Studying Early Christian Sculpture in England and Ireland: The Object of Art History or Archaeology?
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Anglo-Saxon / Irish Relations before the Vikings, ed. J. Graham-Campbell and M. Ryan, London: 397–408
The recent disquiet that has been expressed with the scholarship of Anglo-Saxon sculpture has raised a number of issues, not least of which is the manner in which the material has been discussed during the course of the twentieth century. Briefly, these criticisms concern what is perceived to be the dominant methodological approach: ‘the far from reliable . . . art historical method . . . of style’. This is a method that has been characterised as ‘cavalier’ in its perceptions of similarity, and is identified as having originated in 1927 with W. G. Collingwood’s *Northumbrian crosses*, a book in which Collingwood’s ‘notion’ of an ‘evolution of style’, dependent on ‘his intuitions as a connoisseur of the sculpture’, is used to establish a chronology for the material.

Early Medieval Sculpture: Archaeology and Art History

Of interest here is the fact that this disquiet is articulated by both the art historian and the archaeologist. For the art historian it is the ‘cavalier’ approach of the connoisseur, and recognition of the intrinsically archaeological nature of the study that are at issue, while for the archaeologist, style
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analysis is considered unreliable because it is deemed inherently art historical, and thus subjective and unscientific, having no place in the modern discipline of archaeology. Perhaps equally worrying for the late twentieth-century archaeologist is the perception of style analysis as the analytical tool that—established by Thomsen in Denmark in 1836, and popularised in England, first by Worsaae, and then by John Evans’s numismatic studies—is most closely associated with post-Darwinian archaeological constructs of imperial synthesis, particularly through such works as John Lubbock’s (1865) *Pre-historic times, as illustrated by ancient remains, and the manners and customs of modern savages.* Against this background Collingwood’s stylistic methodology can be deemed unreliable, not only in its apparent invocation of art-historical approaches, but also through its association with evolution and racial typing. Nevertheless, whatever the perceptions of the use of style in archaeological historiography as a means of establishing chronologies within broad historical periods, it is not a methodology that is easily recognisable in current (post-medieval) art-historical circles: at least, not outside the ‘non-academic’ world of the art connoisseur where style was established as a viable approach in Morelli’s (1890) work on *Italian painters* for establishing the relationship of one work with another within the œuvre of a single artist.

In Ireland, in part owing to what has been described as the ‘predominantly pragmatic and non-theoretical’ character of modern Irish archaeology, unease with the scholarship of early medieval sculpture is less explicit, but it is nonetheless present. Studies that apply an apparently processual
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archaeological framework to the carvings, seeking to get to the ‘Heart of the Matter’ and define ‘A Sense of Proportion’, provide clear evidence of this.12 But here, the disquiet lies in the view of the scholarship as being the work of ‘extraordinary dedication’ by individual ‘enthusiasts’ and which, lacking ‘a work of synthesis’, is dominated by the ‘iconographical’ approach.13 In the context of a scholarship post-dating the ‘New Archaeology’, with its self-perceived aims of ‘scientific’ analysis and desire to ‘replace the murky exhalation that passes for “interpretative thinking” in archaeology’,14 a lack of synthesis and the concomitant want of precise definition are indeed anathema. Against this background, the apparent focus on the art-historical ‘iconographical’ aspects of medieval sculpture can only be regarded as compounding the situation.

Yet here again, it is worth noting that the iconographical approach, regarded as dominating modern Irish scholarship, is not one that would be immediately recognised in (post-medieval) art-historical circles, for it primarily involves identifying the subjects depicted on the monuments and comparing them with known parallels.15 Within an art-historical context this could be deemed an archaeological approach—a data-collecting exercise—or at best a method that correlates with what has been identified as the pre-iconographic level of iconographic studies, one that involves description and so ‘requires a minimum amount of specialised knowledge’.16 For, among art historians, iconographic (or rather iconological) studies seek to explicate the semiotics of images through contemporary written sources, and so to relate them to the character of an artist or society. Regarded as having been formulated in the mid-twentieth century by Panofsky in relation to fourteenth- and fifteenth-century art,17 iconological studies are now largely discredited because of the failure of later iconologists to distinguish adequately between their sources, with the resultant tendency to produce very loose generalisations.18

