

snake bodies, are due to the final tooling of the wax models before casting. The conclusion to be drawn from this is that the St. Germain and the Gausel mounts were made for the same reliquary, and the Gausel fragments are all that is preserved from the one gable end, when the St. Germain mounts belonged to the other. The St. Germain mounts have no recorded provenance. It has been suggested that they may have belonged to the treasures of some French church, cathedral or monastery, secularized in the French Revolution. They have been torn with force from the wood they were fixed to, and this brutal deed has also been credited to the Revolution. The Gausel fragments tell the rest of the story, or we have to guess it. The St. Germain mounts were not torn off the wooden shrine in the French Revolution. The shrine, which must have been one of the most magnificent of the Celtic Church, house-shaped and of a man's length, was plundered by Norwegian Vikings. The wooden box and the saint inside could not be used for anything, but the splendid bronze gilt mounts, which François Henry regarded as outstanding masterpieces of Irish art in metalwork, were brutally torn off. To explain why the mounts went different ways, one may presume that the Vikings divided the loot between them: so that the mounts from one gable end came to Norway; but the mounts from the other gable, which show no signs of ever having been buried in the earth, may have fallen into Irish hands again after one of the defeats of the Vikings, and then brought to Gaul by some Irish refugee, who deposited them in some church or monastery.

Note: Another Hiberno-Saxon buckle was found (1961) at *Fyling, Gaular, Sogn og Fjordane*, in a rich double grave for a man and woman. Only small remains survive of this tenth-century bronze buckle and sheet-bronze buckleplate, which was doubled back through the hoop and ornamented with ribbon interlace in line engraving technique. Cf. the buckleplate from *Uig, Lewis, Hebrides, Viking Antiquities*, vol. ii, Fig. 43.

7

CHARACTERISTICS AND DATING OF ANGLO-SAXON CHURCHES

H. M. TAYLOR

A. INTRODUCTION

Post-Conquest Architecture

Prior to the nineteenth century there was little appreciation of the sequence of the various styles of medieval architecture in England, and it is to Thomas Rickman that we owe a reliable classification of buildings into styles and broad bands of dates, which he put forward in 1817.¹ It was he who proposed the names which are still generally used for the principal periods, namely: Saxon, Norman, Early English, Decorated, and Perpendicular.

Rickman gave good evidence for dating these different styles of post-Conquest buildings; and since his time the architectural history of post-Conquest England has become almost an exact science, with many examples of each style accurately dated by written records such as monastic histories or parish account-books.

Pre-Conquest Architecture

For the period before the Conquest, the position is quite different. With one or two notable exceptions, it is impossible to say that any building was erected by a particular person at a particular date; and even when we know from historical sources that a church was built at a particular time and place, there is usually no straightforward evidence to show that any part of it survives in the church which stands in that place today.

The eighteenth-century writers often described any buildings with round arches as Saxon; and in 1817 Rickman very correctly pointed out that the buildings concerned were either known to be Norman, or were so like Norman buildings that there was no real difference. However, with great perception he went on to say that there might be some real Anglo-Saxon work, as yet undiscovered, surviving in some obscure country church. Indeed, he tentatively advanced arguments for believing that the lower parts of the towers of Barton-on-Humber (Lincolnshire) and Clapham (Bedfordshire) were Anglo-Saxon.

¹ T. Rickman, *An attempt to discriminate the styles of architecture in England* (London, 1817).