fig. 25; and in marble fig. 6.

(74) The fish was of course of great significance in early Christian art; and when being swooped on by the eagle could stand for the soul of man. But its significance also arises from its role as a fertility symbol in pre-Christian art, and it is difficult to separate the Merovingian fish of Eurasiaotic origin, like the fish brooches, from the Christian one. The linked pair of fishes, on the Tapestry at B 44, and in later carving at Rock and Wensleydale represent the zodiac symbol, of classical origin; intermediate examples are seen in Carolingian art, e.g. Goldschmidt 1914-18, pl. XXV 62, in ivory.

(75) The snake-eating stag discussed by Ettinghausen 1955, with references for Sassanian examples of the motif; also Mavrodinev 1936, for its survival in the Sassanian-influenced style of the Protobulgars.

(76) Orbeli & Trever 1935 pl. 32, for confronted ibex by a tree with coiled snake; pl. 52 goats, tree and snake.


(78) e.g. Von Falke 1936 fig. 180, Byzantine under Persian influence, tenth century; fig. 172, Byzantine, eleventh century. The grazing position of the Tapestry pair appears
on a number of the confronted pairs used as border ornament on Persian textiles.

(79) See Salin 1959 on the Merovingian horse and rider plaques, and Holmqvist 1939 for their role in Coptic art. Kazarow 1938 and King 1922 discuss the development of the St. George iconography. The scene at Ulgham, with horseman, standing female figure and two birds might conceivably derive from Scandinavian mythology, for Wotan is often depicted on horse back with his two ravens Hugin and Mumin (e.g. Salin 1959 fig. 102, a Vendel plaque) and the associated figure could b the Vala who foretold to him the death and resurrection of Balder - a suitable Christ parallel for a carving of the Anglo-Norman period in Northumberland. The motif of St. George and the dragon enters Romanesque iconography as a result of influences from the crusades; it ultimately derives from Egyptian art, where Horus as a mounted warrior slays Seth-Typhon by driving a spear into his crocodile neck. It is interesting that the date of this annual ritual is April 23rd.

(80) The king drives the spear straight down into the lion's mouth on a Mosarabic textile of Sassanian influence, Brehier 1936 pl. XC; a possible intermediary is seen in a Carolingian ivory of the ninth century Ada group, where the same motif is repeated: Goldschmidt 1914-18 pl. VI II A.

(81) e.g. Talbot Rice 1965 fig. 49; tenth century Khorasan,
showing late Sassanian influence.

(82) The history and symbolism of the senmurv discussed by Trever 1938; Harper 1961 thinks it is descended from the Iranian lion-griffin and serpent-dragon. Ghirshman 1962 for examples in textile and sculpture. For survival in Armenian twelfth century wall painting, Marr 1934, pl. XLIV. And see Piggott 1950 for the spread of the senmurv to India.

(83) In Sassanian art, Orbeli & Trever 1935 pl. 37, on a silver vase from Poltava.

(84) e.g. Pfister 1928 218-223, and fig. 2.

(85) e.g. Von Falke 1929 pl. 41, the Bargello Oliphant.

(86) e.g. Talbot Rice 1965 pl. 65 on Kashan ware, which he dates to c. 1210.

(87) Salmony 1954 36-47, who specifically mentions the long-tongued devil on the Gerona Beatus of 975 as leading into the Romanesque style.

(88) Salin 1959 200-220.

(89) e.g. Wulff & Volbach 1926 fig. 98.

(90) e.g. Von Falke 1936 fig. 192, a Byzantine tenth century woven silk at St. Peter's Salzburg. It can also be seen on the Terracina casket, and in Islamic art - von Falke 1929, pl. C 3, a tenth-eleventh century ivory casket of Fatimid origin.

(91) Jalabert 1935 91 and fig. 20, mentions this trait as characteristic for the derivatives of Sassanian art -
Coptic, Byzantine and Islamic.

(92) Grabar, 1958 79 ff. who cites St. Baudelio as a Romanesque survival of this tradition.

(93) Ghirshman 1954 337; and see Pope 1938 pl. 339 A.
Kermode (1907) makes a firm division between a pre-Scandinavian, or Celtic, and a Scandinavian group. He regards the former as rather late Celtic work, dating from the late tenth or early eleventh centuries and resulting from Irish influence. The other style dates from after the conversion of Norway, c.1015-1030, and survives into the thirteenth century, with 1103-1153, the reign of Olaf, King of Man, as the period of the erection of the most elaborate crosses. The Scandinavian style represents a continuation of the previous cross forms, with the addition of more realistic animals having affinities with the east Scottish style, and dragons of distinctly Norse type. Although he sees no difference in the shape of the pre and post Viking crosses, the distribution shows a greater proportion of Celtic styles in the older parishes, while the majority of Scandinavian types occur where there are few Celtic ones.