Thus, although discomfort with the study of the early medieval sculpture of Ireland has been less explicit than has that of the Anglo-Saxon material, and the methodology identified differs from that perceived to dominate the study of the early carvings of England, the material of both regions is deemed to be interrogated by methodologies that are discredited in both archaeological and art-historical circles, albeit for different reasons. Given this, it seems not inappropriate to consider how these two distinct approaches (that intersect so thoroughly with art history and archaeology) came to be used to interrogate the sculpture, and what questions they were trying to address.

**Art History: Ruskin (and Collingwood)**

As I have argued elsewhere, Collingwood’s use of style as an analytical tool can be regarded as an approach that he adopted quite late in his academic life, under the influence of the archaeological methodologies set out by Montelius in 1899, and more specifically, by his student Bernard Salin, whose work on Germanic, including Anglo-Saxon, animal ornament was published in 1904. These were works that sought to refine existing seriational and typological work in an attempt to establish related series of regional chronologies and archaeological ‘cultures’, and it was only in 1907 that Collingwood began to invoke them in his work on Anglo-Saxon sculpture.

However, using style in this way was not only a methodology appropriated by Collingwood from the field of archaeology, it was also one that marked a significant departure from what had been his more established art-historical concerns: concerns popularised by John Ruskin with whom Collingwood was closely associated between 1872, when he went to Oxford,
and Ruskin's death in 1901. During his time at university, Collingwood attended Ruskin's Slade Lectures in Art, graduating with a first in Greats in 1876, after which he studied with Legros at the Slade School of Art, University College London, and began exhibiting at the Royal Academy in 1880; by 1907, he was Professor of Fine Art at Reading. More importantly, by 1883, he had published his first theoretical treatise, \textit{The philosophy of ornament},\textsuperscript{23} which was followed by a series of publications on Ruskin as an artist and art historian.\textsuperscript{24} Thus Collingwood's art-historical works, rather than demonstrating any concern with style as an analytical dating tool, reverberate with Ruskin's theories of art, and so treat style as a means of demonstrating progress in art from its nascent form through to what Ruskin termed 'Real Art'.\textsuperscript{25}

In fact, in 1868, Ruskin had set out his ideas on the progression of art and humanity by invoking Anglo-Saxon and early Irish art in a paper entitled ‘The mystery of life and its arts’. This was an afternoon lecture organised by ‘the principal residents of Dublin’,\textsuperscript{26} and held in the Exhibition Palace, rather than the usual venue of the Royal College of Science, on St Stephen’s Green, as some 2,000 persons were in attendance.\textsuperscript{27} Considering it to contain ‘the best expression I have yet been able to put in words’,\textsuperscript{28} Ruskin subsequently included an abridged version of the lecture in the 1871 edition of \textit{Sesame and lilies}. The paper itself, however, set out in considerable detail how ‘Real Art’ is ‘the instinctive and necessary result of power, which can only be developed through the mind of successive generations, and which finally bursts into life under social conditions as slow of growth as the faculties they regulate’.\textsuperscript{29} To explain how such ‘progressive’ art could be distinguished from art he
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considered to be ‘at pause’. Ruskin selected a fifteenth-century Italian ‘angelic muse of astronomy’ to illustrate ‘the most thoughtful and passionate phase of the human mind’. This he set alongside an eleventh-century Anglo-Saxon ‘angelic muse of agriculture’, because it emerged from ‘a progressive and thoughtful school’, one that had a ‘notion of sublimity, and grace, and divinity’, and so had potential: potential he demonstrated by contrasting the Anglo-Saxon miniature with an early Irish ‘incorrigible angel’, one that exemplified an art ‘at pause’. As he informed his audience:

This Celtic drawing has . . . one great fault which neither of the other two have, and belongs therefore not merely to an earlier but also to an inferior school. This Irish angel differs from both the others essentially in one character, and in one only. The Irish angel thinks it is all right, and both the others know that they are in many ways wrong . . . the eager Teutonic missal-painter, firmly as he has drawn his childish idea, yet shows . . . the sense of effort and imperfection in every line. But the Irish missal-painter drew his angel with no sense of failure, in happy complacency, and put the dots into the palms of the hands, and curled the hair, and left the mouth out altogether, with complete satisfaction to himself.

