

This is a repository copy of *Translating animal art: Salin's Style I and Anglo-Saxon cast saucer brooches*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/753/>

Article:

Dickinson, T.M. (2002) Translating animal art: Salin's Style I and Anglo-Saxon cast saucer brooches. *Hikuin*. pp. 163-186. ISSN 0105-8118

Reuse

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.

Translating animal art: Salin's Style I and Anglo-Saxon cast saucer brooches

By Tania M. Dickinson

1. Introduction

Although Salin's Style I was the most widely used animal art in early Anglo-Saxon England, its study has been mainly confined to the typology of square-headed brooches in order to establish chronology, especially origins and early development, and cultural connections, particularly with Scandinavia and the Continent.ⁱ Leigh is the only person, from an Anglo-Saxon perspective, who has really tried to explore the relationship between the art-form of Style I and its iconographic and social meaning, and then still mostly on the basis of Kentish square-headed brooches.ⁱⁱ If square-headed brooches were indeed the 'leading' type for Style I, providing its most complex and frequently most accomplished displays, they were not in England its only, or even most numerous, vehicle, being easily outnumbered, for example, by cast and applied saucer brooches combined.ⁱⁱⁱ

The omission of all but the occasional saucer brooch from discussion can probably be attributed to their Style I being perceived as generally derivative, or degenerate, in quality and their role in transmission as non-primary.^{iv} But this is an unproductive attitude. The facts that saucer brooches developed outside the core area of Style I genesis - first in early 5th-century Lower Saxony and later, and predominantly, in central and western Anglo-Saxon districts - and that throughout their currency they showed a preference for geometric designs make their Style I particularly interesting: self-evidently, it was adopted from elsewhere and engaged with a pre-existing tradition.^v If the target is to probe how and why animal art gained its place in early medieval affections, rather than to judge its aesthetic merit, then saucer brooches may be pertinent: the so-called 'indifferent' or even 'bad' can hold as many lessons as the 'primary' or 'best'.

Moreover, ever since Salin first described Style I's widespread repertoire of motifs and design principles, 'degeneration' has been an integral concept in its characterisation. Salin showed that the most arresting aspect of the style was the emphasis on individual body-parts (elements) which enabled animal images to be transformed, whether in the initial development of classic Style I from Late Roman antecedents or, later, when the defining contour lines were lost.^{vi} Haseloff's list of design principles (*Gestaltungsprinzipien*) points to three major transformative processes: 'addition', 'abbreviation' (reduction or *pars pro toto* as well as compression in detail) and 're-assembly' (in Haseloff's words, '*Tiersalat*' - 'animal salad' - or *horror vacui*). Leigh has added, as a fourth factor, 'ambiguity', which underlies the prevalence of dual images of various kinds.^{vii}

Armed with these guides to reading Style I, both the ‘coherent’ and the apparently ‘incoherent’, its nature on cast saucer brooches is opened to exploration. In turn, this raises implications about its meaning and role in this particular context. This paper seeks to initiate such a reappraisal.

2. Characterising Style I on cast saucer brooches

The capacity of saucer brooches to accommodate Style I was obviously constrained by the space available: a single, flattish and circular area, c.20 to 70mm in diameter, compares poorly, for example, with the multiple fields offered by three-dimensional square-headed brooches. Nonetheless, saucer brooches would still have offered many possibilities, so what was not done - but could have been - may be as significant as what was done.

The Style I on cast saucer brooches can be considered in terms of the selection and combination of *motifs* (the individual animal images), *presentation* (the way in which the animal images were executed) and *composition* (overall design layout).^{viii} Before Style I made its appearance, relief-cast geometric motifs on saucer brooches had nearly always been laid out round a central boss or circular inset, usually with the decoration divided into concentric bands or fields by boundary rings.^{ix} The circularity was emphasised by presenting motifs in single, repetitive bands (one-dimensional translation),^x which, depending on the motifs’ number and shape and the proportions of the space occupied (in terms of width of field and arc of circle), would appear as either ‘running’ (e.g. spirals, fig. 1) or ‘radiating’ (e.g. floriate cross, fig. 2).

A fortiori, recognising Style I on saucer brooches involves identifying motifs and forms of presentation previously established in the Anglo-Scandinavian canon, that is discrete, coherent and legible animals. Identifying less coherent versions tends to depend on such *primary* or *prior* versions being extant, from which, in turn, a chain of derivation can be recognised: the line of argument is the same as that more commonly invoked to establish internal, relative-chronological sequence.^{xi}

‘Coherent’ Style I

Initially, Style I was adopted using quite coherent, recognisable motifs. A find from Aston Remenham, Berks, is still the earliest embodiment known on a saucer brooch, as indicated by the ‘Vimose’-headed profile quadrupeds presented in Haseloff’s Style Phase B (figs. 3a and 4a;^{xii} fig. 15). They are best paralleled on square-headed brooches of Haseloff’s Jutlandic Group C, most especially that from Bifrons grave 41, Kent.^{xiii} Indeed, Aston Remenham might be seen as a circular conceptualisation of the imagery on a Jutlandic square-headed brooch: the centrally-placed, full-face humanoid mask reflects the shape, dominant position and preferred motif of the disc-on-bow;^{xiv} the opposed,

‘bird’s-eye’, ‘Vimose’ heads^{xv} and full-face, humanoid heads of the outer field correspond to the positioning of such heads at cardinal points on the Bifrons 41 footplate; and the four quadrupeds represent the major role of profile creatures in early Style I,^{xvi} in this case being specifically close to the animals at the top of the outer field of the Bifrons 41 headplate.

In other ways, Aston Remenham points to how Style I was adjusted for saucer brooches, notably in terms of the motifs selected and the ways they were composed into a design. Portrayal of a full-face head in a single, central field (e.g. fig. 7) was not common, despite saucer brooches being well suited to it and despite it being adopted as the definitive motif for their diminutive cousins, the button brooches;^{xvii} while ‘bird’s-eye’, ‘Vimose’ heads recur only on derivative versions of the Aston Remenham design (figs. 3b-d, of which more below). A single profile head in a field, which was also favoured on Jutlandic square-headed brooches,^{xviii} does not seem to have been adopted at all.