Shetelig (1920-25) felt that it was time to regroup the crosses on the basis of a critical re-examination of the styles, and made a particular study of the Scandinavian group whose cross types, he considered, were more connected with those of Scotland than the Celtic ones of Man, of Irish type, and could be associated with the Norwegian colonies of Scotland and the
Hebrides. Gaut was the first Norwegian sculptor of Man; his characteristic ornament of interlacing bands, ultimately imitating Scottish forms, is Scandinavian and new to Celtic art. While he did not use figural ornament, a slightly later artist did, again with close Scottish parallels, and this style developed into the 'school of Gaut'. From these local developments a truly Scandinavian style was achieved, using scenes of Norse mythology and Jellinge ornament. There was also a slight revival of the Celtic type of decorated cross, using an animal ornament transitional between Jellinge and Urnes. Shetelig attempted to assign the crosses to individual artists, and laid down a very precise dating scheme:

a) Gaut's crosses  930-950 or possibly earlier
b) Figural ornament on Andreas 102 and 103  c. 940
c) Jellinge style and Sigurd subjects  Immediately after 950
d) Later Jellinge  980-990
e) Development of school of Gaut to independence  950-1000
f) Later Norse ornament with Sigurd subjects  1000-1040
g) Celtic cross types with later runes  c.1050

Holmquist (1951) considers the Scandinavian crosses of Man later in date: Shetelig's 930-950 group have motifs which should be compared with the Caedmon style of c.1000, and the closest parallels to the Manx style can be found in south English manuscripts, whose band ornament is reflected in various areas.
It reached Man and Ireland at the same time, and was transmitted to Scandinavia from Ireland in association with the early eleventh century missions. Shetelig's 'Jellinge' elements have no parallels in tenth century Norwegian art but are familiar in Man and the areas around it; the tenth century sculptors must have worked on a native foundation, but absorbed new elements from local areas. Extending this argument, Holmqvist finds a possible origin for the Jellinge stone in Man, and the source of the Jellinge style in the region around the Irish sea. From c.1000, it was English manuscript art which inspired Norwegian Manx crosses, which can not be regarded as contemporary, nor divided into stylistic groups. Viking art itself created no styles, and it is entirely due to English influence within a Christian population that the developments of the tenth and eleventh centuries must be attributed.

Wilson (1966) recognises the earlier sculptural tradition of Man based mainly on Celtic, but with some Anglian prototypes. The cross types, unlike Anglo-Saxon ones, are carved on to rectangular slabs with only a few free standing examples. The motifs of the Gaut group may all be found in north west England, but there is also evidence of close contacts with Scandinavia in the use of Borre like arm motifs and, on the contemporary slabs with figure ornament. The mythical themes and figure types are all Vikings and most of the animals could be Scandinavian, with
the exceptions of a few motifs such as the 'hart and hound' of Cumberland or Irish origin. The ornamental animals, generally separate from the narrative ones, follow the Scandinavian stylistic sequence (which owes little influence to insular models) in the use of Jelling, Mammen and Ringerike styles, with considerable influence from wooden prototypes; the ornament of Mammen type, which is also that of the Jellinge stone, is closer to its Scandinavian prototypes than that of any other British group. A chronology can be established from these ornamental types, the Mammen phase dating from 950 to 1025, Scandinavian influence being felt more directly than in Ireland.
APPENDIX B

THE REASONS FOR DATING THE TAPESTRY TO 1077

While many dates have been suggested for the Tapestry on the apparent evidence supplied by its armour, costume, details of style, and so on, of which the most extreme and late was put forward by Marignan 1902 – the late twelfth century – these hypotheses rest upon the individual and too often fallible interpretation placed upon one small aspect of it. It is safer to start with a fact: that the Tapestry was mentioned in the inventory of the treasures of the church of Notre-Dame of Bayeux drawn up in 1476, where it is described as the strip which was hung around the nave of the church on the Feast of Relics. This statement is important for two things, that the Tapestry was at Bayeux in 1476, and that it was associated with the Feast of Relics. That it was at Bayeux in 1476 does not prove that it was there in 1077; but it is significant that the scene of Harold swearing the oath on the relics is exactly copied in stone in one of the mid twelfth century nave spandrils of the cathedral, as if it had already been present as a model. Also, it is listed as one of the treasures of the church, and its display in the nave, its main function, is obviously a long established tradition. One may compare the medieval inventories of Canterbury cathedral (Legg & Hope 1902) which, two or three hundred years later, list the
gifts and possessions of Lanfranc. In the Bayeux inventory are also mentioned the wedding robes of William and Matilda, which had been presented directly to the church in their lifetime, and had not found their way there in the intervening years; it seems reasonable to assume the same to be true of the Tapestry.