The impact of this on his audience cannot be underestimated, occurring as it did three years after the International Exhibition, held in the same venue where Ruskin was lecturing, at which works celebrating the burgeoning Celtic Revival had abounded. However, the point here is that for Ruskin it was the decorative, and therefore spiritual, aspects of Anglo-Saxon art that defined it as progressive ‘Real Art’, and for Ruskin and his followers such art was crucial to the development of European art generally. As Collingwood was subsequently to put it, with reference to both the Irish and the Anglo-Saxons: ‘these nations, commonly called barbarous [had] great capacities and instincts for art’ to the
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extent that ‘we can trace the history of . . . its development, and find from it exactly those motives [needed] . . . to completely explain the origin of Gothic ornament’—the perfect ‘Real Art’. Indeed, for Ruskin and Collingwood the advantage of the early art was that it was ‘frankly open to the . . . methods of bright decoration employed in the Byzantine Empire: for these alone seemed suggestive of the glories of the brighter world promised by Christianity’. This they used, ‘not for the pleasure of this present life, but as the symbols of another’.

Art and Archaeology: Allen and Stokes

Whatever current opinion may be of the cultural perceptions and sense of historicity propounded by these works, it is worth noting that when they invoke the early medieval art of England and Ireland, it is not in terms of style as an analytical dating tool. Rather, the early material is considered integral to an art theory that privileged a sense of progression and the spiritual: in other words, a Hegelian art theory. Collingwood was very much aware of this; his critique of Ruskin includes a detailed analysis of the scholarship to demonstrate what Ruskin, who was deeply suspicious of the post-Hegelian ‘sceptical school’, had nevertheless managed to imbibe of the philosophy. It is also important to note that no mention is made of sculpture in these treatises; when the early medieval is invoked, it is primarily in terms of manuscript painting. This does not mean that the early carvings were not part of mainstream scholarship, for they were, and when they were discussed it was very much within the context of the theories propounded by Ruskin.

For example, when the Archaeological Association visited Wolverhampton in 1873, despite their bewilderment about whether the column there was Saxon, Danish or Norman, Christian or pagan, they nevertheless considered it to be linked to the cultivation of ‘art through the medium of schools established in our large manufacturing districts and . . . thus [adapted] to the various modes of fostering a love for that which was beautiful, would materially conduce not merely to the physical good, but to the happiness of the people’. This discussion, which moves seamlessly from the reality of the Anglo-Saxon column to the state of education and art, illustrates how those
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who saw themselves as archaeologists regarded the early sculpture as art. And as art, cultivated ‘through the medium of the schools’, it was integral to the motives informing the foundation of the metropolitan schools, one of which could be seen across the road from the Wolverhampton column. For it was in these schools that the sculpture was on public display, in settings intended to provide:

an elementary knowledge [of] . . . historic ornament; awaken a responsive and sympathetic feeling for the many beautiful and interesting remains of ancient and medieval civilization; and lastly, direct attention . . . to the beauty, suggestiveness, and vitality of the Industrial arts of the past, and their immediate relation to the social and religious life of the people.41

Thus, when Romilly Allen delivered his ‘Rhind Lectures in Archaeology’ (in 1885) it is hardly surprising that he discussed the early Christian carvings of Ireland from similar perspectives. He stressed the moral imperative associated with the monuments and their study in a lengthy diatribe against the then current attitudes to the sculptures, presenting them as constituting the proper object of study, and demanding that they be protected and copies made for posterity.42 Allen also articulated a clear sense that the Hegelian progression of the human spirit is revealed in this early art. In fact, his third Rhind Lecture included a detailed discussion of the same manuscript miniature used by Ruskin in his Dublin lecture some fifteen years earlier. Like Ruskin, he noted the ‘extreme and almost barbarous rudeness of the figures’, and considered the image to be ‘conventionalised in a most extraordinary manner’, which produced a ‘marked contrast between the high artistic merit of the ornamental features of the design and the utter want of a sense of beauty exhibited in the figure subjects’.43 Here, in keeping with Ruskinian criteria, design, ornament and decoration are regarded, along with the ‘sense of beauty’, as acceptable features. However, unlike Ruskin who regarded the miniature as exemplifying an abortive art, Allen saw it as preserving the ‘essential elements’ of Byzantine art and so could ‘only conclude’:

