

Orthology Photography Fiction Fishing
Christianity Art Cooking Essays
Buddhism Freemasonry Medicine Biology
Music Ancient Egypt Evolution
Carpentry Physics Dance Geology
Metamorphosis Fitness Shakespeare
Cosmology Yoga Marketing Confidence
Immortality Biographies Poetry
Psychology Witchcraft Electronics
Chemistry History Law Accounting
Philosophy Anthropology Alchemy Drama
Quantum Mechanics Atheism Sexuality
Personal Health Ancient History Criminal
Entomology Shipbuilding Languages Sport
Paleontology Neuroscience Metaphysics
Metaphysics Investment Archaeology

Forgotten Books

— www.forgottenbooks.com —

Copyright © 2016 FB &c Ltd.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, distributed, or transmitted in any form or by any means, including photocopying, recording, or other electronic or mechanical methods, without the prior written permission of the publisher, except in the case of brief quotations embodied in critical reviews and certain other noncommercial uses permitted by copyright law.

THE ANGLO-SAXON HOUSE

ITS CONSTRUCTION DECORATION AND FURNITURE

TOGETHER WITH AN INTRODUCTION

ON

ENGLISH MINIATURE DRAWING OF THE 10th AND 11th CENTURIES

INAUGURAL-DISSERTATION

PRESENTED TO THE

UNIVERSITY OF LEIPZIG

FOR THE

DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

BY

GEORGE TAYLOR FILES

LEIPZIG-R.

PRINTED BY OSWALD SCHMIDT.

1893.

6

~~296~~
~~A80~~

A. 293213

Preface.

The material for the present dissertation was obtained, almost exclusively, from the manuscript Claudius B. IV. (British Museum), since this Ms. offers the greatest abundance of architectural drawings. Yet I have not hesitated to make use of drawings to be found in other illuminated Mss. of this period in the British Museum, as may be seen from the frequent references to Tiberius C. VI., Cleopatra C. VIII., Julius A. VI., and Harleiana 603. Such references are used, however, only when a particular cut in one of the latter is unquestionably superior to any in Clau. B. IV in regard to the point in question.

A word may suffice to explain the abbreviations used. When no Ms. is indicated, the cut is to be understood as being taken from Clau. B. IV., otherwise the abbreviations Tib. Cleo. Jul. or Harl. are invariably added. The letter "a" signifies the front, and "b" the back or reverse of a folio, while the Roman numerals indicate the order of the cut upon the page; e. g. Cl. 141 (b. I.) means the first cut on the reverse side of Folio 141 in Ms. Cleopatra. The marginal references to Plates are but guides to the four plates which are to be found bound into the back of the thesis.

Lastly, it will be noticed that I have avoided, for the most part, a strict comparison with the Anglo-Saxon literature. This I have purposely done since an extended or even partial comparison would have made the present

work of too great compass. I have here dealt exclusively with the illuminations, with the aid of all that has been previously done in the field of domestic Architecture both among the Anglo-Saxons and the kindred Germanic nations.

Leipzig, Jan. 28., 1893.

G. T. F.

Table of Contents.

	page
I. <i>Introduction</i>	7
a) The Irish School of Miniature Drawing	9
b) The English School of the 10th and 11th Centuries	11
c) Later Development	12
II. <i>The Manuscript Claudius B. IV</i>	13
III. <i>The Development as shown in Claudius B. IV</i>	15
Type vs. true Delineation from Nature	

THE ANGLO-SAXON HOUSE.

IV. <i>The Anglo Saxon Dwelling:</i>	
a) The Common Germanic Type and A.-S. Representative	24
b) The External Appearance of the House	29
c) The Internal Appearance of the House	34
d) The Construction of the House	37
e) Ornamentation of the Exterior	45
f) The Interior and its Decorations	51
g) <i>The Furniture</i> 1) The Seat of Honor or Throne	53
2) The Bed	60
3) The Table	62
4) The Desk for Writing	65

Introduction.

I.

Before the end of the twelfth Century, two great eras of Anglo-Saxon Art had arisen, flourished, and each in its turn, sunk into the past as chapters for the great history of the development of Art. Neither was destined to be lost, yet, after the coming of the Norman Conqueror,¹⁾ the individual characteristics of each, sank so far into the background in consequence of the materially different taste of the Norman; that the beauty of these English schools, which had, unquestionably, surpassed all continental contemporaries and vied with the products of the East in splendor and brilliancy—lost its independence and originality to survive only in the scanty remnants of more modern schools of decorative art. Such a loss is to be sincerely regretted since the art of these periods, together with the allied architectural development, possessed that one quality of inestimable worth in such a field—individuality; an individuality alike beautiful and

¹⁾ It may be said that today, in England, no remnants of unquestionable authenticity remain as examples of this Anglo-Saxon Period of Architecture. So complete was the destruction caused by the Normans — and so thorough their energy in rebuilding — that practically nothing of this interesting period remains.

C. Schnaase ("Geschichte der bildenden Künste im Mittelalter". Bd. IV, S. 380) mentions the following examples of churches in which Saxon influence is traceable

Church at Dover (just within Walls)

„ „ Brixworth.

„ „ Earls Barton.

interesting — yet dependent enough upon surrounding influences to make its successive steps of progress a complete study in themselves.

These two great schools, then, flourished in England between the 8th and 12th Centuries; the first (8th and 9th cys.) is not, in the strictest sense *English*, but rather *Irish*, since the distinctive style upon which the whole type depends, originated in the monasteries and cloisters of Ireland, but found its complete development upon the neighboring English soil.

The second, which flourished from the beginning of the 10th to the close of the 11th Century, goes back to the same Irish School for its source, but became in the course of time so altered by the influence of the so called Carlovingian school that it must be judged as a most perfect development of these two sources—and at the same time, in consequence of its combined characteristics—more beautiful than either original.

No study of the illuminated Mss. which date from these periods may be undertaken, at least, if such study be with a view to discovering thereby the manners, customs and peculiarities of the Saxons, without some previous knowledge of the individual characteristics of these two schools. More especially is this the case in the Mss. of the 11th and 12 Cys, in which the fixed conventionalities of miniature drawing (illumination proper) have given way to a freer, more lifelike delineation of objects and persons. Here each cut is made up largely under such influences, and, only after most careful study, is one enabled to eliminate all foreign and artistic elements, and thereby get near to the real truth and form of the objects represented. This fact is of vast importance in consideration of such a subject as that of the present thesis —“The A. S. House”. The illuminations to be considered abound in instances of such influences, all of which must be carefully eliminated before we may hope to arrive at a true conception of the object in view.

The striking characteristics of the two schools:

a) THE IRISH MINIATURE DRAWING. (8th and 9th Cys.)

Schnaase remarks that the Irish took the first steps toward the founding of a *new school* of miniature drawing.¹⁾ Whence it came will perhaps forever remain a question. Is it Byzantine, or is it, as some believe, of Egyptian origin? The latter supposition is an absurdity, since no such school ever existed in Egypt. The best result is undoubtedly that to which Schnaase himself comes, viz., that the origin is to be found in Ireland itself and the peculiar style is but a natural outgrowth from the character of these northern people.

At the time when the Irish style arose, the glory of illuminative art centered in the capital of the Eastern Empire—where, in fact, it is supposed by many to have originated. The power of the Christian church had long rested there, even before the final rupture in 726 A. D. Thus it happens that only in later years, when once again the supremacy of the western Church had been recognized—we are enabled to find a distinctive Roman art—the so—called debased Roman) which in part is closely followed by the English school.

The Germanic tribes developed a style of illumination peculiar to themselves and striking in its originality—the result of the combination of oriental types with a native barbaric element. Nowhere is this more clearly illustrated than in the *Irish school*—the parent of all northern development.

The material for such illumination is drawn from the four following sources: first the textile art, eg. plaits, bows, ziz-zags, knots and geometrical figures; second, the simpler forms of animal life, such as birds, lizards, dogs, dragons: third, those borrowed from metal work, eg. spirals and

¹⁾ Cf. Dr. Karl Schnaase's "Geschichte der bildenden Künste im Mittelalter". Düsseldorf 1854. Bd. IV, S. 456.

scrolls; and lastly, the human figure.¹⁾ No trace of foliage work is to be found but the whole design consists of an intricately interwoven mass of the objects already mentioned. The birds and animals are weird and fantastic—always holding to the most rigid laws of conventionality. Endless bodies of scrolls, twisting and twining in seemingly aimless entanglement, but suddenly emerging and terminating in heads of animals, birds or men. The bodies are crude and conventional—in most cases, only a portion being represented, yet always in closest connection with the main body of the design. The human form is freely represented—still each limb or feature is but a pattern. The face is drawn *squarely* in front—the eyes, ears, and mouth *types* and not representations of nature. The limbs are large and terminate in intricate scrolls. The costumes are but masses of color without naturalness—but shaped into geometrical form. The whole lends an effect of complex masses of closely but skillfully interwoven threads, bands, or ribbons—lengthened and enlarged into animal bodies. The coloring is bright and varied—yet at the same time consistent. The letters are large and of extreme intricacy—usually bordered by one or more rows of red dots—which custom forms a most striking characteristic of the Irish style.²⁾

Such was the so-called Irish school of illumination, which however did not continue long in England in all its strict individuality and purity. As early as the beginning of the 9th Cy., this style became so mingled with the technical effects of Roman influence that the combined qualities led to that greater and perhaps more famous English School.

¹⁾ I have followed in general the description of these following schools, as given by

Schnaase (G. d. b. K.) and also.

Woltmann & Woermann's "History of Painting", Vol. I, p. 188 ff.

Yet the views here presented are based largely upon a careful examination of the Mss. of these periods.

²⁾ cf. Plate I. No. III. (I. fol. 31. a.).

b) ENGLISH SCHOOL OF THE 10th AND 11th CENTURIES.

With the reign of King Aelfred a new life had begun for the Anglo Saxons—alike intellectually and artistically. Manuscripts were largely introduced from foreign lands—particularly from Italy and France. The art of miniature drawing advanced with equal pace but its style was fundamentally altered. Roman influence and particularly simplicity of workmanship, as found in Carlovingian models, supplanted the intricate Irish design. The *leaf*—debased form of the Roman *acanthus*—now became the basal type in place of heads and bodies of animals. The intricate laced-work was still much used but of a less conventional form. This style is indebted to the French for its abundance of rich ornamental border-work. These frames or borders of the pages—which had previously been masses of interlaced scrolls—gave way to richly colored pillars surmounted by graceful arches of rare designs. Profuse border-work took the place of the lettered page and with it came freedom from conventionality in the delineation of life. The human figure was freed from its entanglement amid scrolls and bands and given a more fitting place in the body of the page. The body is free, expressed with much greater activity, and depends less upon type. To be sure, the proportions are still bad—the hands and feet disproportionately large and the limbs crude. But the symmetrical regularity with which the shoulder curves into the arm and the waist into the hip—a great fault in Irish work—is to a considerable degree overcome. All the beauty of the Irish band-work has been added to the grand but simple qualities of the Roman form.

This style continued to acquire richness in its growth until, throughout Europe, it was sought and distinguished from all other illuminative art, as “Opus Anglicum”, which fact points to the esteem in which it was held.¹⁾

¹⁾ For confirmation of this fact cf. T. Wright's “*History of Domestic Manners and Sentiments in Eng. during the Middle Ages*”. London

In the Benedictional of St. Aethelwold, the style of workmanship is thus mentioned. "Ethelwold commanded a monk subject to him to write the present book *and ordered also to make in it many arches, elegantly decorated and filled up with various ornamental pictures, expressed in divers beautiful colors and gold.*¹⁾

c) LATER DEVELOPMENT.

This beautiful work developed in two different lines, the one in the direction of extreme ornamental finish and the second, into complete simplicity.

The result of the first was a florid style of interlacing branches and leaves, with richly drawn columns of Roman and Grecian types — all finished in beautiful colors and gold. It points to the usual extreme which follows a symmetrical and consistent climax in the field of art. Yet this extreme was beautiful, although gaudy, and in the height of its glory (middle of 12th Cy) surpassed all other schools in point of elegance and richness of color.

The second line of development was — as has been said, in the direction of simplicity. We have already seen how the Anglo-Saxon school borrowed from the Carlovingian a greater freedom in the delineation of the human figure. Nor did this development confine itself to the portrayal of man, but animals, birds, foliage — in short all nature — began to assume a more appropriate, a more lifelike appearance. The artist seems to strive for greater freedom in order that he may better express himself and portray objects and

1862. Also the books of Schnaase and Normann mentioned before. Likewise Henry Shaw's "*A Handbook of the Art of Illumination, as practiced during the Middle Ages*". London 1866. p. 16.