Whole profile creatures, however, were copied enthusiastically, occurring in recognisably coherent form on about one-quarter of all cast saucer brooches with zoomorphic ornament. Animals *stricto sensu* are of indeterminate species and are actually uncommon: Aston Remenham provides a definite example (fig. 4a) and the inner fields of one of the pair from Fairford grave 15, Glos. (fig. 4b) and the brooch from Upton, Cambs. (fig. 5b) possibly others. A bird-like creature, with raptor’s beak, single leg emanating directly from the rear of the skull and a ‘tail’, was widely replicated (fig. 5a), but most creatures are animal-men - in Leigh’s definition of the term rather than Haseloff’s. That is the creature appears ambiguously, now with an animal’s head, now with a human head (fig. 4c-f), rather than being a combination of animal and human parts, though such an image does appear, eight times, in the outer field of the Upton brooch (fig. 4h).^{xix}

Profile creatures were always arranged in single-line procession, normally in twos or threes, rarely in fours or eights. A clockwise procession was preferred over an anticlockwise (in the ratio of 4:3), but, inexplicably, whilst two creatures normally processed clockwise (ratio of 7:2), three creatures moved anticlockwise (ratio of 2:5). Feet were nearly always placed to the inside of the brooch and the head in line with the body, except where transmogrification into a human head implies sideways or rearward twisting (e.g. fig. 4e). But heads do *not* look backward over the spine, as in other Late Roman-derived styles, including Scandinavian Style I. Symmetrical, mirror-image pairing of whole creatures occurs only, and debatably, on a brooch from Emscote, Warks. (fig. 6a).^{xx} Saucer brooches thus echo one arrangement commonly adopted by Style I for marginal, profile animals, the processional or chasing format, but not the equally, or even more, common arrangement of mirror-image pairing, though there is nothing intrinsically to prevent it, as its recurrent use on round brooches in Quoit Brooch Style shows.^{xxi} Although a chasing arrangement is also the hallmark of

animals on Kentish garnet-inlaid rectangular belt plates, which might have been a significant source of inspiration for designs on many saucer brooches and some great square-headed brooches,^{xxii} the Aston Remenham brooch shows that the preference was established early and is to be explained by pre-existing traditions, especially for organising geometric motifs like spirals into single-line translation or ‘running’ designs.^{xxiii}

Transformations of Style I

When Style I was transferred to saucer brooches, it was changed not only through selectivity and adaptation to a pre-existing design tradition, but also by realising its inherent, transformatory potential.

Abbreviation in the form of presentation (*compression of the detail*) in essence accounts for the difference between animal bodies in Haseloff’s Style Phase B (contour lines with transverse-line infill), which is uncommon on cast saucer brooches (fig. 4a), and in Style Phase D (two or three parallel lines), which is widespread (fig. 4b). Moreover, Style Phase D with lines of even width often appears to compress a more accomplished version in which one, thick, sloping ridge is contrasted with one or two, thin, sharp ridges (figs. 4h, 5b, 7).^{xxiv} Compare, for example, the animal-men in Figures 8a and 8c, or the two-chasing bird-headed design, in which a finely executed, ‘thick and thin’ version is known from eight ‘primary’ brooches (fig. 5a), while a series of decreasingly less proficient, ‘secondary’ renderings is known from a further eleven brooches (figs. 5d-j, k), including examples in full Style Phase D (figs. 5e and h).^{xxv} This latter series exemplifies how abbreviation in the form of presentation, even to a single line (fig. 5f and 5k), combined with *abbreviation (or reduction) of the elements* which comprise the motif, can result in a truly ‘degenerated’ Style I - and one which might appear illegible were the prior versions not available (cf. fig. 5a,d,g,j,e,h,f,i,k, in that order). Indeed, characteristic elements of this particular motif, such as the ‘T-shaped’ rendition of the leg, allow ‘tertiary’ versions to be identified on the pair from Berinsfield grave 102, Oxon. (fig. 5l)^{xxvi} and even in one of four framed panels on one of a pair from Black Patch, Pewsey, grave 21, Wilts (fig. 5m).^{xxvii}

Such *abbreviation*, or the use of parts of an animal image rather than the whole, is probably the most commonplace transformatory feature of Style I on saucer brooches. A good example is the simplified rendering, again eight times, of the animal-man of the Upton brooch on a pair from Shelford, Cambs (fig. 4i): the ‘thick and thin helmet’ is reduced to a shock of striated hair, the facial features to two blobs, and the limbs to a single, ‘Z-shaped’ triple-bar block. Abbreviation is more often associated, however, with *addition* (or replication) of elements and consequently with *re-assembly*. The results range from more or less incomplete creatures to ‘repeat-pattern’ generation.

Incomplete profile creatures occur on about one-fifth of zoomorphic cast saucer brooches. Where a field is divided radially, say by real or imitation inlays, discrete creatures may be defined, even if their body-parts and hence orientation are not cogent: for example, the creatures on the brooch from Girton grave 10, Cambs. (fig. 5c) are ‘re-assembled’ parts, arguably from creatures like those on the inner field of the Upton brooch and the bird-headed animal (fig. 5a-b); those on Emscote lack authentic heads (fig. 6a); and on a brooch from Kingsey, Bucks., the imitation inlays themselves seem to serve as heads (fig. 6b). In other cases, the number of creatures intended is not apparent, because only parts can be separated out of the asymmetrical confection (e.g. Fairford, Glos. and Alfriston grave 28, Sussex, figs. 6c-d), or have become totally incoherent ‘animal salad’, as on the brooches from Wheatley grave 14, Oxon. (fig. 9).^{xxviii}

Re-assembly need not mean, however, that the identity of distinct creatures had been totally lost, as the devolutionary sequence running from the Aston Remenham brooch (fig. 3a) via an applied brooch from Lechlade grave 90 to a cast brooch in Lechlade grave 111 (fig. 3b) shows.^{xxix} The last retains the full-face ‘Vimose’ heads and also, apparently, one leg of each of the four chasing quadrupeds of the first, but has substituted further legs or more ambiguous elements for other parts of the design. Arguably, this process went even further to produce Long Wittenham I, grave 121, Oxon. (fig. 3c), and, by substituting some geometric elements for zoomorphic ones, Baginton, Warks. (figs. 3d).