that the object which the Celtic scribe had in view was not so much to produce a likeness of actual things, as to exercise his wonderful powers of penmanship and give full scope to his exuberant fancy . . . As a mosaic of brilliant colours
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and a pleasing combination of intricate geometrical ornament, the miniature . . . stands unrivalled. The human features, especially the ears, are ingeniously converted into spiral curves, beautiful as mere ornaments.44

Here, having adopted the established criteria by which a work of art is to be measured, Allen used them to reach very different conclusions to those propounded by Ruskin.

He then proceeded to demonstrate how this art does not represent a Ruskinian ‘form of failure’,45 but rather reflects the spiritual advancement of the Celtic peoples. And, because within a Ruskinian (or Hegelian) theoretical framework, the emphasis lay on the equation of art with the human spirit, Allen not unexpectedly focused on the symbolism of the carvings—the means by which the spirit of the early Celtic peoples could be expressed. So, with what he deemed to be a ‘scientific’ study of the stones,46 Allen systematically analysed the carved panels through the symbolical methodology that had been established by André Didron, through his Iconographie chrétienne (1843),47 and his (1845) translation of the twelfth-century Byzantine treatise on Christian art which set out the formulæ by which the symbolism of Christian events was to be depicted.48 Referring to Didron’s works, as well as to Anna Jameson’s Sacred and legendary art,49 Allen demonstrated how carvings, like the crucifixion panel at Kells, correspond to, but progress from early Byzantine images such as that in the sixth-century Rabulla Gospels.50 From this set of comparisons he pointed to both the details linking the Irish material to the Byzantine, and the symbolic correspondences. Thus, when he noted that, in both scenes, Christ’s ‘life has not yet become extinct, for the eyes are open’,51 such statements are not based simply on observation of the images’ details; rather, they are informed by his understanding that ‘each period of history of Christian art has its special set of subjects’, so that ‘the varying conditions of ecclesiastical life . . . produced corresponding changes in the monuments and objects upon which the symbolism manifests itself’.52 To demonstrate this Allen cited a number of texts recommended by Didron
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as well as other, more ‘Insular’ texts. Through these he explained how the focus of the Irish carving, reduced to the spear- and sponge-bearers, marks ‘the fulfilment of prophecy on account of its symbolical significance, having reference to the sacraments of Baptism and the Lord’s Supper’.  

It is worth rehearsing Allen’s arguments in some detail, not only because they mark a significant departure from those of Ruskin, but also because they differ notably from the methods used to discuss early Irish sculpture that were current elsewhere. This is seen quite clearly when Allen’s Rhind Lectures are considered alongside Browne’s ‘Disney Lectures in Archaeology’ for, like Allen’s third and fourth Rhind Lectures, Browne’s (1892) Disney Lectures had as their stated theme the early Christian sculpture of Ireland. Yet barely three of Browne’s six lectures look at the Irish material, and those that do focus almost exclusively on inscriptions—that aspect of Anglo-Saxon sculptural studies that had predominated since the late sixteenth century.

Allen’s approach is also of note because it anticipated that of Margaret Stokes whose first systematic discussions of early Irish sculpture were published as Part II of her Early Christian art in Ireland in 1887, two years after Allen’s Rhind Lectures, and one year after she had brought together and translated, as the second volume of his Christian iconography, Didron’s miscellaneous notes and publications, along with his Byzantine ‘iconographic manual’—collated during her Three months in the forests of France. In her Early Christian art, Stokes’s language is redolent of Ruskin in its focus on design and decoration, and its association of art with the human spirit, but like Allen she used these criteria to reach very different conclusions:

The peculiarity of Irish Art may be said to be the union of such primitive rhythmical designs as are common to barbarous nations, with a style which accords with the highest laws of the arts and design . . . and such delicate and perfect execution . . . as must command respect for the conscientious artist by whom the work was carried out.