¹⁾ cf. H. H. Humphrey, "The Illuminated Books of the Middle Ages". London 1844/49. p. 2.

persons as they appear to him in life. One by one the fixed rules of conventionality are broken. The beautiful but stiff and ornamental border gives way to a plain but more lifelike drawing of some scene. The architectural surroundings gradually assume the proper forms of houses and cast aside formal regularity. The beautifully illuminated initial letter is supplanted by some appropriate drawing for the adjoining text. In short the *illuminator has developed into an illustrator*, and all his efforts have this in view. It is, then, in such a period as this that we must look for the dawn of illustration, not as is often asserted—in much later time. The change has already taken place and the excess of beauty and richness in illumination has brought with it the necessary return to *simplicity and truthfulness to nature*.

The development is gradual but unmistakable. Not without a great effort does the Anglo-Saxon artist give up the common types and conventionalities—this influence is seen in each line that he draws. Traces of the preceding schools are apparent in all work of the transition period—clearly and distinctly defined.

The manuscript Claudius B. IV, from the illustrations in which the material of the present thesis is drawn—belongs exactly to this period (middle or latter half of the 11th Century) and illustrates all the striking peculiarities.

II.

The manuscript, Cottoniana Claudius B. IV, now in the British Museum (London), contains an Anglo-Saxon Paraphrase of the Pentateuch together with the Book of Joshua, written by Aelfric.¹⁾

The date of composition can not be ascertained with cer-

¹⁾ The *exact* date of this manuscript can not be ascertained—since no reference thereto is made in the book itself. Still it was, in all probability executed within some 60 to 75 years after the date given as the probable time of the original: viz. Middle or latter half of 11th Cy.

tainty but, in all probability, is not for from the year 997 or 998 (since in this and the other copies Aelfric calls himself "priester".¹⁾)

Besides the text are to be found some two hundred and twenty illuminations, illustrative of different passages in the paraphrase, so that the book is of inestimable value both from the standpoint of its literary contents and still more so on account of the actual portrayal of the manners, customs, and dress of the Anglo-Saxons of that period. To be sure, the real delineation of life, as found in this and other manuscripts of its class,²⁾ is at the expense of the beauty which characterizes the usual miniature drawing; yet this transition between cold conventionality and freedom of expression, forms in itself a period of art, a link in the long line of development. We cannot wonder that the eye accustomed to the regularity of border illumination should, with difficulty, draw life in all its activity and freedom. No radical change could possibly take place, but in accordance with the usual laws of development, we find in all this period a union of the first with the last, the earlier with the later, while each and every trace of the earlier forms is clearly defined in the drawings of the later. The beautifully interwoven bands and ribbons of Irish work form excellent patterns for branches and foliage. Add but the Roman acanthus leaf to this and the vine is complete.³⁾ In similar manner the graceful architectural column of the Carolingian style offers material for a developed house, yet so mingled and diffused with attributes of its prototype that the borrowed elements must be first eliminated before we may hope to obtain a true picture.⁴⁾ Such is the case

¹⁾ cf. Prof. Wülker's "Grundriss zur Geschichte der A. S. Litteratur". Leipzig 1885. § 549 — 551.

²⁾ The most important are as follows: Tiberius C. VI, Cleopatra C. VIII., and Julius A. VI., all in the British Museum, and the Caedmon Mss. in Bodleiana.

³⁾ Vgl. Plate I. No. I. (fol. 17 a. I.)

⁴⁾ Vgl. Plate III. No. I. (fol. 24 b). II. No. II. (fol. 37 b). II. No. V. (fol. 23 b. 3).

throughout in the illuminations of Cl. B. IV and a consideration of this particular Ms. will suffice for this whole period of art.

III.

DEVELOPMENT IN CLAUDIUS B. IV: TYPE VS. TRUE DELINEATION FROM NATURE.

We have already seen that the artists of freer — or as some would term it, barbarous style of illumination, are indebted to two great periods of miniature drawing, first, the neighboring Irish school and second, the debased Roman¹⁾ for I shall so name this second, although most of the models were, without doubt, of French workmanship. The Carolingian style is, however, so manifestly built up from the Roman that the names might well be considered synonymous. It remains now to find exactly to what degree the illustrations in Cl. B. IV must be considered art types and not true delineations from nature.

In the *structure of the house*, the style of design is, to a great degree, dependent upon the French. The chief characteristic and beauty of Carolingian workmanship consists of a profuse border ornamentation of architectural design. The sides of the illuminated pages are adorned with beautifully finished columns, capitals, and bases, while the top of the page is ordinarily rounded into a graceful arch. The ornamentation of the pillars and capitals is chiefly some Roman-acanthus design.²⁾ This style the Anglo Saxon has openly borrowed and incorporated in his architectural forms.

¹⁾ This came to the Saxons chiefly through the French (as represented by the Carolingian School).

²⁾ This will scarcely be found amply illustrated in the accompanying plates. Unfortunately such plates are the *most numerous* in the Ms. and yet their dependence upon mere miniature type and style (the Carolingian) is so manifest as to render them *useless* as material for such a work as the present.

In Cl. B. IV, where the cuts are small and badly executed, this influence is not so readily seen, but still is unquestionably there. For example, in the architectural surroundings of the thrones of kings and powerful personages, the *whole* may be considered in no other light than that of a free use of architectural finish as appropriate background for the royal seat. *The design is in no degree a truthful portrayal of internal decoration* — on the contrary, *only an ideal, artistic finish.*¹⁾ We must look to the cruder, simpler cuts to find the necessary true delineations. The next step is, naturally, a combination of the real and ideal and, accordingly, many pictures (for the most part ideal designs) are finished with portions of real houses; eg. a pure Roman arch to which is fantastically added a tiled roof and peaked towers, or a similar arch with large gables and towers. A favorite method of drawing a complete structure is as follows: the king, with attendant guests, is seated in the center of the picture. Over them is drawn a series of two or more ornamental arches, often supported by pillars and large enough to enclose the assembled company. Above all this may be seen the tiled roof, slanting sharply until it meets the architectural finish. The angles between the arches are filled with diminutive towers and gables while the whole may be given a natural appearance by means of high towers on either side extending to a level with and sometimes above the roof.²⁾

In other cases, the process has advanced somewhat farther. The sides of the house may be finished with architectural designs, while the roof is perfectly drawn from real patterns, the whole giving the appearance of a roof supported by a row of richly decorated columns.³⁾

The last step is that in which the entrance or gateway alone is dependent upon some earlier influence. Such plates

¹⁾ Good examples of such traces may be seen in Plate XXIV (Tib. 5 b).

²⁾ Vgl. Plate III. No. I. (fol. 24 b). Plate II. No. V. (fol. 23. b. 3).

³⁾ Vgl. Plate II. No. III. (fol. 31. a. I.) Plate II. No. I. (fol. 32. a. I.).

are common and oftentimes beautifully drawn.¹⁾ There can be but little doubt but that such was actually used in A. S. Architecture.

In other plates, two portions of the city wall may be finished with columns, while the space between is spanned by a gracefully curving arch.

Only one fact remains to be mentioned and that too belongs more to technique than to influence. It may be frequently seen that the artist has, as it were, tacked the front elevation of the house directly upon the side. Such an occurrence can only be accounted for when we consider the ignorance of perspective at this period. The artist, being unable to draw both front and side, has given *the one beside the other.*²⁾

In the field of *external and internal ornamentation*, the A. S. artist is indebted alike to Irish and to Carlovingian models.

It would be impossible in such an introduction as this to enter into a full discussion of the extent to which the Anglo-Saxon, as well as other Germanic nations are indebted to the peculiar types of the early Irish school.³⁾ Not alone does this occur in miniature drawing, but the whole field of art is so pervaded by this one style that the influence becomes recognizable at the first glance. Such remains are far more numerous in Norway, but in the few that are still left to us in England, e. g., the tombstones and wayside crosses, ornamentation of armor and vessels, the fact is clearly proved that art in general was *borrowed from manuscript illumination.*

¹⁾ Vgl. Plate II. No. 2 (fol. 37. b). Plate II. No. 6 (fol. 32. a. II).

²⁾ Vgl. Plate II. No. 5 (fol. 23. b. III).

³⁾ Vgl. "Denkmäler einer sehr ausgebildeten Holzbaukunst aus den frühesten Jahrhunderten in den inneren Landschaften Norwegens", hrsg. J. C. Dahl, (Dresden) 1837, und auch Schnaase's "*Geschichte der bildenden Künste im Mittelalter*", likewise Rudolf Henning's "Das deutsche Haus" p. 61. In these works a full description may be found of the peculiar external and internal ornamentation of houses in Denmark, Sweden and Norway. The whole is traced by Schnaase to an Irish origin.

In the present Ms. examples of such work are numerous, the most noteworthy may be said to be the following:

The decorations of the shafts, capitals and bases of the columns,¹⁾ the friezes of the walls,²⁾ the iron ornamentation as well as the panels of the doors, and the carved work upon the chairs and beds³⁾ are all dependent upon the same *band design*, intermingled with curious heads of animals and birds. The draperies upon the walls and doors, as well as clothing and armor are universally adorned with ornaments of similar design. It must be born in mind throughout, that such work is relieved by the use of the acanthus leaf — which will be noticed particularly in the consideration of the development of the landscape.

No better example of a free use of such elements could be found than the prows of ships which in *Folios* (14. a II), (14. b), (15. a),⁴⁾ represent the *Ark* as conceived by the artist. Long bands colored in blue and yellow emerge from the mouth and neck of the fantastically conceived heads of monsters of indescribable sort. These bands twine among themselves or about the animals neck, disappearing in the carved portions of the beak and, in turn, emerging in similar form or as broadened acanthus leaves. Such designs as this are represented upon the corners of houses and columns throughout the Ms.⁵⁾ Yet more interesting to observe and fruitful to trace, is the almost entire dependence of the artist upon such models for his *delineation of the objects of Nature*. A figure, an architectural flourish, or a border may be designed with great skill, but for his interpretation of the different forms of natural phenomena and particularly for the landscape, the artist is still bound by the hard and fast lines of conventionality. Each and every object becomes a type and however

¹⁾ Vgl. Pl. IV. Nos. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9.

²⁾ Vgl. Pl. III. No. 9 (T. fol. 13. b).

³⁾ Vgl. Pl. IV. No. 10. (fol. 55. b. III). Vgl. Pl. IV. Nos. 18, 19, 20. Vgl. Pl. IV. Nos. 15, 21.

⁴⁾ Vgl. Pl. I. Nos. (4 and 5).

⁵⁾ Vgl. Pl. II. No. 3. (fol. 31. a. I).

often it may be represented, one find little if any deviation from the fixed standard.

The tree is but a solid, clumsy trunk terminating in an oval mass of green. There are no leaves, no branches — only stubby little bunches protruding here and there from the body of the tree which may suggest broken branches or sprouts.¹⁾ Leaves, in the solid mass of what typifies foliage, are suggested by *short circular dashes*, or regular tile-like compound curves. Gradually however the branches begin to assume form, and this slight development may be traced in Cl. B. IV., particularly in *Folio 7 (a)*, where the separation from the mass becomes necessary, the representation being the temptation of Eve where the Serpent is found twining among the branches. In other Mss. e. g. Tib. C. VI., the development becomes very marked. The foliage has assumed a more wavy form, the branches are separate and distinct from the body of the tree, while the trunk assumes more slender and graceful proportions. Wherever the tree is to be found, whether growing from the earth, or a separate piece, it is invariably suggested by the branch-like protrusions over its surface.

Much more originality and freedom is shown in the delineation of the trees than in that of the shrubs and bushes. In the latter strict conventionality is rigidly adhered to. In fact, they can scarce be called types, for so formal is their portrayal and wanting in originality, that the finished picture gives the impression of a nicely conceived design. Here the artist is more than commonly dependent upon the acanthusleaf.

Folio 36 (b. I) furnishes us with a perfect example. The central figure is a beautiful scroll design. The two sides are perfectly similar, each branch being exactly balanced by a similar one upon the opposite side. The stem or trunk is represented as an upright succession of out-growing stems, from the junctions of which proceed stems or branches finished with acanthus leaves, strictly conventional in form. The two bushes upon either hand hold less firmly to

¹⁾ Vgl. Pl. I. No. VII (fol. 7. a).

the usual types, the trunks being longer and more slender, while the branches emanate from separate portions of the stem near the top.

In *Folio 93* (a. II) the drawing of the palm trees is interesting. There are two rows, each containing some twelve conventional acanthus designs, no one of which bears the least resemblance to a palm-tree. The artist has evidently seized upon this as an excellent opportunity to show his power in original designing, for no two trees are at all similar but all are more artistically conceived patterns.

With such a use of the acanthus leaf the artist has joined the entwining branches, particularly so in the portrayal of *vines*. Take, as example, *Noah's vinyard* (in *Folio 17. a. I*).¹⁾ The trellis is formed of a single horizontal rod resting in the crotched ends of two uprights. Around this trellis wind the many branches of the vines, twisting in and out in most intricate fashion. Here and there upon the stems are attached the conventional acanthus leaves while the ends of the vines terminate commonly in species of blossom made of five circular petals. No better illustration of the adaptation of the Irish band-work to the portrayal of nature may possibly be found. The one is fitted perfectly to the drawing of the second and has been unscrupulously borrowed.