The processes of abbreviation, addition and re-assembly also generated repetitively-patterned designs, which are especially characteristic of Style I on saucer brooches: about 60 per cent of the zoomorphic brooches bear parts of animal images rather than an attempt at a whole creature. The process of incorporating animal parts into radial and running designs must have begun early in the translation of Style I to saucer brooches, to judge by both the well-known type in which the arms of a floriate cross are filled by full-face heads^{xxx} and a recent discovery from Wasperton grave 163, Warks., which has legs between the scrolls of a four-spiral motif (fig. 10a).^{xxxi} The most popular arrangements of all, however, involved legs which seem to run, nearly always in a clockwise direction, round the centre. The number of legs ranges from three (as in the central field of Droxford, Hants., fig. 8a) to eight, with four (fig. 10b), six (fig. 10d-e) or seven (fig. 10g) the most frequent and five more occasional (fig. 10c). The number-patterning makes sense less as a shorthand for discrete animals and more as a reflection of running-spiral numeration. Indeed, where the leg is presented with the foot to the outside, whether bent back or pointing forwards, there is a marked resemblance to designs with running spirals (cf. figs. 10g and 10h).^{xxxii}

The other main type of pattern to be generated was a frieze. Either a full-face head with profile

body-block and leg (fig. 11a-b) or just alternating body-blocks and legs (fig. 11c) were repeated from three to six times, usually round a central geometric motif (hexafoil, quatrefoil, five-point star or floriate cross with full-face heads). Where completely symmetrical, the patterning dominates, but discrete animals might still have been intended, most obviously where each part of an animal is represented (the full-face head of a profile animal therefore seemingly turned towards the viewer, fig. 11a) or where irregular elements, even head-like ones, separate the sequence of legs and body-blocks (fig. 11f).

Ambivalent, or even multivalent, images are ubiquitous throughout all this Style I. Among classic treatments are animals with heads which transmogrify into human ones, creatures which are separate in profile but, through sharing parts, can be seen as single either from above or full-face, and heads which can be read either way up.

How recognisable animal-men are, and especially the direction in which their human heads face (to outside or inside of the brooch), depends on presentation. For example, the human mouth is construed from the animal's crown/nasal on Bishop's Cleeve 1/4, Worcs. (fig. 4c), but from the animal's face in the cases of one creature from the 'pair' to Fairford grave 15 (fig. 4d), mentioned above, and of one from the singleton in Mitcham grave 208, Surrey (fig. 4e). The last-named has a veritably 'Sutton Hoo-type' helmet, while the Fairford example displays a feature noted by Leigh, in which an animal-ear is transformed into a headdress with feather or streamer. This feature might help to identify animal-men without a mouth, such as Wasperton grave 18, Warks. (fig. 4g). In other cases, while the head-shape - with curled nape - replicates those of assured animal-men, the absence of other features makes the duality uncertain (cf. figs. 4c and 8a). And in the case of the second creature on the Mitcham brooch (fig. 4f), the human head might be read facing inwards *or* outwards!

Ambiguously paired or single creatures are a feature of a series of mostly large, late brooches. There is one example of what might be a 'Great Beast' from Prittlewell grave group 32, Essex, with full-face (or 'bird's-eye-view') head, two hips and shared 'S-shaped' leg (fig. 8g).^{xxxiii} Paired profile heads are more frequent and can admit of three different iconic readings (figs. 11d-e, g-h): they are composed either with radiating, imitation inlays between affronted faces (fig. 11di), which then can appear as a single full-face head (fig. 11diii), and bars or multiple-bar blocks between back-to-back heads (fig. 11dii), or vice versa. (fig. 11hi-ii and iii). Of note are transformations where the heads are presented with rounded skulls rather than crested 'helmets'. In the outer field of a pair from East Shefford, the full-face format can be read either way up (fig. 11hi-ii), though it is more striking looking outwards (fig. 11hi). In other versions, by fusing the dividing-bar with the eyebrows, four 'm-shaped' or 'Mr Chad' masks are highlighted, bringing forward an explicitly zoomorphised

floriate cross, as on Berinsfield grave 22, Oxon., where visual ambiguity is increased by the sharp but irregular relief (fig. 11e).

Saucer brooches exhibit other types of ambiguity which have not been so commented upon. There is a series of brooches closely linked by shape (mostly convex, lathe-turned) and other ornament (central glass inlay or riveted stud and punched flange or outer border), which features six repeated motifs. On Lechlade grave 113, Glos., they are clearly clockwise legs (fig. 10d); by contrast, on a brooch from Kempston, Beds., they appear as anticlockwise ‘helmet’ heads (fig. 10f, especially 10fi), though one is more like a ‘shrimp’ (fig. 10fii) and it is this motif which recurs on brooches from Luton, grave 41, Beds. (fig. 10e), Alveston grave 65 and Bidford-on-Avon graves 88 and 178, Warks.^{xxxiv} By altering the number and position of ridges in the ‘thick and thin technique’, the same basic shape can transmute between head and leg: the shrimp-motif could have been produced by mirror-image transposition of the Lechlade leg-motif (fig. 10di), with concave curving of the upper limb, or, as is nearly achieved on the Kempston brooch (fig. 10fii), by integrating the cheek-bars and forehead of a head to make a leg or tail. Which came first, and which, if either, was really intended, is debatable.

A final ambiguity which affects many of the transformations already described is a tendency to reduce zoomorphic images to geometric ones. For example, mosaic-like patterns occupy the spaces between the arms of a cross on a large brooch from Alveston, Warks. (fig. 8f) and between imitation inlays on a brooch from Thornborough, Bucks. (fig. 8i). In the former case, the overall design seems to replicate that on a smaller brooch from Market Lavington, Wilts. (fig. 8e): the mosaic may then be read (admittedly, generously) as abbreviated, profile animal-men, or *Protome* in Haseloff’s terms. In the latter case, the mosaic can be compared with the design on a pair of brooches from Long Wittenham I, grave 71, Oxon. (fig. 8h), where ‘T-’ and ‘angle’ shapes are more obviously geometricised versions of full-face heads and bent legs - in essence compacted animals - such as appear on friezes like those in Figure 11a or, with the leg inverted, on applied saucer brooches of the ‘Kempston Cross’ type (fig. 8j).^{xxxv} Another case is the pair of brooches from Watchfield grave 75, Oxon. (fig. 8b): the central motif has been called ‘triaxial’,^{xxxvi} but it owes its appearance more probably to the three ‘rotating’ Style I legs at the centre of the pair from Droxford, mentioned above (fig. 8a). If so (and intermediary stages probably intervened), then the former’s outer field of multiple-bar blocks might represent the two chasing creatures of the latter: the dominant radial blocks, which divide the field, correspond to the two, markedly radial, body-blocks of the whole animals and to the junctions between them. And if that is so, then the outer field on the brooch from Cassington II, grave 5, Oxon. (fig. 8d), although surrounding a central quatrefoil, might also be ‘zoomorphic’.