As to when it was first presented to Bayeux, it is known that the cathedral was consecrated by Archbishop Odo in 1077; and that, by 1476, it was on view in July, which was both the feast of relics and the anniversary of the consecration. (Leve 1919 192). The Tapestry is eminently suitable for such an event; its subject is highly moral, and it has a dual significance for Bayeux in the role of Odo in the story of the Conquest, and the importance of the holy relics of Bayeux.

For the theme of the Tapestry is the justification of William's action because of Harold's perjury; it is this element, rather than its exciting narrative, that makes it an object of religious significance. (pace Dodswell) The Conquest was regarded in the Norman chronicles almost in the nature of a crusade, with the Pope's sanction shown by the banner carried on William's ship, the purpose being to carry out God's judgement on the trebly forsworn Harold. This was the official interpretation, however much it stood for a justification of Norman aggression. The exact terms of the oath are unsure but, apart from Harold's obligation to William as guest and vassal, the promise of the English crown that he made on the relics of Bayeux is the focal
point of the Tapestry, and the Norman victory vindicated their sanctity.

The new cathedral was consecrated in 1077; by 1082 Odo had fallen from power. To display a work in which he played such a prominent part, and in the centre of his diocese would seem highly unlikely after the latter date. Neither is the period following William's death in 1087 a very suitable one, for this is twenty years after the Conquest when on the one hand many of the events depicted in the Tapestry would be rapidly losing their immediate appeal and meaning, and on the other the need to assert and justify William's claim was not so intense.

A date within ten years of the Conquest is strengthened by the objects of material culture illustrated, and by many points of style which can be independently placed in the same chronological horizon. Items listed by Verrier 1946 3 include the details of dress, hair and moustaches, the armour of leather and platework, the narrow shields, helmets with face guards, lances with gonfalons, the Saxon battle axe, bridle curb, and buildings of the period, in particular the style of Westminster Abbey (Brown 1965, 77). While it is too easy to draw stylistic conclusions without much regard to the date, there seems nothing in the style of the Tapestry to contradict this suggested date; as regards the animal ornament, it compares with the few sculptures which can be dated to that period, and with manuscript and textile types of earlier date.
So, by the documentary evidence, the historical background and the nature and style of the Tapestry, there is nothing to contradict a date of 1077 for the completion of the Tapestry to commemorate the consecration of the cathedral of Bayeux; this is a fact which can never be proved, but should not be too seriously disputed.
APPENDIX C

HERRMANN'S INTERPRETATION OF THE TAPESTRY BORDER

FABLES

It would not be right to mention Herrmann's study of the border fables (1964) without drawing attention to some of his inexplicably incorrect attributions.

Wolf and Crane He makes three fables out of this, accepting B II (his IV) as the conventional interpretation, but treats the animals at A 89 as being quite separate, and representing two further fables, XXV and XXVI, despite the fact that they are firmly associated, since the bird has its head in the wolf's mouth.

Fox, Crow and Cheese He accepts B 8 as illustrating this fable; he describes the animals at A 90 as Lark and Fox (XXI), the Fox unsuccessfully trying to tempt the bird to the ground, which does not account for the obvious object in the bird's mouth. For B 40, he suggests the story of the fox gaining vengeance on the eagle. (XXVII)

The Bitch and Puppies Herrmann decides that the two identical depictions represent two different fables: B 10, his III, is the obvious one, but B 191, his XXXVII is the tale of the cat who mediates between the bitch and the eagle, despite the absence of any bird and the difficulty of identifying the central animal with a cat.

Lion, Monkey and other Animals Herrmann suggests the story
of the lion which ate the monkey despite its flattery; but this takes no account of the other animals, which are an integral part of the picture at B 12.