The grass of the fields is rarely represented. Only in one instance (*Folio 7. b. II*) are *long blue blades* to be found and here the representation is quite natural.

Earth and sky conform to one type in the mind of the A. S. artist. The form may be described as long series of compound curves one emanating from the other. Such a type lends itself very appropriately to the conception of the clouds and so they are always represented; long series of such connected compound curves alternating with wavy lines of similar length and regularity. But for the representation of the earth's surface, such a method is less commendable. The earth thus becomes one extant of waving, hill-like surfaces.²⁾

¹⁾ Vgl. Pl. I. No. I (fol. 17. a. I).

²⁾ Vgl. particularly in reference to this, the two cuts made from Cleopatra C. VIII (Folios 28. b. I and 27. b. II) both on Plate XXVII.

For the formation of hills these curves Rise to a much higher level and descend upon the other side. Not only in Cl. B. IV but in all the Mss. of this period the artists adhere to this one type for the earth's surface.

In the early pages of the Ms.¹⁾ the artist finds abundant opportunity for the delineation of *animal life*. These Folios treat of the Creation. The fowls of the air, the beasts of the field and, finally, Man, are drawn with varied success in point of truthfulness to nature.²⁾ These again are but types, for, were it not for the horns of the cattle and sheep, the beard of the goat and the lump of the camel, the cuts might serve as well for one as for the other. Each animal has its type with slight variations in size and form. The whole delineation is but a succession of curves, the neck curving slightly from the back and the legs from the body. So also in case of the birds, the body, wings, and tail are all successions or variations of curves, offering little originality. The feathers too are short circular dashes.

The artist seems to have had little difficulty in drawing garments, and this may be accounted for when we think that the manuscripts had for ages been filled with representations of Saints and Church Fathers. When once the clothing is removed, the artist becomes lost in the maze of anatomical structure.

For such a cause as this, the style of this period has been called barbarous by many commentators.³⁾ Without doubt it deserves the reproach for little or no skill is displayed in this brance of drawing.

Here again body and head are but patterns.⁴⁾ The figure as a whole, is composed of *bows and knots*. The eyes, nose, and mouth are but slight dashes of the brush while

¹⁾ d. h. Claudius B. IV.

²⁾ Vgl. the one Plate made in regard to this point: Plate I. No. II (fol. 48. b).

³⁾ This whole style of "Miniature Drawing" is characterised as a "barbaric outgrowth of a once beautiful Art" in the "History of Painting" by Woltmann and Woermann.

⁴⁾ Vgl. Pl. I. Nos. 6 and 7.

the hands and feet are large and disproportionate. I cannot refrain from quoting a passage from Woltmanns and Woermanns "History of Painting" (p. 188, vol. I) which describes the general appearance with wonderful truthfulness: "The lanky figures with attenuated limbs, lifeless heads and wild fluttering draperies, with fidgety creases at the edges and often exaggerated in their movements, but with all this rawness of treatment, the compositions, often containing many figures, show a surprising number of lively motives and happily devised incidents."

The drawing is oftentimes bad, but still a great advance has been made. The forms have stepped down from their frames and taken on life and action. There is movement, if without grace, and there is life; even though the limbs be but successions of badly drawn curves. Even in the drawings of Tiberius C. VI, which has been so often cited—there remains a stiffness of limbs and joints which mars the picture—although many of the curves of the body are drawn with much accuracy.

THE LANDSCAPE.

Twice in the course of the whole Ms. the artist has raised himself from the level of the ordinary designer, and in these two plates—crude and primitive as they are—we possess the actual germs of a landscape. The text to be illustrated is descriptive of the river which flows from the garden of Eden and reads as follows:

("Daet flod is ðanon todæled on feower ean. An ea of ðam hatte fison—seo gæð anbutan ðæt land ðæt is gehaten evilað—ðær ðær gold wyxð 𐌿| ðæs landes gold is goldas.... ðær beoð eac gemette ða gimmstanas ðellunn 𐌿| honynclumis." ¹⁾)

This cut alone may be called a real painting. All conventionality is thrown aside, and the brush alone serves to illustrate the contents of the text. The quadrangular surface

¹⁾ or this one "𐌿| ðæt flod eode of stowe to stowe þære wynsumnysse to wœteringenne neorxnawang."

of the frame or border is colored in dark red, shading to a blue near to the picture. The yellow of the vellum serves as an appropriate color for the sky, while the body of the river is painted in green. All other elements are omitted—but the triumph remains in this alone that the rigidity of type has once given way to the free use of the brush.

In all other examples that we have considered, the different forms of nature have been represented *as individuals forms*—alone and distinct. In no one instance do we find the whole combined in one comprehensive sketch. To be sure, in (Folio 34. a. II) which represents Lot hidden in the mountain cave, there is much more breadth of conception,—yet all is conventional and the mountain holds to the strict formula of representation for the earth's surface.

The emancipation was only accomplished piece by piece. As soon as the *individual forms were bettered* the *finished whole* followed immediately. Still the great advancement which the Ms. Cl. B. IV demonstrates is that so often mentioned—a step toward freedom of design and delineation. Barbarous as the style may be, we cannot but admire this early step from illumination to illustration.

IV.

The Anglo-Saxon House (11th Century).

a) THE COMMON GERMANIC TYPE AND ITS A.-S. REPRESENTATIVE.

Before entering into a minute description of the Saxon house in all its particulars, it may be well to give, as briefly as possible, a short sketch of the probable form of the original Germanic House together with its development in England.

Two fundamentally different opinions have been advanced in regard to the form of the original Germanic House: the first, the theory of unity, or the form in which *man and beast were sheltered under one and the same roof*;¹⁾ and the second, that of multiplicity, where not only man and beast, but also each separate department of the household, *demanding its separate structure*.²⁾ Whichever may have been the real original form, the consideration of the house of the German in his continental home becomes of great importance to the present subject, since it is there that we must look for facts to sub-

¹⁾ This view is particularly upheld in regard to the *German* house by *Heinrich Otte* in his "Geschichte der deutschen Baukunst von der Römerzeit bis zur Gegenwart". (Bd. I, p. 45.) Leipzig, 1861. He believes the early houses in Saxony in which all is comprised within one structure, to be the original whereas,

²⁾ Moritz Heyne in "Germania X", p. 94 gives priority to the Fränkish house—of more than one building.

stantiate certain views, and—of still greater importance—for the testimony which the literature furnishes.

The first of the theories given above is, perhaps, more strongly upheld, and yet, upon careful examination of the German house, the following peculiarity becomes unmistakable, viz., as one approaches nearer to the North Sea, the *tendency toward separate structure* becomes greater. Rudolf Henning, in his excellent treatise, “Das deutsche Haus”, lays particular stress upon this fact and finds particularly in the Frisian house the tendency to combine three or more houses clearly defined.¹⁾ Such was true, without doubt, in the case of the English house. For a great part, the houses must have been separate structures, although the tendency to join the smaller buildings to the main house, in shape of sheds and ells, seems to have begun at an early date.

Turning from Germany, which probably has undergone radical changes from the strong civilizing influences of the continent, we may find, in the more secluded districts of *Norway*, a better field for research in regard to the original Germanic house.²⁾ There, among the remains of a well developed system of architecture, are to be found many instances of separate structures in the building of the House. These too, in all probability, come very near to an original type. The houses are universally built of wood, large, irregular, and built either entirely distinct from one another, or joined closely wall to wall. Each individual structure contains rarely more than one room, whereas, in some instances, a sleeping apartment seems to have been added as an ell. The old custom of the great hall in which the leader received and

¹⁾ I have made use of the treatise as it appeared in Ten Brink und Scherer's “Quellen und Forschungen”, Bd. 47, p. 43, also published as a separate work; “Das deutsche Haus in seiner historischen Entwicklung” von Rudolf Henning. Strassburg, 1882; auch London, 1882.

²⁾ I have here followed the description of the Norwegian house, as given by Dahl in his work upon the remains of this early architecture in Norway, “Geschichte einer sehr ausgebildeten Holzbaukunst in den inneren Landschaften Norwegens” von J. C. Dahl. Dresden, 1837.

entertained his retainers, is commonly adhered to, while apart from this stood the separate buildings, each for some particular purpose. In the sagas of the North there was a separate house for each of the household needs, and the actual remains, which are unquestionably of great antiquity, reproduce these customs with striking truthfulness.

The Gothic house likewise, as far as may be judged from literary remains, coincides with these views of the Germanic type.¹⁾ The different structures which made up the house were numerous, separate, and ordinarily used for a single purpose. All the small peculiarities which distinguished the house of the northern nations from that of the south seem to be reproduced and illustrated in the Gothic literature.

Such was, in all probability, the common Germanic type. We know from the description of Tacitus that the Germanic village was scattered over a large extent of territory²⁾—yet, not alone the village, but the home of the private individual, must be conceived as being made up of distinct structures, which, taken as a whole went to make up the home.

In England, this custom of building separate structures is clearly demonstrated in the literature and in illuminations of the existing manuscripts. An inquiry into the literature does not belong to the field of the present treatise, yet it may be well, before leaving the "A. S. house in reference to its dependence upon a Germanic type", to mention the important instances in which this custom of separate structure finds its strongest proof.

In the Harleian manuscript No. 603³⁾ there occurs a most important cut. The Ms. contains many inferior representations of houses but Folio 67 (b) may be said to picture the A. S. house in all its details. The picture is designed as an illustration for the 91st Psalm⁴⁾ and represents the righteous and

¹⁾ I have followed the comparison made by Henning (*Das deutsche Haus*). p. 121.

²⁾ Vgl. Tacitus' "Germania" 16.

³⁾ Harleian a 603 in the British Museum. The following description is made from personal examination of the Mss.

⁴⁾ Psalm CXI in the "Vulgata". (Psalm CXII in "King James Version"),

generous lord feeding and clothing the poor, within his own household.¹⁾ The master of the house is seen in the arched doorway, together with his wife, distributing loaves to the hungry while in the doorway of an adjoining structure other members of the household are dispensing clothing. In this home, the distinct structures are four in number, while the addition of three ells or sheds, increases the number to *seven*. In the center stands the great hall, in front of which is to be seen a semi-circular entrance or porch surmounted by a cupola, which, in turn, is supported by pillars and arches. To the left, is a second quadrangular building, built partly of stone with large arched doorway and small windows. This was the living-apartment either of the master or of his retainers. This second structure seems to join the hall—wall to wall—for about a fourth of its entire length. A shed or ell is attached to the side of this second house while to the side of the ell still another small structure is built on.

On the right of the main hall stands the small church or chapel which is distinguishable by its cross. Another shed or ell is joined to the chapel, while behind the whole structure rises a small portion of the sides and roof of a circular building. Here then are four distinct buildings—joined to each other only enough to permit of passing from one to another. The tendency to join the separate structure to the main house, as an ell or shed, is also fully illustrated.

In Claudius B. IV., *Folio* 89 (b. II),²⁾ we possess most conclusive proof—although the cut is one of the poorest in the Ms. The picture seems to be a cross-section of four adjoining buildings.³⁾ The houses seem to be simply framed, each with its peaked roof and inner supporting—column.

particularly illustrating the fol. passages: 3. "Wealth and riches shall be in his house and his righteousness endureth forever." 9. "He hath dispersed, he hath given to the poor, his righteousness endureth forever, etc."

¹⁾ Wright, in his "Homes of other Days", (a later edition of the book already mentioned) gives also a description of this cut.

²⁾ Vgl. Pl. III. No. VIII (fol. 89 b. II).

³⁾ Only three of the four buildings have been reproduced.

Most singularly, however, the structures are joined side to side—if we may trust the illuminations—one wall serving for the side of two buildings.

In *Folio* 31 a. II., two and perhaps three separate structures are represented while upon the side of the more remote, two sheds have been added.¹⁾

In *Folios* 32 (a) and 33 (b), taken from Cleopatra C. VIII., we find two perfect illustrations of the exact method in which the sheds were added to the main structure.²⁾

Such, then, seems to have been the method, or, better the style, which the Anglo-Saxon inherited from the great Germanic stock:—a group of separate structures, wholly apart from one another or, in a measure, joined side to side. This style of domestic architecture appears to have been preserved from the time of the earliest migrations to the island, to the coming of the Norman Conqueror. Each of the chief household needs demanded its individual building. There was, before all,—particularly in the homes of the wealthy and more powerful—the great hall where the noble feasted and drank with his friends and retainers. Besides this, we must include within the picture the other important buildings—the treasure room, the stable, the kitchen and the washroom.