It would go too far to propose that all regular astragal- and basketwork friezes were zoomorphic substitutes, but the potential for ambiguity should be acknowledged, especially where there is some irregularity or combination with other Style I elements. For example, a full-face head and floriate cross motif is surrounded by a mask-body-leg frieze on a brooch from Sutton Courtenay, Oxon.(fig. 11b), but by basketwork on brooches from Berinsfield grave 107, Oxon.(fig. 12), and Horton Kirby I, Kent. In the case of the brooches from East Shefford discussed above (fig. 13), multiple-bar blocks in the middle field might be considered either as a pattern between the simplified ‘m-shaped’ heads or as some kind of body to the heads; while in the outermost field (of one of the pair only) an extra scallop has been inserted beside one of the paired heads (fig.11hii), generating an incipient, geometric pattern which differs only in its orientation from that used consistently on a group of large brooches from Puddlehill II, grave 10, Beds., Stone, Bucks. and Faversham, Kent (fig. 11i).^{xxxvii}

3. Interpretation

Chronology

To relate analytical description to wider interpretation is to move into more difficult and speculative areas. A primary problem, which was mostly circumvented above, is the lack of a really secure chronology, both in terms of absolute dates and of the timescales over which devolutionary sequences might have taken place (at a uniform rate or not? Within, say, one year or over a whole generation?).

The link between the Aston Remenham saucer brooch and the square-headed brooch from Bifrons grave 41 puts the beginning of Style I on saucer brooches about AD 500 on current, conventional dating, that is concurrent with the beginnings of great square-headed brooches in Saxon and Anglian districts. Thirteen great square-headed brooches included in Hines’ *Corpus* came from graves which also contained zoomorphic saucer brooches, and thus permit some calibration of chronologies, though the degree of overlap which Hines allows between his phases and within his absolute dates of c. AD500 - 570 causes uncertainty.^{xxxviii} The associations with great square-headed brooches of Hines’ Phase1 to early Phase 2 would place examples of coherent Style I on saucer brooches, such as two chasing animal-men (Haslingfield/Harlton, Cambs.) and bird-headed creatures (Alveston 5, fig. 5d), in the first quarter or third of the 6th century, but, as Hines himself notes, at the same time as quite ‘developed’ versions, such as ‘tertiary’ renderings of the bird-headed creatures (Berinsfield 102, fig. 5l), partly incoherent creatures (Alfriston 28, fig.6c) and ambiguous ‘shrimp-like’ heads/legs (Luton 41, fig. 10e, and Bidford-on-Avon 88). Associations with Hines’ full to late Phase 2 and Phase 3 indicate that coherent, if ‘secondary’, bird-headed creatures

(Ely/Cratendune, Cambs., fig. 5j) and full-face heads in a floriate cross (Berinsfield 107, fig. 12) could still be produced in the second quarter and/or middle of the 6th century, but designs with re-assembled creatures (Girton 10, fig. 5c), body- and leg-friezes (Lechlade 18, formerly 57, Glos.) or incoherent ornament (Coleshill, Oxon., Black Patch, Pewsey 21, fig. 5m, and Holdenby 4, Northants.) predominate.^{xxxix} It is perhaps significant, however, that nearly all the brooches in this second grouping combine the zoomorphic field with one or more geometric fields, whereas the brooches in the earlier set have only a single zoomorphic field. Links with Kentish chronology place the end of saucer-brooch production in the late 6th and early 7th century, well beyond Hines' end-date for great square-headed brooches:^{xl} by then brooches had become noticeably larger and designs were usually multi-field, composed from (mostly) highly transformed Style I, geometric or geometricised motifs (e.g. figs. 11g and 11i).

While the relative and absolute date of individual pieces, especially those caught between Hines' and the Kentish chronology, may be uncertain, the overall trajectory is clear.^{xli} Coherent Style I was applied in the early 6th century, but was more or less immediately subject to transformations in motifs, presentation and composition; abbreviation, addition, re-assembly and ambiguity were increasingly used to break up Style I into less instantly recognisable animal images, especially through geometricisation of motifs and compositions. The question is why.

Art-form and meaning

The traditional and negative answer is that Style I was an alien art-form, used without understanding of its original meaning and purpose and with decreasing success. In many cases close similarity in the dimensions and layout of the relief-casting might suggest that deficiencies in the detail were compounded by the brooches having been reproduced mechanically. Indeed, in the case of the series with two chasing bird-headed creatures (figs. 5a, d-l), the area of relief-decoration tends to be smallest on the least coherent versions (though these do not necessarily have the smallest diameters overall), which might confirm that they resulted from a long sequence of re-castings, in which clay shrinkage progressively accounted for loss of size and detail.^{xlii} Most evidence from saucer brooches accords, however, with the current state of the debate on Early Anglo-Saxon casting technology, which is that, although pre-prepared, wax, blanks could have been used as well as ephemeral (skin?) templates for marking out the design (thus delimiting size and layout), the production of a brooch-model was essentially an individual and *de novo* exercise.^{xliii} Quality was therefore very much at the mercy of the freehand skills *and* volition of the craftworker rather than being determined by a copy-casting technology. On a negative reading, degeneration would then be a consequence of ignorance and/or

carelessness. The fact that in some large series (the two chasing bird-headed creatures and the six-leg or -head series) primary versions tend to be found in more south-easterly areas, while secondary versions concentrate in the west (Avon valley), might lend support to an argument for ‘down-the-line’ drift in the diffusion of Style I.^{xliv}

The characterisation of the Style I on saucer brooches encourages, however, more positive interpretations. The persistent and varied use of Style I on so many saucer brooches and over such a length of time implies that the animal imagery, however disguised, had genuine popularity and value. Moreover, the fact that craftworkers practised, in so many ways, the transformatory processes which, it is argued, are constitutive design principles of the style, implies that they were engaged actively in the production and reproduction of those principles; in that sense, they acted knowingly and willingly.^{xlvi}

On the one hand, as the above analyses have demonstrated, craftworkers exploited Style I’s flexibility in order to integrate it with pre-existing and, arguably, still cherished design traditions. Particularly notable is the geometricising of compositions and, as time passed, motifs too. Thus, while just over half of the cast saucer brooches with zoomorphic decoration (142 out of 281 examined) are exclusively zoomorphic (not counting the central boss, real or imitation inlays and punched decoration), the other half (139) combine zoomorphic and geometric (fig. 15), either as motifs in a single field (e.g. legs with four-scrolls, or full-face heads with floriate cross) or as fields in a multi-field design (e.g. leg-swastika with *Zungenmuster*, or frieze of Style I elements with star, hexafoil or quatrefoil). In one rare case, from Bidford-on-Avon grave 79, Warks., an otherwise very simple design of concentric ribbing is embellished with a zoomorphic punch - a Style I leg in a triangle (fig. 14a).^{xlvii}