The Lion's share While accepting the lion, cow, sheep and goat at B 15 as illustrating this fable, he makes the B 16 scene of the lion on its prey represent the quite separate fable of the lion and the ass, although there is no trace of an ass and the lion's victim is obviously a deer.

The Wolf and the Goat He makes two fables out of the unified scene at B 14: in his VII is shown the young goat who resists the wolf while its mother is away; and in VIII is the fox who gives away the wolf to the hunters but gets killed itself, although the fleeing animal shown is more wolf than fox.

The Knight and Bear He describes the pair at B 26 as illustrating the fable of the horse which lost its freedom by seeking man's aid. (XIII) As there is no mention of a bear in the fable, nor an illustration of a horse in this scene, the attribution cannot be accepted.

He interprets the hunting scene at B 27 as the fable of the stag which was trapped by branches while admiring its antlers reflected in a stream; but there is no evidence in the scene of water or tree, which the designer was quite capable of depicting, while the animal shown is an ibex or goat rather than a stag.

The scene at B 123 of a dog leaping at a hare is described (XXIX) as illustrating the fable of the old dog which was blamed when it could no longer catch its prey; but the prey
in that fable is a boar, while this dog seems to be catching the hare quite successfully.

He describes the B 181, 182 spotted feline and donkey as the fable of the ass which preferred not to change one burden for another (XXXVI), a fable which makes no mention of any feline predator; and if he is considering B 181 alone, he is reading a great deal of significance into one animal.

Surprisingly, he makes no attempt to interpret the enigmatic B 45 'Beowulf' scene. Among other laborious attempts to identify the 42 fables he decided the designer was working from are his quite arbitrary selection of some of the symmetrical pairs, no different from any other (for example, XI, XVIII, XX) to fit certain fables. His most extraordinary identification is that of the very obviously male naked figure between B 36 and 37 as that of a woman in childbirth; (XIV); and although Herrmann constantly attributes very strange ideas to the designer, not even the most naive monk would make this error.

It is a pity that the detailed study and relation of the border motifs to a specific fable book is marred by mistakes of this kind. The obvious conclusion is that the designer was not working directly from the Phaedrus collection of fables, although he may have been illustrating some of them; the assumption that there was one source only cannot be proved.
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c, d. Facundas Beatus 1047 fols. 197 & 6
Section I: Anglo-Norman Animal Sculpture

Chronology

Milborne Port, Somerset Reference should be made to Zarnecki 1967 98, where the building, doorway and carving are ascribed to 1090 or a little later.

Ribbesford, Worcester The tympana and capitals should be regarded as belonging to the earliest stylistic phase of the Hereford school, from the years following 1125, and therefore not truly representative of the Anglo-Norman animal group. The bird on bird motif can be compared to an almost identical subject on the contemporary north door at Aston, Hereford (RCHM II pl.16) and one which was to become typical of the developed school.

Further unpublished examples of animal carving should be added to the catalogue:

- tympanum at Thetford
- Norwich slab with capitals
- capitals of Westminster and Whitehall

Photographs of these are in the Conway Library at the Courtauld Institute.
Section III: The Bayeux Tapestry

In connection with the suggested date of 1077 for the completion of the Tapestry, the article by Dodwell (1966) should be considered. He does not believe that the Tapestry was commissioned for the nave of the Cathedral of Bayeux, but that it was an essentially secular monument made to decorate one of Odo's palaces. This would place it within a time-span of 1066-1097, from the Conquest to Odo's death, but "it is more plausible to place it before Odo's arrest in 1085". (560)

Section IV: The Survival of the Iranian Animal Style

266 See Swarzenski (1962) for a discussion of the location of the south Italian workshops of the animal decorated oliphants, and their relationship with contemporary Byzantine ivory carving; he stresses the significance of the oliphants themselves for some of the animal motifs of Romanesque art, for they were highly prized in the west.

267 Stress should also be laid on the direct influence of Byzantine animal sculpture as opposed to textile models, and on the intermediary position of Italy in the spread of this influence. The Bernay capitals (Grodecki 1950) show a number of elements based on Byzantine models most probably derived from Italy; this can be partly related to the power of the Normans in south Italy.
3. See also Grabar 1963 pls. XXIV, XXXVII, XL etc. for examples of Byzantine relief carving showing the influence of the animal style of the woven silks.

269 Some Italian influence should be recognised in the Vladimir Suzdal carvings; it is an exaggeration to describe their style as resulting solely from an isolated course of development.

304 For 'frescoes' of St. Germigny-des-Pres, read 'mosaics'.
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