Yet, all this time, the tendency toward concentration was in progress—particularly in the towns and cities where the land rose greatly in value and the houses conformed naturally to the demands of the time. We have already seen that this tendency can be clearly marked in all the manuscripts of the period. First, we find the separate structure; secondly, the buildings are more closely united; thirdly, the adjoining buildings are confined to small side buildings or ells; and lastly, all or much is included under one roof in the form of separate rooms.

In the middle of the 11th century, when, in all probability, the Ms. Claudius was made, the Anglo Saxon culture had reached its highest point. The language existed in all its

¹⁾ Vgl. Pl. III. No. II (fol. 31 a. II).

²⁾ Vgl. Plate IV. No. I (C. fol. 32 a).

purity, Art in all its beauty, and Architecture—in spite of the unfavorable account of William of Malmesbury¹)—must have reached, at least, a fair state of perfection and beauty. At all events, it possessed originality.

Today, few, if any traces of such architecture are to be found in England. It has given way to the more highly developed and, unquestionably, more beautiful style of the Normans. All that we know, or all that we may ever know of this original development of architecture in England must, for the greater part, be collected from the scattered remains in the Anglo-Saxon manuscripts.

b) EXTERNAL APPEARANCE OF THE HOUSE.

Without some fairly beautiful types of domestic architecture actually before the eye, the untrained hand of the illuminator could never have produced such unique and tasty structures as are actually to be found in the Mss. of this century. To be sure they are crude and stiff, in many ways ill proportioned, and devoid of all perspective. Yet there is a straightforward simplicity in each which immediately appeals to our interest. Externally, the Anglo-Saxon house is represented as being plainly, yet skilfully constructed and decorated in the prevalent style which will be described later on. Internally, the house seems, for the most part, to have been small (rarely more than one story in height), simply furnished, but quite gorgeously decorated.

The individual building is commonly quadrangular in form, with enough variation in size to serve the purposes of the household and the needs of its owner. This quadrangular building becomes by no means, monotonous, since the representation of circular and oval structures is surprisingly frequent throughout the Mss. Such circular buildings are, in part, separate houses, and, in part, merely porches, or, as

¹) The passage is often quoted from William of Malmesbury in which he describes the Saxons, at the time of the conquest, as living "*in dissipation and extravagance, in houses mean and despicable*".

we may say, hall-ways to the main building. We are at first inclined to consider these circular structures as mere *cuts* drawn after the models of some foreign school, yet such is not the case, since all the Mss. of the period agree in this particular, and, furthermore, there is no such round type to be found in any school of miniature drawing. The building material is almost universally of *wood*—only in rare instances, are the foundations represented as being constructed of stone. Both exterior and interior are finished in timber, oftentimes carved, and worked into curious designs. The outer surface of the house is rarely left plain but, ordinarily relieved by long horizontal strips of narrow timber. The roof joins closely upon uprights of the side walls—rarely if ever projecting far enough over the wall to represent eaves. The roof is either peaked,—the sides sloping gradually from the ridge-pole to the eaves—or circular, when so demanded by the shape of the building. These circular roofs bear a striking resemblance to the rounded cupola of Byzantine architecture. The roof slopes from the peak to the junction of the wall in gently rounding curves. The main building seems to have occupied but a small portion of the whole space allotted to the whole household. Adjacent and adjoining buildings, ells, porches, sheds, and towers (circular or quadrangular) partially, and, at times, wholly conceal the body of the main building. The adjoining buildings are either entirely distinct or joined, in part, or, as a whole, to the side of the hall. The sheds either join squarely upon the wall of one of the houses, or are attached to the main walls in the form of ells, each shed possessing its own roof. In many cases, long towers (square and circular) are attached to one of the walls of the principal building—extending to, or even above, the roof. Each tower is independently finished with tiled roofing.

One of the most strikingly characteristic touches which the artists have given to the illuminations are the countless diminutive towers which ornament the roof. This is so prominent that, when a number of such structures are represented as a whole, these same little towers represent a

most noticeable part.¹⁾ No chimneys are to be found—in fact their advent belongs to a later period.²⁾ Nor is the “testudo”—or covered means of exit for the smoke—to be seen. Whether this is a neglect or the part of the artist or whether the doors and unnumerable small windows served as conductors for the smoke—it is impossible to say. Yet one thing immediately impresses you as being at least probable, namely, that these countless small tower-like structures which have already been described *may* have served as a means of exit for the smoke, and form the forerunners of the modern chimney. These small towers are always built upon the roof either at the center of the ridge pole or at the back or front of the building (sometimes both). The sides are short, capped with peaked roofing, and usually containing a number of small slashes or windows. At this advanced age, the doors could scarcely have served universally as means of exit for the smoke from the hearth. Furthermore, no “testudo” is to be found, and it may be only just to conjecture that these small chimney—like structures served for the purpose mentioned—although, by no means, directly connected with the hearth. They are possibly more elaborate “testudos”.

The roofs of the buildings are either tiled or shingled—many different varieties of the latter being noticeable in the drawings. The description of these will be found on later pages. The buildings are usually one story high—although structures of two stories are unquestionably to be seen in some of the more pretentious houses. The fact that houses of two or perhaps more stories were not unknown to the artist, is proved by the illustration of Noah’s Ark which has three distinct floors. In the lower, are to be seen the animals, in the middle, the birds and fowl, while Noah and his family seem to have appropriated the upper story.

One or more doors are represented within the walls of

¹⁾ Vgl. Pl. III. No. I (fol. 24 b). Pl. II. No. V (fol. 23 b. 3).

²⁾ Chimneys were quite universally used in the 13th Cy—their advent belongs, probably, to the second half of the previous Cy.

the house—usually in the center of the shorts sides or ends. This is particularly noticeable in the drawing of one of the circular buildings, where the perspective is clearly enough marked to allow both doors to be seen. In many cases, the door is concealed behind the arched entrance or porch, which, in turn, is finished with plain columns and singled roof, although these same porches often contain the most elaborately decorated columns and capitals.¹⁾

The windows are few and usually similar in construction to the doors—although, naturally, smaller in size. In Noah's Ark, the window is protected by means of a shutter, hung in the same manner as the doors. Glass (although quite commonly used for drinking vessels) was, probably, never used for windows.

The universal means of obtaining air and light, as well as of furnishing an exit for the smoke within, appears to have been small window-like openings in the walls and towers. These openings oftentimes give a fantastic appearance to the exterior of the house, since they are found, not only as the conventional and usual long, narrow slit, but also as circular openings—square and oblong cuts—and many quite fantastically conceived in design. In this regard, it is often hard to distinguish whether the above mentioned forms are intended to represent windows or merely external decorations. We may set the common type without difficulty—since the prevalence of the long, narrow opening puts the question beyond doubt.

In all the Mss., the free use of color upon the exterior seems to have been recognized. Red, green, blue, and yellow—both in solid body-color and in partial tones—are used with unsparing hand. Necessarily, the artist has greatly exaggerated this brilliancy, yet, deducting all the mistakes of the artist, we shall find that the result compares very favorably with the description given in the literature.²⁾ In

¹⁾ Vgl. Pl. II. No. I (fol. 32 a. I).

²⁾ An exhaustive inquiry into the adjectives used in A. S. literature, in regard to the appearance of the house e. g. gold-fâh, fättum fâh, sinc-fâh etc. etc., would be both interesting and helpful to the

fact, the Anglo-Saxon's eagerness for brilliant color can scarce be much exaggerated in the manuscripts. The exterior wall of the house seem either to have been painted in one solid body color, or left with the natural color of the timber. The edges of the eaves, the frames of the windows and doors, and the entire surface of the towers, are ornamented with various yet nicely blended colors. The eaves and arched entrances to the porches are bordered with serrated ornaments painted in blue and red, or with intricately worked bands in color or carving.¹⁾

We shall see, in the more complete description of of the columns,²⁾ that many were *turned* and represented alternating bodies of convex, concave, and cylindrical divisions—separated by narrow beaded edges. These different portions are colored in well ordered tones, as well as the capitals, which permitted of still greater variety in coloring. The shaft of the column, when not curved, is often painted in pretty designs, at times in parallel rows, and at other-times, in broad spirals which encircle the shaft from top to bottom. The shingles of the roof are often colored, this—added to the fact that the tiles or shingles themselves are varied in size and form—lends a still more pleasing effect.

The exterior of the house was ornamented not only with color but probably quite as much with designs of carved wood-work. The peak of the gable, for example, is quite commonly finished with a leaf-like ornament which strongly resembles the French “fleur-de-lis”. In the *Beowulf*, we learn that the gables were crowned with antlers of enormous size.³⁾ This seems to have remained customary until a very late period, since, in the illustration on *Folio 67 (b.)*, Harleiana 603, which has already been mentioned, both skull and antless, are affixed to the gable.

In general, however, the drawings in the manuscripts

understanding and appreciation of the external appearance of the house.

¹⁾ Vgl. Pl. II. No. I. Fol. 32. a. I.

²⁾ Vgl. page 50.

³⁾ Vgl. *Beowulf* ll. 80—81. “Sele hlifaðe heah and horn-geáp”.

are too small and badly finished to give us an adequate idea of the extent to which wood carving was used by the Anglo-Saxons in exterior and interior ornamentation. The proof which we possess for this fact is meager but conclusive, as will be seen in the chapter upon the subject. Yet, outside of England, in lands where the methods of building and decorating coincide closely with those of the Saxons—the prevalence of such work is seen in well preserved remains. For example, in Norway, in the wooden church at Urnes (which, I may here add, may, in all its completeness, be patterned, part by part, by drawings in A. S. Mss.) the whole wall is decorated with such fantastic carved work of Irish design.¹⁾

Other work of this sort is found in the church at Urnes, though less skilfully done.

Besides such complete examples as these, scattered specimens of beautifully carved window and door frames are to be seen in the various Museums. No better proofs may be had than the three beautiful specimens of such work in the South Kensington Museum (London), in the Architectural Court. Two of the specimens are of Norwegian and the third of Irish origin—both representing clearly that adaptation of the Irish band-work to carved ornamentation.

c) INTERNAL APPEARANCE OF THE HOUSE.

Access to the interior of the main house (the Hall) is obtained, first, through a small porch, and then by means of a single door, entering directly into the hall itself. The use of this porch is not one of immediate importance but serves rather as an ornamental finish to the front elevation of the house. In form, it is either rectangular or semi-circular, protected ordinarily by a gracefully peaked or curved roof. The sides consist chiefly of plain pillars, in many cases supporting an arched frieze immediately below the roof. The floor of

¹⁾ Vgl. Carl Schnaase (Gesch. d. b. K. im Mittelalter). page 445. Vol. IV.

this porch seems, ordinarily, to have been raised a slight distance above the earth—forming a platform or approach to the door itself.¹⁾ It may be well to mention here that many of the circulars structures which appear in the manuscripts are little more than porches. This is the porch which was furnished with a bench upon which the guests sat and there laid aside there armor before being summoned to the interior of the house. This reference is of frequent occurrence in the literature.

Passing across this raised entrance to the house, one comes to the *door* which opens immediately into the hall. In most of the neighboring buildings, this is the only entrance—the porch being dispensed with, or perhaps, more properly speaking, being considered as a necessary part of the hall alone. This door opened outwards and was adorned with heavy hinges and metal ornaments. In form it seems to have been narrow in proportion to its length and invariably rounded at the top.

Once within the main hall, the first thing to attract the attention would, in all probability, be the large pillar or pillars which supported the roof. In many instances, there seems to have been rows of such columns extending along the center of the room and, in the Mss., ornamented with capitals and surface designs.

The inner walls were, undoubtedly, rarely finished but covered with hangings and curtains—the designs upon which are, in Claud. B. IV., unique and well arranged. Unfortunately, the ignorance of the laws of perspective and, still more, the carelessness of the artists have left us with meager representations of interiors, so that the facts that we are able to find must be gleaned from material scattered here and there. The hearth is never represented—but we shall not come far from the truth, should we place it at the center of the room near the pole or column which supported the roof.

¹⁾ The best representation of this porch or "Vorhalle" is obtained from the plate on Folio 67 (Harleiana 603. B. M.). All the details are clearly portrayed. The cut has been reproduced by Thos. Wright (Homes of Other Days) p. 26.

In the center, either of the end of the hall opposite the main entrance, or of one of the long sides, is situated the seat of honor, which is either a more pretentious throne, cross-legged seat, or a long bench upon which master of the house sat surrounded by his family and honored friends. In the Ms. Claud. B. IV., this seat of honor is usually placed in the middle of the end opposite the entrance, while the benches for the retainers and guests, extend along the two long sides. We possess representations of benches seating from ten to thirteen persons.

If the person of honor represented be a king or chieftain, he is invariably attended by his body guard or armor bearer, who stands to the right of the royal personage, bearing shield and drawn sword.