On the other hand, the detailed analyses of the Style I images have shown a continuity of iconic form, and so, as Haseloff and Leigh, among others, have been at pains to point out, potentially of iconographic meaning.^{xlviii} What Style I signified in its Scandinavian homeland, let alone once transferred to Kent or East Anglia, is, of course, a matter of considerable debate. There is extensive, if not universal, support for the idea that, like the closely related bracteate art, it embodied a North Germanic mythic world, relating in particular to a shamanistic cult of Odin.^{xlix} A few potentially Odin-type images occur on saucer brooches. The most striking instance is the animal-man of the Upton brooch (fig. 4h) and related applied brooches from Barrington A, grave 29B and Barrington B, grave 108, Cambs.,^{li} the details of whose face, raised forearm, collar and even conjoined forearm and leg can be paralleled on Scandinavian A-, B- and especially C-bracteates.^{li} Even if this image expresses more of the northern conceptualisation of a Roman emperor than of the god Odin,^{li} the

iconographic transmission from the Scandinavian milieu seems evident. Whether the motif's meaning survived its transformation to the version found on the Shelford brooches (fig. 4i) is unknowable, but worth entertaining. So too is the intention of the maker(s) of the 'Hexafoil and Style I frieze' brooches from Cassington, Purwell Farm, Oxon. (a failed casting: fig. 11a) and Kempston, Beds. (an applied brooch), who so carefully positioned the points of the central hexafoil in relation to the mouths of the full-face heads in the outer frieze that each head seems to be blowing out a divine breath or 'tongue of fire' (*Atem*).^{lii}

In other cases, the iconography is even more difficult to decipher. But the fact that the creatures who chase each other round a brooch (or pair of brooches) are mostly subtly differentiated (e.g. fig. 7), even between animals and animal-men, might hint at some narrative purpose. And the maker of the East Shefford brooches discussed above (fig. 13) surely had uppermost in mind some special point about humanoid heads, for not only is one set plainly in the centre, but it is surrounded by two fields with more ambiguous full-face heads, *and* the flange and inner rim have been stamped with little profile animal-man heads - the second instance of a Style I punch on a saucer brooch (fig. 14b).

Even if the mythology invoked is closed in detail to modern knowledge, its general value need not be. The very ambiguity of Style I, which is fully represented on saucer brooches, may be part of its iconographic role: it seems to have been designed to defy instant recognition, and perhaps thereby to restrict access to the power and status which came through knowledge. In this sense it would have operated like a revelatory art, that is one which can be read on different levels, from a simple iconographic sign, or trigger to a narrative story, to a complex series of metaphors relating reality and belief. Understanding would be acquired (revealed) cumulatively, in socially controlled situations, with the brooches themselves perhaps playing a specific role as a source of revelation through conversation and demonstration.^{liii}

That dress and jewellery played a major part in constituting individual and group identity in early Anglo-Saxon England is now well established. In particular, in the 6th century kindred relationships and status, and a pivotal role for women within them, whether real or idealised, seem to have been paramount.^{liv} The association of Style I with the most lavish types and sets of jewellery suggests that - at least in the first half of the century - Northern Germanic myth and legend was central to that constitution, particularly for leading kindred. But the ways in which Style I was absorbed and transformed on saucer brooches suggest that the messages needed modification and manipulation: a Northern Germanic inheritance had to be squared with other relationships, just as, it has been argued, the original imagery of saucer brooches played on the association of Late Antique (geometric) motifs with 'Saxon' artefacts.^{lv}

At present, however, correlating different expressions of Style I on saucer brooches (and on other artefacts) with different social or political spheres, as, for example, is argued for Salin's Style II in the late 6th and early 7th century,^{lvi} is not easy. Compared with square-headed brooches, the distribution of zoomorphic saucer brooches is more westerly (fig. 15).^{lvii} Some particular series indicate that coherent, purely zoomorphic and earlier versions of Style I are often found in the south or east Midlands or south of the Thames, whereas less coherent, more geometricised and later versions are more likely to be concentrated in the Upper Thames and Avon valley regions.^{lviii} All of this would be consistent with an idea that in the east leading kindreds were more likely to utilise direct references to a Northern Germanic background, while further west the message was compromised or reinvented by allusions to another, more 'Roman', past.

The spatial correlations are far from perfect, however, whether for individual types, zoomorphic-only versus zoomorphic-plus-geometric designs, or zoomorphic versus geometric-only saucer brooches.^{lix} Nor is the distribution of those graves which combine a great square-headed brooch with zoomorphic saucer brooches - surely a sign of a strong desire to maximise the Style I message - weighted in favour of easterly districts. However, Hines' observation that the great square-headed brooches preserved an 'earlier' (purer?) form of Style I than their associated saucer brooches might imply that different attitudes were, nonetheless, held towards the latter's symbolic value.^{lx} But a cursory examination of the Style I on the associated great square-headed brooches (and their typological fellows) seems to indicate that the same transformatory practices as have been identified on the saucer brooches were also being used on them.^{lxi} And it is agreed that zoomorphic motifs were also being dropped from the latest great square-headed brooches in favour of geometric designs. The unexpectedly high number of associations between later great square-headed brooches and geometric saucer brooches might also reflect a diffusing of the Style I message. Transforming Style I and accommodating it to Late Roman-derived, geometric ornament was not therefore peculiar to the cast saucer brooches.^{lxii}

It remains true, however, that the makers of saucer brooches engaged in these processes for a century, from the first introduction of Style I to Anglian and Saxon jewellery until perhaps a generation or more after it had been abandoned elsewhere (assuming, of course, Hines' chronology for great square-headed brooches is right). The latest saucer brooches, concentrated in western districts but with a surprising sprinkling in Suffolk, Essex and Kent (notably Faversham), seem to belong to an increasingly select number of families.^{lxiii} At the same time, in Kent and East Anglia the symbolic dialogue in dress accoutrements was taking new forms, with increasingly continental and 'Roman-inspired' dress for women and appropriation of Northern Germanic mythic links for the

highest placed, mostly male, members of the community.^{lxiv} The perpetuation on saucer brooches of some established Style I motifs, but more particularly design principles which enabled their integration with traditions of geometric ornament, should be considered as much an aspect of deliberate social negotiation as the outcome of incompetent ignorance.^{lxv}