With the moral imperative of studying such art in mind, Stokes described how it can elucidate the development of early art because Ireland, being
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furthest ‘from those centres of culture in the East and South whence the current flowed’, is exactly the place where ‘we find the largest traces of those elements which are common to all races in the development of their primæval arts’. Thus the ‘reflex light . . . cast by the early Christian customs and arts of Ireland upon early Christian practices elsewhere’ cannot be overestimated.  

More importantly, with her editorial knowledge of Didron, Stokes presented the Christian iconography of early Irish sculpture as capable of expressing what she terms ‘The Christian Scheme’.  

By this, biblical images could be considered ‘historic’, and ‘prophetic of Christ when selected from the Old Testament [and] symbolic when taken from the New’, because, through the use of a ‘system of symbols’, early artists were able to turn into symbols ‘the events recorded . . . as expressive of religious faith’. For Stokes, therefore, ‘decoration is beautiful only when found in its right place’ (in this case, on a stone cross); it is beautiful only ‘when adding to the effect of the fundamental form to be adorned’ (through use of the symbolic subject matter); and when aiding in the ‘expression of the essential elements of the subject’: the spirit of the age.

This type of commentary, which used criteria familiar from the art-historical tradition popularised by Ruskin, but which nonetheless differed from it by invoking the symbolic approach, is one that can be regarded as marking a clear departure, not only from these mainstream art-historical discussions, but also from the methods that were being formulated to discuss Anglo-Saxon sculpture. It was, nevertheless, a methodology that was used elsewhere—in the pages of journals such as The Ecclesiologist, ‘an art-journal’ set up to advocate ‘the best of art’: namely, ‘the symbolic’.  

It was here that Didron’s and Jameson’s work, along with that of Elizabeth Eastlake, were reviewed, discussed and invoked to assess medieval and contemporary works of art and architecture in the 1840s and 1860s.  

Applied to the early sculpture of Ireland by Allen and Stokes, it is an approach that encapsulates the manner in which the archaeological object, the carved stone cross, was considered to inhabit the world of art history. Indeed, Stokes is clear about the relationship. Citing Evans’s archaeological work on early coinage as a paradigm by which to explain the development of ‘our iconography’, she
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states that ‘something more than archaeology is required to perceive this’: ‘to
the mere archaeologist, antiquity is everything, and Art nothing’. Thus a
mind of ‘wider grasp’ is required ‘to perceive the qualities which form the
essential elements of the individuality of Irish Art’, the ‘true merit [of which]
lies in its use, and in that indefinable quality which, for want of a better word,
we term feeling’. For Stokes, archaeologists must embrace (Hegelian) art
theory, and art historians must utilise archaeological methodologies.

Conclusions

This does not answer the question of whether the current study of the early
Christian sculpture of England and Ireland is the object of art history or
archaeology. It does, however, demonstrate that when the modern scholar-
ship was emerging, those shaping it were fully cognisant of, indeed were
major proponents of, the dominant art-historical method of commentary,
and were seeking, variously, to construct something ‘other’, something more
systematic and ‘scientific’ in order to discuss material they considered vital to
understanding, not just the early medieval culture of the Insular world, but
the progress of the human spirit. For Collingwood, the answer lay in the most
up-to-date archaeological approach by which ‘forms, materials and technic,
subject-matter, figures, animals and ornament’ were to be considered together
as analytic tools by which to establish a chronology for the sculpture. For
Allen and Stokes, the answer lay in a more systematic art-historical approach:
that of the symbolic, in order to establish the intellectual nature of the
material. Their approach was one that Focillon would respond to in his
Life of forms in art, a book considered to articulate an ‘archaeological
formalism’ in which the Hegelian spirit of art is still prevalent, and one,
moreover, that was produced at the time when his student Françoise Henry
would come to ‘inherit’ the ‘mantle of Margaret Stokes’. But that is a
subject for future discussion.
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