Chairs are represented in many illustrations, usually differing only in a slight degree from the heavy straight-back chairs of the 14th and 15th Cys. These, however, are almost universally confined to the use of the ladies room or bed rooms—the more substantial benches being better fitted for the needs of the great hall.

The center of the floor is either left bare or tiled with variagated bricks. The sides along by the benches seem to have been planked. Furthermore, the feet were also protected from the earth by means of footstools—the surface of which was draped with embroidered coverings. The tables are of various lengths and forms, always suited to accomodate the number of guests. The legs of the tables are commonly plain but, in some instances, they seem to have been tastefully carved and otherwise ornamented. The top is covered with cloth of beautiful color—draped and falling in neat folds from the edge of the board. These tables—particularly the long ones for the accomodation of many persons—seem to have been temporary structures, probably consisting of long boards (as the A. S. word “bord”, signifying table, would suggest) and supported by means of uprights with branching legs. They were moved in position before the guests before the meal, and, immediately after it, taken away. The guests sat upon the long benches along the walls and—when eating—are

served from the opposite side of the table, only one side being occupied by those feasting. The dishes are simple in design but show a variety which would suggest skill in workmanship.

The interior of the adjoining buildings and smaller attached rooms cannot be so accurately described—since the only one carefully represented in Clau. B. IV. is the room of the mistress of the house and several smaller rooms which are undoubtedly bedrooms. These are universally small—one storied—so that, in most cases, we may judge them to be mere sheds or ells added to the main house. The decorations correspond in general to those of the main hall—though usually simpler and less assuming.

The bed seems to have been made either as a fixed portion of the room or as an entirely independent piece of furniture with high head and foot boards. In many cases, the room seems to have been just wide enough to accomodate one bed, either upon the end or one side. The prevalence of instances in which the great cushions *rest directly upon the floor* gives sufficient proof that a bedstead or even bunk was quite a luxury. The Anglo Saxons seem to have slept quite commonly upon heavy mattings laid directly upon the floor. The front and sides of the beds are not uncommonly draped with pretty curtains.

These small sleeping rooms served, in many cases, as the private apartments for the women. In other instances, the women seem to have occupied more pretentious apartments—probably separate or adjoining buildings.

The other rooms and separate buildings must have been numerous but drawings of them fail in Ms. Cl. B. IV., as well as other Mss. of this Century. There is but one cut in which the artist has clearly drawn an interior destined for a definite purpose. In this illumination we find Joseph's store house portrayed. The large square interior—filled with sacks of grain—differs in no way from the ordinary structure.

d) THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE HOUSE.

Whatever material is to be had from the manuscript Claudius B. IV. in regard to the method of building as prac-

ticed among the Saxons must be gathered from casual suggestions scattered throughout its pages. A single occurrence is not always sufficient to establish the rule, but the frequent, sometimes constant use of certain fixed designs, materials, and methods leads to the establishment of rules which governed the Saxon in his building.

As regards material, there can be little doubt but that the Anglo-Saxon house *was built almost exclusively of wood*. A structure built of stone may be detected by the method of representation, viz., the parallel lines drawn horizontally across the walls and cut by short intersecting lines. As illustrations of this, we may take the outer walls of the fortifications. In only two instances among the illustrations of houses, are there even suggestions that the lower portions may have been constructed of brick or stone.¹⁾ The foundation was commonly of stone and in representing this the artists have undoubtedly exaggerated its height. It is but an instance of bad proportion which has been found to be the case so often.²⁾ Structures built of wood are uniformly drawn with plain surfaces.³⁾

A second and interesting proof that the use of brick and stone was more uncommon, may be had from the fact that in all pictures representing the construction of a house, the proportion of carpenters to masons is in the ratio of nine to one. The carpenter is universally represented with hammer and nails—while, in three instances alone, we may conjecture that the workmen are masons. Folio 19 (a)

¹⁾ Vgl. Pl. III. No. III. (fol. 19 a.), Pl. II. No. VI. (fol. 32 a. II.), in all probability the outer *wall*.

²⁾ This is particularly noticeable in the cut on Folio 67 (Harleiana 603) which has been already referred to. The stone portions of the walls in some cases extend nearly to the roof.—only a small portion being left for the windows.

³⁾ Schnaase (Gesch. d. b. K. im M.) gives as his view, that, in England, nearly all structuree—even of churches—were built of word. (Bd. IV. p. 380). It is also interesting to compare the similar developement in wooden buildings in Norway, Sweden and Denmark. Particularly so that of Norway as described by Dahl (in Gesch. e. s. a. H. i. i. L. Norwegens).

has frequently been used to illustrate the fact that much of the Saxon house was built of stone. Yet this cut, which represents the building of the Tower of Babel, cannot be too literally construed, since the artist has simply illustrated the whole of the sentence "Uton timbrian us ceastre and stypel", and the stone portion represented is the city wall—not that of the house.¹⁾

Yet the use of stone could not have been extremely uncommon since in the two churches represented on *Folios* 32 (a) and 33 (b) from Cleopatra C. VIII., the foundation is in one case built of stone, while in the other, the church appears to have been constructed entirely of the same material.²⁾

The timbers were hewn into the required form with large *broad-axes*, the best representation of which is found on Folio 14 (a) where Noah is in the act of hewing a timber for the Ark. When once placed in the desired position, these timbers are held to one another and to the uprights by means of spikes or large nails—the tiles of the roof and hinges of the doors being made fast in similar manner. *Stagings* are frequently represented, being constructed of planks supported by means of long narrow horizontal timbers, which in turn are held in the crotched ends of uprights. Besides such stagings, perfectly constructed ladders are of frequent occurrence. One of the finest of these is found in the illumination which represents Jacob's Dream.

¹⁾ Vgl. Plate II (19, a), where only a portion has been reproduced. The whole is to be found on Plate IV in the "*Horda Angeleynna*" by Joseph Strutt (London, 1775/6). Compare also the description of this cut in Moritz Heyne's, "Ueber die Lage und Construction der Halle Heorot im angelsächsischen Beowulfsliede", Paderborn, 1864, p. 38. The description in general is accurate but the following mistakes become evident upon closer study of similar cuts in Mss. I. "ein Arbeiter auf einem Gerüste stehend, das zwei andere mit gehobenen Armen stützen." A fault of perspective, the staging is supported by *crotched uprights*—as is universally found. II. "Diese Thüre kann sich, der daran stehenden Säulen wegen, nur nach innen öffnen." A second fault because of poor perspective. The doors open almost universally *outward*. III. "Dass derselbe etwa aus Ziegeln aufgeführt oder vielleicht schon abgeputzt sei." This point has already been discussed.

²⁾ Vgl. Pl. IV. No. I. (C. fol. 32 a).

The outer walls of the house were supported by long upright timbers. Proof of this is to be found in two cuts in which cross sections are represented: *Folios* 89 (b. II) and 14 (a. II).¹⁾ From the upper end of these timbers, the roof rises to the ridge-pole which, in turn, is supported by the column within the house.²⁾ These various points of structure may be best seen in the poorly drawn but useful cut on Folio 89 (b II).

The illumination which represents Noah's Ark—Folio 14 (a. II)—is also useful and worthy of more careful description. Upon the solid body of the boat, which itself is planked with long timbers extending fore and aft, is built the house-like structure for the reception of animals and fowl. The whole building is three stories in height—the second and third stories each smaller than the one next below. The upper portion alone has a slanting roof—and that too, not to a ridge-pole but topped by a flat roof. In the lower story is to be seen a large door, and in the upper story, a window similar in construction and form.

These outer walls of the house were not infrequently ornamented, as well as strengthened by columns or pillars, which are ordinarily placed at the four corners of the building.

The form of the separate buildings shows great variety and freedom of design—the majority being rectangular, while the remainder are circular or oval. The rectangular buildings, in general, follow so closely to the general description which has already been given that they need no further mention, yet it still remains to establish, if possible, the construction and purpose of the peculiar circular structures.

There are in all, in Claud. B. IV., eight plates illustrative of such circular rooms.³⁾ There are also many other plates which represent portions of the roof but those only have been mentioned where some portion of the house itself is visible.

¹⁾ Vgl. Pl. III. No. 8. (fol. 89 b. II).

²⁾ Vgl. Pl. III. No. 8. (fol. 89 b. II). Pl. II. No. 5. (fol. 23 b. III).

³⁾ Vgl. Folio 31. (b. II), Folio 63. (a. II), Folio 34. (a. I), Folio 44. (b. I.) Plate II, Folio 35. (b. I), Folio 37. (b) Plate II, Folio 36. (b. II).

In the instances cited above, the room seems to have been used for the following purposes:

1. In three cases, as the Main or Reception Hall.
2. In three cases as the Sleeping Room and,
3. In one case, as a Dining Hall.

Yet since, as we have seen, the dining was nearly always in the Main Hall,—the last must be counted among the first. Thus it is fair to conclude that this circular building was a style common to any of the more important needs of the household—yet, from the nature of its structure and the table given above, it seems to have been particularly adapted to the purposes for which the Hall was built. In such a room as this, the master might have full view upon all sides. In one instance (Folio 31. b. II) the two sons-in-law of Lot sit in the center of such a room and there receive the message sent by Lot concerning the doom of Sodom.

Yet, all things being considered, we must not judge too liberally concerning such structures, for, without doubt, *they were in most cases the circular porches already described as ornamenting the main entrance to the hall.*¹⁾ Folio 44 (b. I)²⁾ is clearly such an instance and yet immediately within Abraham is seated feasting. So small an obstacle as the front wall of the house was no hindrance to the imagination of the Saxon artist.

In construction, these circular structures were similar to the rectangular buildings—the outer walls being made of wood. One peculiarity is noticeable, namely, that the two extremities of the diameter are usually ornamented with towers extending somewhat above the roof. These, in cases where the circular building is to be considered as complete in itself, are a sort of round ells. In the instances where the buildings are to be construed as porches, they are mere small, ornamental towers which serve to finish the wall. In some cases, these circular buildings are furnished with

¹⁾ The best proof of this is to be found in Harleiana 603.

²⁾ Vgl. Plate II. No. 4. (fol. 44 b. I). The persons (6 in number) seated within have not been reproduced.

two doors while in others, the outer surface is devoid of all further finish.

The roofs of the halls and adjoining buildings differ as widely as the buildings themselves. In short, they are made to suite the size and form of the structures which they cover. The common style is that of the peaked or ordinary ridged roof.¹⁾ Next in order of frequency would come the circular roof.¹⁾ In the instances of the curved roof the lines slope from a central point to the edge of the walls in gentle, but very pleasing curves. The last to be mentioned are the roofs of the adjoining sheds and ells.²⁾ As has already been mentioned, these have been much misrepresented and wholly misunderstood—simply because of the inability of the artist to represent perspective. The roof of the shed is attached, at the upper portion, directly to the side of the building and slopes thence quickly to the uprights. Sometimes the shed takes the form of an ell, attached to the house at the back, thus possessing its own peaked roof.³⁾

The boards which rested upon the rafters, are *protected by means of tiles or shingles*. The consideration of these leads us immediately into difficulty, both on account of the carelessness of the artist and, still more important, the want of actual specimens by which the different forms may be verified. In Claudius B. IV alone, no less than *seven different kinds* of coverings for the roof are represented. It may be possible that some of these different forms represent thatch or reed roofings, yet even with the assistance of the literature, the question remains one of extreme difficulty.

The type which is ordinarily used may be easily identified as the tile or *shingle*, *similar to those so commonly used today*. This shingle is represented, in the drawings, as being of various lengths, rounded at the lower end, and always placed so as to cover the joint made by the two shingles immediately below.⁴⁾ The shingle is held to the boards of

¹⁾ Vgl. Examples on Plates II, III, and IV.

²⁾ Vgl. Pl. III. No. II. (fol. 31 a. II).

³⁾ Vgl. Folio 67 (Harleiana 603).

⁴⁾ Best representations of this common type may be seen on Pl. II. No. V., Pl. III. No. II, Pl. III. No. VIII.

the roof by means of a nail, which is indicated in the drawings by a point in the center of the shingle.

In other cases, the shingle is square—extending, probably in similar manner, over the joint of the two immediately beneath—the nail being driven in the lower left hand corner.¹⁾ Such shingles as these afford excellent opportunities for decoration not only because of their different form but also, the various colors with which they were painted. Sometimes a square tile is divided into two triangular halves, the two portions being painted in different colors—the colors of one, corresponding to those of its neighbors.²⁾ To relieve this apparent monotony, the shingles are suddenly divided in the opposite direction.

Still another peculiarity of arrangement appears in the cuts where the roof is divided perpendicularly into equal portions by means of long strips of wood extending from the ridge-pole to the eaves. These strips are, in all probability, intended to represent long strips of wood which cover the cracks made by the long boards which cover the roof. Furthermore these perpendicular sections are again intersected by short horizontal strips, in which divisions, the shingles are nailed side by side.³⁾ These varieties are, in truth, mere ornamental contrivances for roof decorations.