References

- Arrhenius, B. 1975: Die technischen Voraussetzungen für die Entwicklung der germanischen Tierornamentik. *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 9, 1975, 93-109.
- Austin, W. 1928: A Saxon cemetery at Luton, Beds. *Antiquaries J.* 8, 177-92.
- Avent, R. and Evison, V.I. 1982: Anglo-Saxon button brooches. *Archaeologia* 107, 1982, 77-124.
- Axboe, M. 1998: Die innere Chronologie der A-C-Brakteaten und ihrer Inschriften. In: K. Düwel (ed.), *Runeninschriften als Quellen interdisziplinärer Forschung. Abhandlungen des Vierten Internationalen Symposiums über Runen und Runeneinschriften in Göttingen vom 4.-9. August 1995*, 231-52. Berlin/New York 1998..
- Axboe, M. and Kromann, A. 1992: *DN ODINN P F AUC?* Germanic 'imperial portraits' on Scandinavian gold bracteates. *Acta Hypoborea* 4, 271-305.
- Axboe, M., Düwel, K., Hauck, K. and von Paderborg, L. 1985-1989: *Die Goldbrakteaten der Völkerwanderungszeit. Ikonographischer Katalog. Vols. 1 - 3.* Münsterischen Mittelalter-Schriften 24, 1,1 - 24, 3,2. Munich 1985-1989.
- Bakka, E. 1958: On the beginning of Salin's Style I in England. *Universitet i Bergen Årbok, Historisk-antikvarisk rekke* 3, 1958.
- Böhme, H.W. 1986: Das Ende der Römerherrschaft in Britannien und die angelsächsische Besiedlung Englands im 5. Jahrhundert. *J. d. Römisch-Germanischen Zentralmuseums Mainz* 33, 1986, 469-574.
- Boyle, A., Dodd, A., Miles, D. and Mudd, A. 1995: *Two Oxfordshire Anglo-Saxon Cemeteries: Berinsfield and Didcot.* Oxford 1995.
- Boyle, A., Jennings, D., Miles, D. and Palmer, S. 1998: *The Anglo-Saxon Cemetery at Butler's Field, Lechlade, Gloucestershire. Volume 1: Prehistoric and Roman Activity and Anglo-Saxon Grave Catalogue.* Oxford 1998.
- Brugmann, B. 1997: *The Anglo-Saxon Cemetery on Mill Hill, Deal, Kent.* London 1997.
- Chadwick, S.E. 1958: The Anglo-Saxon cemetery at Finglesham, Kent: a reconsideration. *Medieval Archaeology* 2, 1-71.
- Brush, K.A. 1993: Adorning the dead. The social significance of Anglo-Saxon funerary dress in England (5th-6th centuries AD). Unpublished PhD thesis. University of Cambridge 1993.
- Dickinson, T.M. 1991: Material culture as social expression: the case of Saxon saucer brooches with running spiral decoration. In: H-J. Hässler (ed.), *Studien zur Sachsenforschung* 7, 39-70. Hildesheim 1991.
- Dickinson, T.M. 1993: Early Saxon saucer brooches: a preliminary overview. In: W. Filmer-Sankey (ed.), *Anglo-Saxon Studies in Archaeology and History* 6, 11-44. Oxford 1993,.

- Dickinson, T.M forthcoming: Saucer brooches. In: A. Boyle, D. Jennings, D. Miles, and S. Palmer, *The Anglo-Saxon Cemetery at Butler's Field, Lechlade, Gloucestershire. Volume II: Discussion and Synthesis*. Oxford forthcoming.
- Dickinson, T.M. and Farley, M. 1992: An Anglo-Saxon saucer brooch from Hedsor, Buckinghamshire. *Records of Buckinghamshire* 34, 1992, 97-100.
- Down, A. and Welch, M.G. 1991: *Chichester Excavations 7: Apple Down and The Mardens*. Chichester 1991.
- Evison, V.I. 1978: Early Anglo-Saxon applied disc brooches. Part I: On the Continent; Part II: In England. *Antiquaries J.* 68, 1978, 88-102 and 260-78.
- Evison, V.I. and Hill, P. 1996: *Two Anglo-Saxon Cemeteries at Beckford, Hereford and Worcester*. CBA Research Report 103. York 1996.
- Gaimster, M. 1998: *Vendel Period Bracteates on Gotland. On the Significance of Germanic Art*. Acta Archaeologica Lundensia, series in 8°, 27, Stockholm 1998.
- Geake, H. 1997: *The Use of Grave-goods in Conversion-Period England, c.600-c.850*. British Archaeological Reports, British Series 261. Oxford 1997.
- Haseloff, G. 1981: *Die germanische Tierornamentik der Völkerwanderungszeit. Studien zur Salin's Stil I*. Berlin/New York 1981.
- Hines, J. 1997a: *A New Corpus of Anglo-Saxon Great Square-Headed Brooches*. Woodbridge 1997.
- Hines, J. 1997b: Religion: the limits of knowledge. In: J. Hines (ed.), *The Anglo-Saxons from the Migration Period to the Eighth Century*, 376-401. Woodbridge 1997,.
- Hodder, I. 1991: *Reading the Past*. 2nd edition. Cambridge 1991.
- Højilund Nielsen, K. 1997: Animal art and the weapon burial rite - a political badge? In: C.K. Jensen and K. Højilund Nielsen (eds), *Burial and Society. The Chronological and Social Analysis of Archaeological Burial Data*, 129-48. Aarhus 1997,.
- Højilund Nielsen, K. 1999: Style II and the Anglo-Saxon elite. In: T.M. Dickinson and D. Griffiths (eds), *Anglo-Saxon Studies in Archaeology and History* 10, []. Oxford 1999,
- Jones, S. 1997: *The Archaeology of Ethnicity*. London 1997.
- Kendrick, T.D. 1934: Style in early Anglo-Saxon ornament. *IPEK* 9, 1934, 66-76.
- Kendrick, T.D. 1938: *Anglo-Saxon Art to A.D. 900*. London 1938.
- Kennett, D.H. 1971: Applied brooches of the Kempston type at St. John's, Cambridge. *Proceedings Cambridgeshire Antiq. Soc.* 63, 27-9.
- Leeds, E.T. 1912: The distribution of the Anglo-Saxon saucer brooch in relation to the Battle of Bedford, AD 571. *Archaeologia* 63, 1912, 159-202.

- Leigh, D. 1980: The square-headed brooches of sixth-century Kent. Unpublished PhD thesis, Department of Archaeology, University College, Cardiff, 1980.
- Leigh, D. 1984a: Ambiguity in Anglo-Saxon Style I art. *Antiquaries J.* 64, 1984, 34-42.
- Leigh, D. 1984b: The Kentish keystone-garnet disc brooches. In: S.C. Hawkes, J. Campbell and D. Brown (eds), *Anglo-Saxon Studies in Archaeology and History* 3, 65-76. Oxford 1984.
- Magnus, B. 1999: Monsters and birds of prey. Some reflections on form and style of the Migration period. In: T. Dickinson and D. Griffiths (eds), *Anglo-Saxon Studies in Archaeology and History* 10, []. Oxford 1999.
- Malim, T. and Hines, J. 1998: *The Anglo-Saxon Cemetery at Edix Hill (Barrington A), Cambridgeshire*. CBA Research Report 112. York 1998.
- Matthews, C.L. and Hawkes, S.C. 1985: Early Saxon settlements and burials on Puddlehill, near Dunstable, Bedfordshire. In: S.C. Hawkes, J. Campbell and D. Brown (eds), *Anglo-Saxon Studies in Archaeology and History* 4, 59-115. Oxford 1985.
- Morphy, H. 1989a: Introduction. In: Morphy (ed.) 1989, 1-17.
- Morphy, H. 1989b: On representing Ancestral Beings. In: Morphy (ed.) 1989, 144-60.
- Morphy, H. (ed.) 1989: *Animals into Art*. London 1989.
- Mortimer, C. 1990: Some aspects of Early Medieval copper-alloy technology, as illustrated by a study of the Anglian cruciform brooch. Unpublished DPhil thesis. University of Oxford 1990.
- Musty, J. and Stratton, J.E.D. 1964: A Saxon cemetery at Winterbourne Gunner, near Salisbury. *Wiltshire Archaeol. and Nat. Hist. Magazine* 59, 1964, 86-109.
- Nissen Fett, E. 1941: Relief-Fibeln von nordischem Typus in Mitteleuropa. *Bergens Mus. Årbok*, Historisk-antikvarisk rekke 4, 1941.
- Salin, B. 1904: *Die Altgermanische Thierornamentik*. Stockholm 1904.
- Scull, C. 1993: Excavations and survey at Watchfield, Oxfordshire, 1983-92. *Archaeological J.* 149, 1993 (for 1992), 124-281.
- Seng, Y.J. and Wass, B. 1995: Traditional Palestinian wedding dress as a symbol of nationalism. In: J.B. Eicher (ed.), *Dress and Ethnicity. Change across Space and Time*, 227-54. Oxford/Washington DC 1995.
- Stoodley, N. 1997: The spindle and the spear. A critical enquiry into the construction and meaning of gender in the early Anglo-Saxon burial rite. Unpublished PhD thesis. University of Reading 1997.
- Stoodley, N. 1999: Burial rites, gender and the creation of kingdoms: the evidence from seventh-century Wessex. In: T.M. Dickinson and D. Griffiths (eds.), *Anglo-Saxon Studies in Archaeology and History* 10, []. Oxford 1999.

- Suzuki, S. forthcoming: *The Quoit Brooch Style and Anglo-Saxon Settlement: a casting and recasting of cultural identity symbols*. Woodbridge forthcoming.
- Taylor, L. 1989: Seeing the 'inside': Kunwinjku paintings and the symbol of the divided body. In: Morphy (ed.) 1989, 371-89.
- Tyler, S. 1988: The Anglo-Saxon cemetery at Prittlewell, Essex. *Essex Archaeology and History* 19, 1988, 91-116.
- Vierck, H. 1967: Ein Relieffibelpaar aus Nordendorf in Bayerisch Schwaben. Zur Ikonographie der germanischen Tierstils I. *Bayerische Vorgeschichtsblätter* 32, 1967, 104-143.
- Vierck, H. 1976: Eine südsandinavische Relieffibel. Zum Feinguss im frühen Mittelalter. In: K. J. Narr (ed.), *Aus der Sammlung des Seminars für Ur- und Frühgeschichte der Universität Munster*, 137-209. Hildesheim 1976.
- Washbrook, D. 1995: Style, geometry and perception. In: C.Carr and J.E.Neitzel (eds), *Style, Cognition and Person. Archaeological and Ethnological Perspectives*, 101-122. New York/London 1995.
- Welch, M.G. 1985: Button brooches, clasp buttons and face masks. *Medieval Archaeology* 29, 1985, 142-5.

Captions for Illustrations

1. Cast saucer brooch with spiral design (Abingdon I, B60, Oxon.). Sc. 1:1. Photo. TMD.
2. Cast saucer brooch with floriate cross design (Merton, Surrey). Sc. 1:1. Photo. TMD.
3. Aston Remenham and derivative designs: a. Aston Remenham, Berks; b. Lechlade 111, Glos.; c. Long Wittenham I, 121, Oxon. (British Museum 75,3-10,311); d. Baginton, Warks. Sc.1:1. Drawing: TMD, 1999.
4. Profile animal and animal-men motifs: a. Aston Remenham, Berks; b. Fairford 15, Glos. (Ashmolean Museum 1961.33); c: Bishop's Cleeve 1/4, Worc.; d: Fairford 15, Glos. (Ashmolean Museum 1961.34); e-f: Mitcham 208, Surrey; g: Wasperton 18, Warks.; h: Upton, Cambs. (outer field); i: Shelford, Cambs. Sc. 2:1. Drawing: TMD, 1999.
5. Profile animal, bird-headed and related motifs: a: motif from the two chasing bird-headed 'primary' series: Luton I, Beds.; b: Upton, Cambs. (inner field); c: Girton 10, Cambs., 're-assembled' creature; d - k: motifs from the two chasing bird-headed 'secondary' series (n.b. corrosion has robbed surface detail from g and j): d: Alveston 5, Warks. (the inner part of the design is obscured by a riveted stud); e: Shefford, Beds. (Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, Cambridge, 83.513B); f: Market Lavington 8, Wilts; g: Market Overton II, Rutland; h: Hedsor, Bucks.; i: Alveston 26, Warks.; j: Cratendune/Ely, Cambs.; k: Woodston I, Cambs.; l: two chasing bird-headed 'tertiary' series: Berinsfield 102, Oxon. (whole design); m: motif on one panel of Black Patch, Pewsey 21, Wilts. Sc. 3:2. Drawing: TMD, 1999.
6. Incomplete profile creatures: a: Emscote, Warks; b: Kingsey, Bucks.; c: Alfriston 28, E. Sussex; d: Fairford, Glos. (Liverpool Museum M.7728). Sc. 3:2.
7. Fairford, Glos. (Ashmolean Museum 1961.98). Sc. 1:1. Photo. TMD.
8. Examples of ambiguous and geometricised images (with selective blacking-in of elements): a: Droxford, Hants; b: Watchfield 75, Oxon. (after Scull 1992, illus. 50); c: Alton 47, Hants; d: Cassington II, 5, Oxon.; e: Market Lavington, Wilts; f: Alveston, Warks; g: 'Great Beast' motif, Prittlewell 32, Essex; h: Long Wittenham I, 71, Oxon.; i: Thornborough, Bucks.; j: Winterbourne Gunner 8, Wilts., applied brooch (after Musty and Stratton 1964, fig. 7). Sc. 3:2. Drawing: TMD, 1999.
9. 'Animal salad': Wheatley 14, Oxon. Sc. 1:1. Photo. TMD.
10. Running leg and related designs: a: Wasperton 163, Warks.; b: Horton Kirby II, 97, Kent; c: Chatham Lines, Kent; d: Lechlade 113, Glos., with (i) mirror-image inversion of one leg-motif; e: Luton I, 41, Beds.; f: Kempston, Beds., marking (i) a head-motif and (ii) the more 'shrimp-like' version; g: Ewell, Surrey; h: Alton 12, Hants, seven running spirals design. Sc. a-g: 3:2; h: 1:1.