In Ms. Harleiana 603. (Folio 67 b.), there occurs a peculiar variation from all found in Claud. B. IV. In this, the whole roof of the hall is simply divided into square surfaces or portions of equal size. Such a roof as this—upon the Main Hall—in all probability represents a metal covering, the divisions marked, merely indicating the joints of the metal plates.

There remain yet to be described the peculiar coverings of the circular roofs and herein lies the great difficulty. The general appearance of these may be described as follows: long lines radiate from the peak in the center, to the outer

¹⁾ Vgl. 22 (a. I) not reproduced.

²⁾ Vgl. 63 (b. I) not reproduced.

³⁾ Vgl. Folio 63 (b. I) not drawn.

circumference of the circular roof. The sections thus formed are divided into portions of equal length by means of double dissecting lines.¹⁾ We learn from the more careful representations in Harleiana 603. (Folio 67 b.), *that these small sections or rows of sections are cylindrical—or better still, convex in shape.* This fact is also indicated by the cuts in Cl. B. IV., since the short dissecting lines are invariably curved.

The question remains, what do these drawings really represent? There seems but one plausible explanation for these, namely, that they represent a more skilfully executed *convex tile*. There is still another possibility and that is, that this is but a method of representing a reed roof, the lines being the strings which made the reeds fast to the roof. This latter view is, however, far less probable.

The doors of the period seem to have been simple structures of wood. They are solid in structure, high, but narrow, the top (as has been said) being invariably rounded.²⁾ This seems to have been a distinguishing type of the architecture of this period.

The doors are, in many cases, heavily laden with two or three enormous hinges, curiously designed. Ordinarily, the hinges extend more than three fourths of the entire width of the door, and terminate in arabesque scrolls, while, from the upper and lower side of the main arm of the hinges, other branches radiate at more or less regular intervals. Entirely independent of these hinges, may often be seen other branches and scrolls so that the door may be said to be literally laden with metal work. Such work, in all probability served both as ornamentation for the door, and—perhaps more specifically—as a means of strengthening the boards from without. The finest instance of such work is to be found on Folio 14 (a. II), the representation of Noah's Ark. The hinges, in this picture, conform to the usual type, but besides these may be seen a long metal rod extending from the top to the bottom of the door along

¹⁾ Vgl. Pl. II. No. II. (fol. 37 b). Pl. II. No. I. (fol. 32 a. I). Pl. II. No. VI. (fol. 32 a. II).

²⁾ Vgl. Pl. II. No. V. (fol. 23 b. III).

the center. From this rod radiate, from the top and sides, numerous short spirals of tasteful designs.

Besides these hinges and other metal ornaments, there frequently occurs the *staple and ring*. The whole is so simply drawn that a closer examination leads to no further results.

The windows of two kinds, either large openings with hinged shutters, very similar to, although smaller than, the doors, or, as is usually the case, mere long and narrow openings cut in the side of the wall.¹⁾ Nothing need be said in regard to the former, since they resemble the doors so closely. Yet they never appear to have been ornamented with the metal work, as in the case of the doors. One instance (Folio 67 b. Harleiana 603) is worthy of mention. In this drawing the window is cut into the side of an ell,—the top of the window and shutter being square (or at right angles with the sides) thus forming the only exception to the rule which seems to have demanded a rounded top. The shutters found in this plate, as also in 14 a. I., open outward.

The second and far more usual style of windows is the simpler opening or cut into the house wall. These are ordinarily represented in the sides of the wall near to the eaves, or, in other cases, cut into the sides of the small ells and towers. They are commonly long and narrow, although in many instances they seem to have deviated from the original purpose of admitting air and light, to one of mere ornamentation. This is illustrated by the instances in which they are round, square, and even cut into greater variety of form. The most of such small cuttings and windows must have been without all permanent means of covering.

e) ORNAMENTATION OF THE EXTERIOR.

Should we include within such a description, the decorative art as found upon the Churches, such a discussion might form in itself a separate treatise. This, however, will be carefully

¹⁾ These occur in all the pictures of houses. Vgl. Plates II., III., and IV.

avoided, only so much material being drawn therefrom as may be judged to apply alike to the church and to the house.

All the necessary material may be drawn from four plates, the first three from the Ms. Claudius B. IV:

- I. Folio 14 (a. II), including also similar bits from the Folios 14 (b); 15 (a); and 15 (b).¹⁾
- II. Folio 124 (b)—a beautifully decorated exterior.
- III. Folio 32 (a. I)²⁾ an example of the usual method of painting in domestic architecture, and
- IV. Folio 13 (b)—selected from Ms. Tiberius C. VI., which—although clearly representative of church architecture—nevertheless presents many features which belong equally well to the house.³⁾

We have already seen, in the Introduction, how all the ornamentation both of the interior and exterior were dependent upon the style of drawing practiced in the miniature work, whereas all such work may be said to go back, for its peculiarity in style, to the early Irish School of Miniature Drawing⁴⁾—a peculiar style of workmanship which is more commonly called “arabesque”.

We might possibly question the accuracy of such drawings as are to be found in the Mss., and attribute much to the imagination of the A. S. artist—did we not possess proof that such decorations are unquestionably true representations, in the fact that a style, similar almost to the minutest detail, flourished in Norway and Denmark, and is illustrated today by perfectly preserved specimens.⁵⁾ Such a style was strikingly original, and pleasing because of its fantastic character.

We may assume as a first principle, that the Anglo-Saxon house was decorated both with painting and with carved work—in most cases, probably, by a combination of the two.

¹⁾ Vgl. Pl. I. Nos. IV and V (fol. 15 a and b).

²⁾ Vgl. Pl. II. No. I (fol. 32 a. I).

³⁾ Vgl. Pl. III. No. IX (T. fol. 13 b).

⁴⁾ Schnaase (Gesch. d. b. K.) traces all such work, both in England, Norway, Denmark, and quite universally throughout the continent, back to Irish origin.

⁵⁾ Vgl. J. C. Dahl's (D. e. s. a. H. i. i. L. N.), Dresden, 1837.

In the field of external painting, the cut upon Folio 13 (b) Tiberius C. VI. affords the best example.¹⁾ The building is two stories in height surmounted by a tower. A flight of three steps led to the lower story. The faces of these steps are painted in two designs, the lower and upper, in the following manner: around the steps at equal distance from the edge is drawn a line (which may possibly indicate that the whole is paneled). The interior surface is divided by means of double alternating dissecting lines so joined as to form triangular parts, while the space between these parallel lines is relieved by three or more dots (strongly suggestive of Irish influence).²⁾ The middle step contains six geometrical figures. Above the upper step rises the lower story of the building, the lower portion of which is supported by five columns each with short shaft and large bases and capitals. The latter are freely painted or carved, as are also the shafts. Still above the capitals is seen a narrow arched frieze similarly decorated with scroll designs. The trimmings of the outer edge of the walls and roof are throughout beaded or dotted. Above the main body of the house rises a gallery—bordered by heavy columns (only one being visible in the cut). This column is without base or capital, but around the shaft extends a double-lined spiral. The frieze above this is likewise decorated with scrolls and dots.

The highest portion of the structure seems to represent a tower or cupola, supported by three graceful columns, lined and dotted, while the arched frieze above contains painted scrolls of symmetrical acanthus design.

No better representation of this somewhat ornate style of decoration may be had. Most of the designs were probably painted—only in the case of the bases and capitals of the columns, may we suspect them to represent carving.

The cut on Folio 32 (a. I)³⁾ represents a painted doorway of arched pattern. Its surface is decorated with short

¹⁾ Vgl. Plate III., No. 9, (T. fol. 13. b).

²⁾ Vgl. Introduction, p. 10.

³⁾ Vgl. Pl. II. No. I (fol. 32 a. I).

dashes of red, drawn in slight curves left and right from the center. The entire upper edge is bordered by a serrated row of blue points. The frames of the small windows are also painted in blue and red.

On Folio 14 (a. II) the carved prows are brightly painted in blue and yellow, while the separate planks of the ship are colored in neutral tints. The doors and windows, in light vermillion.

In carved work, the Anglo Saxon seems to have followed similar methods—the result being a unique combination of complex Irish band-work with the addition of the Roman acanthus. The description of a few such examples will suffice for the whole style.

Folio 124 (b) is unquestionably the finest bit of designing in the manuscript. The whole structure seems to represent an ideal church front, or possibly, the vaulting of an interior. The capitals of the three heavy columns are massive and magnificently drawn examples of the acanthus leaf carved in wood—the gracefully curved petals of which hang far out over the body of the shafts. Connecting the three columns are two arches, formed of combined rounded and angular strips. Within the open space left between these strips at the peak, are to be seen similar ornaments of acanthus design, the petals of which wind in and out among the strips—thus supporting their own weight. Above and connecting these extends a single curved arch.

Still, in regard to such carving, the oft mentioned cuts on Folios 14 (a. II), 14 (b), and 15 (b), are of great assistance, the figures upon the prows and sterns of the different pictures which illustrate the Ark, being most perfect examples of such carved work. In each case, the prow is represented as the head of some grotesque monster—usually with the head, ears, and nose, of a dog or wolf and the neck of some sea monster. From the mouth and back of the neck protrude long bands which twine and interweave among themselves, as well as the ornamental strips upon the ships prow—now ending in perfect spirals and again, in enlarged leaf designs. Some of these bands are painted blue throughout their entire length,

others yellow, while the whole design may be complicated and confined at the center by means of a bright red ring. In Folio 14 (a. II) the monster seems to hold in its beak the branching leaves of the acanthus, while from the neck protrudes an ornament much resembling the mane of a horse.¹⁾ The stern of the Ark in this cut is decorated with the tail of a fish carved into somewhat conventional shape.

In the cut or Folio 31 (a. I)²⁾ the corner of the porch—immediately above the capital of the column—is finished with a similar scroll of leaf pattern.

In addition to these ornaments, we may mention the peculiar little figure which is so frequently used to finish the peak of the gable, in form very similar to the French “fleur-de-lis”.

The influence which the Carlovingian school of miniature painting exerted upon the later English work, leaves, as one of its most important results, a great number of examples of the different *styles of columns* used in architectural design. No one fixed style, however, seems ever to have been held to, but the same drawing will often contain specimens of unadorned shafts finished with capitals of Irish band-work, side by side with turned columns or those of pure Roman design.

The style most prevalent was the plain shaft, with equally simple capital and base. In short, it was little more than an upright, finished at top and bottom with a simple block of wood. Such hardly deserve the name of columns. Yet the more pretentious columns were by no means rare—particularly in the construction of the porch and the more important buildings, as we may see by a closer examinations of the illuminations.³⁾

The fluted shaft is rarely met with and, in cases where

¹⁾ Vgl. Plate I, Nos. IV. and V. (fol. 15 a and b).

²⁾ Vgl. Plate II. No. III (fol. 31 a. I).

³⁾ Cf. Plate IV, where I have collected all the various examples of columns to be found in Claudius B. IV. The drawings are arranged in regular order, beginning with the simplest which was little more than a pole—to those of complex design, particularly in capital and base.

it actually occurs, the drawing is always much more suggestive of external painting than of actual fluting.

That style which we must consider most typically Saxon is the style which is ordinarily called the "*turned*" column. Its general appearance resembles very strongly the round of a modern balustrade.¹⁾ The body of the shaft is divided into short sections, from five to eight in number, the surfaces of which are either concave, convex, or bell-shaped. These separate sections are, in turn, tiers of circular disks from three to five or eight in number, the whole shaft being often surmounted by a small capital of acanthus design. In Folio 32 a. I. the different sections are painted in yellow and brown.

A most perfect reproduction of this column is to be found in the stone pillars which support the frame of the arched window in the old tower (of an old Saxon Church) at Earls Barton. The form is identical with those represented in the illuminations. In regard to such pillars, Schnaase justly remarks that such work is evidently borrowed from the "turner's art".²⁾

In general, the shafts show slight variations; it is in the capitals that the great divergence is to be found. The favorite type in the latter is the scrolling acanthus—resembling, in many cases, a debased Corinthian column. Still scarcely less frequently we meet with the entwined band-work which found its way into the capital, as well as upon the broad surface of the shaft. Such carved capitals are also brightly colored—a favorite method seems to have required that the background should be painted in some dark tone—thus leaving the figured leaf in bold relief, either left unpainted or colored in some bright tint. The same method seems also to have been used upon the surface of the solid carved-wood-work. Thus we find the broad panels carved and colored in pleasing variety—the friezes painted with equal care, and above all, well formed columns or pillars adorned with equally consistent design. The

¹⁾ Vgl. Pl. IV. No. IV and Pl. II. No. I (fol. 32 a. I).

²⁾ Vgl. Schnaase's "Geschichte der bildenden Künste". Bd. IV. p. 383.

whole may well point to a height of excellence in decorative art which was surpassed only by similar development in the Miniature Painting of the same period.

f) THE INTERIOR.

In the Ms. Claudius B. IV., the building most frequently represented is, naturally, the main hall, or, as we may perhaps better call it, the *Audience Room*.¹⁾ Moreover, this room is seldom represented in its entirety but generally only a small portion about the seat of honor—a drawing of this sort offering the artist a better opportunity for pure architectural designing. This is the room which, taken in the broadest signification, served as a place of meeting, for conversation, for audience, and for conviviality.

A second apartment, which not infrequently occupies a separate building, is the *Bed Room* (A. S. “bur” or the “bryd bur” of the Beowulf), or, according to the more usual interpretation of the word, the women’s apartment. There are, in all, some nineteen drawings which illustrate this “bur”.

In one single instance, Folio 64 (a. I), we find the representation of a *Store House*, the nature of which is made known both by the text which it illustrates, and sacks of grain which are stored within.

No other individual buildings are to be identified for, although many illuminations are to be had where several buildings are represented, the nature of the individual structures remains a matter of conjecture, except in the case of the main hall. The drawings of the latter (the Hall) are noticeably different from those of the neighboring buildings. It is usually the central and largest building in the groupe, commonly finished at the main entrance with a porch, better constructed and more profusely decorated. Yet, in regard to the interior, we seldom find much more than the bare architectural finish for the seat of honor. The artist seems to have cared to do little more than represent the royal personage within an appro-

¹⁾ The A. S. “halle”.

priate frame. An entire ignorance of perspective still further deprives us of any conception of the sides of the room or of the roof. In short, we have the flat surface of the remoter wall, together with stray bits illustrative of construction and art, in which the artist seems to have been unwillingly drawn from his favorite types. Fortunately, such casual examples as these suffice to furnish material for a detailed description of the interior *decorations and furniture* in common use.

INTERIOR DECORATIONS.

In the door-ways, upon the walls in all portions of the room, at the sides of the “beah-setl”, and before the beds, are to be found *hangings or curtains*, tastefully fashioned and still more beautifully embroidered. No one object is more familiar in the drawings of the A. S. home than these beautiful hangings. Their use must have been universal.

They occur almost invariably in pairs of equal length and breadth—joined corner to corner in the center of the pole at the top, and thence draped back to the wall below.¹⁾

In rare instances we find but a single curtain hung from a rod by means of rings similar to those in use today.²⁾ In such cases as this, the curtain is hung in a door way.

The upper edge of the curtains, instead of being fastened flat to the wall or rod, are held from five or six points, thus allowing the curtain to fall in folds rather than in a solid surface. Besides the folds, the surface of the curtain is generally ornamented at the top and bottom with wide borders, as well as artistically embroidered designs. We know, from the literature of the period, that such embroidery was famous throughout Europe, and the drawings in the Mss. go far to substantiate this, as we shall see more clearly illustrated by the embroidery upon the furniture. These curtains either hung loosely from the wall, or are draped back in the manner above mentioned.

¹⁾ Vgl. Pl. II. No. VI (fol. 32 a. II).

²⁾ Vgl. Pl. II. No. I (fol. 32 a. I).

In Folio 27 (b. I), two beds are represented side by side. Before one of these, which seems to occupy the entire end of a small ell, hangs a single curtain, while before the second, two are to be seen, draped back to the foot and head of the bed.

In Folio 23 (b. III)¹⁾, the curtains are hung from scrolls which ornament the ceiling—each curtain being turned once around the neighboring pillar. This twining of the curtain around the a pillar seems, from the frequency of its occurrence, to have been a favorite style of draping.²⁾ The finest example occurs on Folio 55 (b. III), where the curtain is turned once around one of the posts which forms the head-board of the bed.

The body color of the draperies is commonly red and blue, relieved by borders and designs in gold and colors.

These curtains, however, form but a small portion of the interior decorations—the greater portion by far being found upon the cushions of the benches and the seats of the chairs and stools, all of which will be more carefully considered in the examination of the different articles of furniture.

(1)

THE SEAT OF HONOR OR THRONE (A. S. “heah-setl”, “setl”, and the simpler form “stol”).

In Claudius B. IV., this seat or throne (accordingly as the text demands) is invariably represented in the center of that portion of the room pictured in the drawing. This fact is particularly noticeable in the drawings of circular buildings, where the seat is always in the center, the two doors being represented on either hand.

In the cuts on Folios 24 (b)³⁾, and 23 (b. III), the seat

¹⁾ Vgl. Pl. II. No. V (fol. 23 b. III).

²⁾ Vgl. Pl. II. No. V (fol. 23 b. III), and Pl. IV. No. X (fol. 55 b. III).

³⁾ Vgl. Pl. III. No. I (fol. 24 b.) the seat—which is not reproduced—is situated at the back of the structure represented; so is also the case in Pl. II. No. V (fol. 23 b. III).

of honor is in the middle of one of the long sides of the quadrangular room. This is proved in each case by the representation above of one of the slanting surfaces of the roof. This seems to be the case quite commonly and it is more than probable that the seat of honor occupied the center of one of the long sides, quite as often as the middle of the end—though the balance of proof goes to strengthen the latter view, particularly in the earlier literature. Thus the doors would be in the middle of the two ends, whereas, if the “heah-setl” was in the center of the rear end of the hall, the door must be placed a little to one side.

This seat of honor is always represented as a chair or stool of more elaborate design in striking contrast to the usual benches upon which the rest of the company sat. Chairs were undoubtedly great luxuries and intended only for the use of persons of high rank and dignity. Sometimes they are large enough to accommodate two persons, in which case the wife shared her husband’s seat.

Along the walls of the long sides, and—in cases where the “heah-setl” itself occupied the center of this—at the ends of the building, extended the *benches* for the members of the family and guests. With such an arrangement as this, we should in all probability, find the hearth in the very center of the room—unfortunately, no representations are to be had from the illuminations.

The seat of Honor or throne is, as we have seen, distinct from the neighboring benches—large enough to accommodate one, and, in rare cases, two persons. When more than two persons are seated, the seat loses its distinguishing characteristics and becomes a bench. In the Ms. Claud. B. IV., the following different varieties occur, which may serve to illustrate the general types of the “heah-setl”:

I. We may take as example of the better sort, the drawing found on Folio 60 (a. II) where Joseph is seated in state, as Pharaoh’s “gerefa”. His elevated seat may best be described as a somewhat elaborate cross-legged stool, raised above the surface of the floor by means of a single step. He is clothed in the usual long flowing tunic worn by old

men and those of high rank. Beneath his feet is seen a foot-stool covered with a cloth bearing a worked pattern. At his back stands his body guard with drawn sword and dressed in full armor. The general appearance of the surroundings of the seat for honor is, in all cases, very similar to this—the variety is to be found only in the chairs themselves.¹⁾

II. The type most frequently met with is best illustrated upon *Folio 41 (b)*.²⁾ This example may also serve a double purpose since it is one of the few instances where the seat is large enough to accommodate two.

The seat of this chair is a long solid piece, rounded at both ends and supported by a solid paneled base (instead of legs). In some cases it is questionable whether this base is solid, or consists of two round supports. The best proof that it is usually solid may be had from the cut from Julius A. VI., where the whole strongly resembles a couch, the base of which is solid. Upon the surface of the seat is a thick cushion which protrudes from either side of the covering. The two ends of the base, which may also be seen beyond the covering, are constructed in various ways in different cuts—either sloping inward or outward to a common center or left perpendicular as in the case of *Folio 46 (a. I.)*³⁾, where the feet alone seem to be paneled and finished with a border. This same example offers a still more striking difference, in the fact that it is furnished with a back—composed of two uprights, capped with acorn-like ornaments and connected near the top by a horizontal rod. In all other instances, such seats are wholly without back.

III. The *stool or cross-legged seat* needs further description on account of its different varieties.

The modern “camp-stool” (so called) is a perfect representation of the same.⁴⁾ The seat is supported by means of

¹⁾ Vgl. Pl. IV. No. XII. (fol. 43 a. II).

²⁾ Vgl. Plate IV. No. XI (fol. 58. a). Other examples occur on fol. Folios: 41. (b. II); 68. (b. I); 58. (a); 45. (b. I); 69. (b. II); 22. (b. II); 48. (a. II).

³⁾ Vgl. Pl. IV. No. XVI. (fol. 46 a. I).

⁴⁾ Vgl. Pl. IV. No. XII. (fol. 43 a. II).

four legs made of narrow (probably rounded) rods, the upper extremities of which are usually finished with ball-like caps and the lower ends, with fantastic claws which serve as feet. These claws are sometimes of enormous size and apparently beautifully carved. A thick cushion rests upon the seat, which, in turn, is made fast to the legs of the stool near to the top. In the manuscript, only two legs are seen but this is a mere fault of drawing.

IV. In Folio 27 (b. I.), occurs a wide variation from this general type, the drawing of which approaches very near to a modern chair.¹⁾ The seat is solid, either regularly upholstered or covered with a heavy cushion. The legs are crossed, as in the examples already mentioned—but do not extend above the seat of the chair. A second radical difference is seen in the back, which consists of two uprights joined to the corners of the seat and to the lower ends of the legs. The upper ends of these two supports are ornamented with curious heads of animals or birds.

V. A very odd variety is found on *Folio* 23. (b. III),²⁾ in which the broad seat is supported by four perpendicular legs of considerable thickness and finished at the bottom with broad feet. These uprights extend but a short distance above the seat and are capped with carved heads of birds, as in the last example. The seat is still further supported by short rods or rounds which extend from the center of the bottom of the seat to the base of the legs.

VI. The most beautiful and luxurious seat represented in Cl. B. IV., is Pharaoh's throne on Folio 91 (a).³⁾ The cut is, unfortunately, poorly finished, still we are able to see that the portions drawn are chiefly cushions or divans. Cf. later description of furniture decorations.

VII. This example, [Folio 136 (b. I)], may be scarcely called a seat. The whole may be described as an inclined plain extending from the wall to the floor upon the upper

¹⁾ Vgl. Pl. IV. No. XX. (fol. 27 b. I).

²⁾ Vgl. Pl. IV. No. XIX. (fol. 23 b. III).

³⁾ Vgl. Pl. IV. No. XVII. (fol. 91 a).

surface of which is to be seen a cushion of more than ordinary thickness. The whole presents the general appearance of a divan.

VIII. In Folio 45 (b. III.) ¹⁾, we possess the drawing of a perfect chair according to the modern interpretation of the word. The seat is one solid piece, supported by four legs—the two in front being short, while those behind extend above the seat and serve as back of the chair. Beneath the seat, the legs are connected by broad rounds—the chair, as a whole, is solid but not at all suggestive of the nicety and finish which characterises the furniture in general.

All these preceding examples represent the seats which served as thrones, and seats of honor. They seem also to have been commonly used in the private apartments of the women. There still remain the long *seats or benches* which were occupied by the guests and retainers. ²⁾ This bench is represented in the drawings as accommodating from three to fifteen persons. In general, it probably extended the whole length of the long side.

In Folio 29 (b), we have, without doubt, a cross-section of the same which helps materially in determining its structure. ³⁾ The bench is made of two pieces—a solid plank perpendicularly set, upon which rests another board extending back to the wall. A third board holds the seat from the rear. Beneath, the seat seems to be supported by props of narrow timber extending diagonally across the inner space. In the present instance an inclined surface in front serves as a foot-rest. Whether the benches were also mad fast to the wall or left to be removed at will, may not be determined, but the

¹⁾ Vgl. Pl. IV. No. XV. (fol. 45 b. III).

²⁾ Rudolf Henning (D. d. H.) p. 140, thus describes the common northern Hall: "In the long northern hall, the benches were along both long sides while the king sat in the middle of one, the honored guests in the other. In the second form, the king sat in the middle of one of the gables, while the long benches were arranged along the long sides—in the center of which sat the relatives or honored friends." It is pleasing to notice how closely this corresponds to the cuts found in the A. S. Mss.

³⁾ Vgl. Pl. IV. No. XVII. (fol. 29 b).

instance cited above seems to support the latter view. The outside surface of the benches seems in some cases to have been ornamented yet this is more often concealed by the large covering which is usually thrown over the whole. The wall serves as the only back to the seat. At times of eating or feasting, long tables were placed immediately before these benches.

In front of the thrones, chairs, and benches, are commonly found *footstools* of various size and form.¹⁾

These are usually cubical—yet vary greatly in accordance with the nature and height of the seat, some being mere inclined planes, as indicated in Folio 29 (b).

Another extreme is found in those which are either very low or—as is more probably the case—mere mats or woven rugs for the feet. In all cases, the footstool is either painted or pannelled and covered with a cloth with embroidered pattern.

Decorations upon the Furniture.

The general nature of the ornamentations upon the chairs and seats is in exact accordance with the style of art which was prevalent at this period. The Irish school in particular made use of the various forms of animal life as well as the human figure. These features the Anglo Saxon has borrowed and used freely in all branches of art—but in none more so than in his wood carving. For instance, the legs of the chairs were carved into figures of birds, dogs, and other animals. A favorite ornament for the back of the chair seems to have been the head of a dog, finished with the long hooked beak of the bird, while at the same time the lower ends of the legs broadened into huge birds-claws.

In one of the cuts in Julius A. VI., the long seat which accommodates three persons, is decorated at one end with the figure of an enormous swine, at the other end, with an equally curious figure of a lion or some beast of similar appearance.

¹⁾ Vgl. Cuts already mentioned.

The beaks of the ships—which have already been mentioned, point to the curious style which originated in the Irish monasteries.

Oftentimes the flat surfaces upon the different articles of furniture were gaily painted, e. g., in Folio 136 (b. I). The whole triangular surface is divided into three unequal portions. The uppermost and narrowest portion is painted a brilliant yellow, which, in Cl. B. IV., usually represents gold (no gold being used in the illuminations). The next lower surface is of a dark blueish-brown ground, relieved by bright red scrolls. The body color of the lower portion is vermilion, ornamented with scrolls of deeper red, shaded in white (as is usually the custom at this period, since the shading with neutral tints or deeper tones was unknown). The whole forms one of the most beautiful bits of furniture in the Ms.—lending a simplicity of effect and unity of tone which might well do credit to a much later period.

In Folio 60 (b. II)¹⁾ the two portions of the surface are painted in different designs of star-shaped pattern.

For the comfort of those occupying these chairs and benches, thick *cushions* were used upon the seat. These are of various size and thickness, while the covering was, in all probability, some coarse woven material, as may be judged from the method of representing the surface by close, diagonally intersecting lines. These also are represented in the illuminations, of many and beautiful colors.

The most richly appointed throne in the Ms. is the one already referred to, [Folio 91. (a)].²⁾ The seat is composed of three distinct portions, first a seat upon which is placed a cushion of bright vermilion and secondly, two broad divans, both broad at the further end, and approaching the seat in complex curves. The upper one is colored a rich purple—and the lower a bright green. The borders of the separate cushions, as well as that of the footstool, are in gold (represented by yellow).

¹⁾ Vgl. Pl. IV. No. XXI (fol. 60. b. II).

²⁾ Vgl. Pl. IV. No. XVII (fol. 91. a).

Rich coverings of bright colors and designed with scrolls and figures, finished the decoration of the seats and benches. The breadth of the covering is usually adapted to the size of the object which it covers—yet of a length which permitted it to hang in folds to the floor. Such coverings are used for seats of all lengths—from the single “heah-setl” to the long bench which accommodated many people. The long bench in Cl. B. IV. Folio 50 (b) upon which fifteen persons are seated, is covered with a vermillion cloth of equal length.

Upon the outer surface of these cloth coverings ornamental designs were embroidered in colors and gold. Indeed, it was through the skillfulness of the A. S. women in such work as this, that throughout Europe, all specimens of exceptionally fine workmanship became known as “Opus Anglicum.” The proof of its beauty is indicated by the esteem in which it was held by other nations.¹⁾

(2)

THE BEDS.

If the drawing in the Mss. are to be considered trustworthy, we must assume in the beginning that, even at the time of the Ms. Claudius B. IV. (11th Cy), the bed,—taken in its modern signification of *bedstead*—was a great luxury. Not only the guests and retainers but also, for the most part, the members of the family slept either upon the floor or upon rude benches attached to the wall. Seven eighths of all the cuts represent the custom as such.

According to the illuminations, the body of the person seems surrounded by a border or rim of nearly the same form as the body itself. Such representations mean simply that the person lay, not upon the floor, but upon thick mats or cushions of some material stuffed probably with straw. The head and shoulders are usually raised somewhat by means of pillows or bolsters. Hence, according to Wright (“A. S.

¹⁾ Cf. Wright’s “History of Eng. Culture”, p. 66; also Sharon Turner’s “A. History of the Anglo-Saxons”, Bd. 3. (London, 1823.)

Culture" p. 59) we are able to account for the Saxon words which signify bed, viz., *bænce* (bench) and *streow* (straw), since the bed itself usually consisted of a *sack* (*A. S. sæccing*), *filled with straw and laid upon a bench or board*.

There is one curious instance on Folio 35 (a. I) where the body of the person rests upon sacks laid directly upon the floor, whereas the bolsters which support the head are supported by two short props or legs, thus raising the upper portions of the body and doing away with the use of superfluous pillows.

The benches and beds seem to have been placed at the sides and ends of the small chambers, which, as we have seen, were attached to the buildings in form of ells or sheds, and shut off by curtains. Yet the piece of furniture which today is commonly called the bedstead—is not infrequently found, there being, in all, five such drawings in Claud. B. IV.

For closer examination of the drawings, we may easily bring all examples under one of the two following divisions:

I. *the bunk*, which was attached to the wall of one of the adjoining sheds or ills and,

II. *the bed*, which, being independent of surroundings, appears in the form of the modern bedstead.

I.

The one illumination on Folio 27 (b. II) will serve to illustrate the nature of this group.

Two low ells or sheds are represented adjoining one another—the side of one joined to the end of the other (as is shown by the portions of the roof). In the shed to the left is to be seen a low bunk, supported by short props and occupying the entire end of the structure. In front hangs a curtain suspended from a rod by rings, and thrown back a short distance from the head of the bed. In the small chamber to the right, the bunk is similar in all particulars with this exception, that it seems to extend along the long side of the room instead of the gable. Two curtains are draped from the center of the pole and caught back at either wall.

Upon these bunks are laid sacks and bolsters, while the bodies of those sleeping within are covered with the usual coverlets or "bed-reafe".

II.

Under the second group, we have three cuts, on Folios 34 (b); 55 (b. III);¹⁾ and 122 (b). The first and last are almost identical in form.

The body of the bed is a long piece of timber, rectangular in form and broad enough to accommodate two persons. In each instance there is a head-board but no foot-board. In 34. (b), the headboard is perpendicular, rounded slightly at the top and finished on either side with scrolled ornaments. Over all is thrown a plaited covering of red. The head-board in 122 (b) is much simpler, being formed of plain uprights topped and connected by a triangular finish. Both these examples are without sides and ends.

In Folio 34 (b), the flat body of the bed is supported by two legs at the head and one at the foot; while in 122 (b) only the two legs at the head are visible. The seemingly sloping surface of the bed in these two instances is simply the fault of the artist and affords a most interesting example of inability to reproduce perspective.

Folio 55 (b. III) differs from the two already described only in the solid sides and end. These planks which extend from the surface of the bed to the floor are either paneled or painted. The upright which forms part of the head-board, is round, and finished at the top with arabesque head.

(3)

THE TABLE (*A.-S.* "*bord*").

In Claudius B. IV., there occur four drawings in which the chieftain is feasting with the members of his family and guests.²⁾ Adding to these, Folio 5 (b) from Tiberius C. VI.,

¹⁾ Vgl. Pl. IV. No. X (fol. 55. b. III).

²⁾ Vgl. Pl. IV. No. XIII. (fol. 31. b. I). Vgl. Pl. IV. No. XIV (fol. 35. b. I).

and Folio 15 (a) from Cleopatra C. VIII., we possess material enough to establish with certainty the most important facts concerning the construction and furnishings of the Anglo-Saxon table.

I. The table varied in size according to the number of persons to be accommodated. Hence it was merely a temporary structure. They vary in the Mss. from the short oval table for two or three persons to the long rectangular board which was placed before the benches.

II. The tables were removed when no longer in use. In the case of the short tables, the board is usually supported by a single board leg with wide foot. These were in all probability permanent, as, e. g., in the cut which is taken from Cleopatra C. VIII., where the single leg is supported by a broad branching foot. The small table on Folio 5 (b) Tiberius C. VI., seems to be supported by two such legs with carved feet. In all other cases the legs are concealed by the long table cloth, but, judging from the size, the legs were only temporary.

III. The guests sit only upon one side—the other remaining free for the approach of the servants in attendance.

IV. The place of honor seems invariably to be at one end of the long side.

In general, it may be added that the tables were narrow in comparison to those of our own day. The sides of the long tables are straight while the ends are either cut squarely at right angle ¹⁾ or slightly rounded. ²⁾ The surface of the table is invariably covered with a cloth (A.-S. “bord-hrægl” or “myse-hrægl”), laid smoothly upon the board and falling in folds from the edges and corners. These table cloths are represented in colors and often with a rich border near the edge.

Upon the tables are seen dishes of various forms and sizes, which contain the larger portions of food—also knives and spoons, differing but slightly from those in present use.

¹⁾ Vgl. Pl. IV. No. XIV (fol. 35. b. I):

²⁾ Vgl. Pl. IV. No. XIII (fol. 31. b. I).

There are no forks to be seen. The advent of this article for table use belongs to a much later period. The drinking vessels are either horns or goblets with rounded bottoms.¹⁾ In all the Mss. which have been used in the preparation of this treatise, there occurs but one instance where the goblet is represented as *having a foot*. This is to be found in Tiberius C. VI. Folio 10 (b), among the costly gifts which Satan offers as a temptation to Christ. This goblet is of solid gold ornamented with gems.

The drinking cups without feet, when filled, were held in the hand and rarely placed upon the table.

The *drinking-horn* is, in all the Mss., the favorite drinking vessel—although at the time of the 11th century, it seems to have given way considerably to the glass cup which was more rare and costly. The horns are represented as being tipped with gold or brass and, in general, correspond very nearly to the specimens which are to be seen today in the British Museum.

It does not belong, in any way, to the province of this work to discuss the various dishes which are represented in the Mss. yet it may not be considered out of place to make note of the following observation:

Thos. Wright, both in the “English Culture” and also in his “Essays on Archaeological Subjects”²⁾ speaks of the probable use of the *bucket as the usual utensil for carrying the beer*. It may be added that these buckets are frequently found in the Saxon burying grounds throughout England. They are generally made with wooden sides but with rims and handles so richly ornamented that one must doubt whether they were actually used for common household purposes.

The drawings of the Mss. will, in no single instance, confirm such a use as that supposed by Mr. Wright. It seems only probable that if such buckets were in common use at

¹⁾ Vgl. Thos. Wright's “English Culture” p. 17. From the nature of these goblets (without base or rest), he derives the word “tumbler.”

²⁾ Vgl. “Essays on Archaeological Subjects” by Thos. Wright, Vol. I. p. 139. (London) 1861.

the table, the A. S. artist would not have omitted to represent it in some of the many instances where drinking is represented. Buckets are frequently represented, for example in Folio 94 (a. II), where they are used by the Children of Israel in gathering the manna. At the tables, on the contrary, either a larger horn or a large earthen vessel is always used to hold the beer.

(4)

THE DESK FOR WRITING.

There remains yet to be described, only one article of furniture—*the desk for writing*—which, to be serve, belonged in no way to the home, but to monastery.

Such a desk is represented in three cuts, Folios 95 (b. II), 101 (a. I), and 138 (b).

Folio 138 (b) contains a most skillfully drawn cut and may well serve as a type for the whole. The surface of the desk is large enough to accommodate the heavy volume in which Moses is writing. The desk slopes gently toward the person and is covered with a rich blue cloth which falls in folds some distance below the edge. The leg or support is beautifully turned or cut from a solid piece, the different portions of which are colored in brown and yellow. This support, in turn, fits into a branching stand formed of three (probably four) legs, curved and finished—as is commonly the case—in the claws of a bird. At the junction of these legs with the main support the parts extend upward and end in spirals. The desk is, without doubt, the most beautiful bit of furniture in the Ms. and points to a high standard of skill in cabinet-making.

VITA.

I was born in Portland, Maine, U. S. A., September 23, 1866 and received my early education in the public schools of my native city. In September, 1885, entered Bowdoin College (Brunswick, Me.) from which institution I was graduated in June 1889.

The following year, '89—'90, I heard post-graduate courses in English, German, and History in Johns Hopkins University, (Baltimore, Md.). The Collegiale year of '90—'91 I spent in Bowdoin College as Tutor in Languages. In June, 1891, I was elected Instructor in Modern Languages at the same institution with leave of absence for two years. Since that time I have pursued the study of English, German, and Philosophy at the University of Leipzig where I have heard Professors Wülker, Sievers, Heinze, Masins and Settegast, also Privatdocenten, Dr. Flügel, and Dr. Witkowski. I have been, for three semesters, a regular member of Prof. Wülker's „English Seminar“ and Prof. Sievers' „Pro-Seminar“ in German.

I take occasion here to express my deep gratitude to all my professors who have so kindly offered me counsel and personal guidance during my study in Leipzig, particularly, however, to Prof. Wülker through whose personal kindness I have been guided in my work both in Germany and in England.

Leipzig, Jan. 28, 1890.

George Taylor Files.