Drawing: TMD, 1999.

11. Repeat-pattern friezes and multivalent head designs: a: Cassington, Purwell Farm, Oxon. (design partly reconstructed); b: Sutton Courtenay; Oxon. (design partly reconstructed); c: Bishopstone I, Bucks.; d: Stretton-on-the-Fosse F102, Warks.; e: Berinsfield 22, Oxon.; f: Northampton III, Northants.; g: Lechlade 144, Glos. (second and third fields only); h: East Shefford, Berks (British Museum 93,7-16,41), outer field only; i: Faversham, Kent (Maison Dieu Collection 97). Sc. a: not known; b-i: 1:1. Drawing: TMD, 1999.

12. Berinsfield 107, Oxon. Sc. 1:1. Photo. TMD.

13. East Shefford, Berks (British Museum 93,7-16,41). Sc. 1:1. Photo. TMD.

14. Zoomorphic punch marks from cast saucer brooches: a: East Shefford, Berks (British Museum 93,7-16,41); b: Bidford-on-Avon 79, Warks. Sc. 6:1. Drawing: TMD, 1999.

15. Distribution map of cast saucer brooches decorated with Salin's Style I. The distinction between brooches with 'Style I alone' and 'Style I and geometric motifs' is as defined in the text. Where both types occur at a single site, circles are diagonally superimposed over triangles. A ' Aston Remenham. Drawing: TMD, 1999.

Saucer brooches are actually the most frequent bearers of Salin's Style I in England, but have been overlooked because of perceptions of the derivative nature of their ornament. This paper seeks to rectify the imbalance by accepting that translation (in a physical and linguistic sense) is *the* key to understanding both the form which Style I took on saucer brooches and potentially its meanings. The study is based on 281 cast saucer brooches (almost half the total corpus of the type): half feature zoomorphic decoration on its own and half combine zoomorphic and geometric motifs. The animal art is characterised in terms of motifs, presentation and composition. While 'coherent' motifs, recognisable from the classic, early repertoire of Style I, are reasonably well represented, attention is mostly given to the way motifs and designs were transformed, involving both established principles of Style I design (abbreviation, addition, re-assembly and ambiguity) and adaptation to the pre-existing, geometric-based, saucer-brooch tradition. Although calibrating the pace of change (devolution?) is difficult, the process can be shown to have endured throughout the 6th century and to have been most practised in western Anglo-Saxon districts. Explaining the meaning and role of this transformed animal art is obviously hard, but it is argued that it was the result not of ignorance or carelessness, but a deliberate choice. By adopting images from Northern Germanic mythology *and* blending them with other (Roman and Saxon) symbols, meanings were both perpetuated and subtly altered, enabling important kindred outside Kent and the main Anglian areas to negotiate their own identity and affiliations.

i. Salin 1904, esp. 215-45 and 322-25, is, of course, the starting point. Kendrick 1934, 69-76 and 1938, 73-91 was a serious attempt at motif analysis, but chronologically flawed. Major advances in understanding began with Bakka 1958 and Chadwick 1958, esp. 45-57, and culminated in Haseloff's magisterial survey of 1981, as significant for Anglo-Saxon Style I as for his main concern, Scandinavia and the Continent. Hines 1997a has now put the great square-headed brooches outside Kent firmly into the picture.

ii. Leigh 1980, especially 288-432; 1984a.

iii. The other major vehicle for Style I was the later cruciform brooch (Mortimer 1990). Otherwise Style I was used sparingly for items of female adornment, such as garnet-inlaid disc brooches, clasps, girdle-hangers and pendants, and uni-sex belt fittings, and rarely for male possessions (fittings for shields, swords and vessels).

This study is based on classification of 587 cast saucer brooches out of a current total corpus of just over 600. While 306 (52%) have designs that are exclusively geometric, 281 (48%) are entirely or partly zoomorphic. New finds and differences in appreciation of what is >zoomorphic= account for the difference from the figures for cast brooches registered by Leeds (1912, 197-201): 144 geometric and 79 zoomorphic (a ratio of 65%:35%). Leeds also listed 20 geometric and 67 zoomorphic applied brooches (a ratio of 23%:77%), but these figures are compromised by nearly half again (80) being found without their decorative foils. Although applied brooches must also have

greatly increased in number by now, they remain less amenable to analysis and have not been included in the current study. It should be noted in making overall numerical comparisons that each member of a pair is counted individually, even though in most cases the designs are essentially the same: pairs of cast saucer brooches occur in about 80 per cent of undisturbed burials.

iv. The cast saucer brooches from Fairford (fig. 7) did merit the comment from Salin (1904, 325 and fig. 703), >Dass wir hier eine Thierfigur in Stil I vor uns haben, tritt so zu sagen aus allen Details zu Tage=, but generally perceptions were adversely judgemental, remarking on >decadence= and lack of intelligibility, e.g Leeds 1912, esp. 174 and 190; Kendrick 1934, 73-5.

v. Cf. Dickinson 1991 and 1993 for the origins and development of cast saucer brooches. Only three pre-Style I zoomorphic designs are known from England, all on applied saucer brooches: Evison 1978, 265-7; Böhme 1986, 548, Abb. 65-66, types Mahndorf, Spong Hill and Muids.

vi. Salin 1904, 215-45.

vii. Haseloff 1981, 113-114, 486-521; Leigh 1980, 288-364; 1984a.

viii. These concepts are drawn from Morphy (ed.)1989, esp. Morphy 1989a.

ix. Dickinson 1993, 15, fig. 5.

x. Washbrook 1995, esp. 105-106.

xi. Cf. Hines 1997a, 14-15, where devolution is detected in both his >equivalent= and >related= degrees of motif similarity.

xii. The line drawings in this paper interpret the images by depicting the raised ridges of the relief ornament; in some cases selective blacking-in has been used to highlight motifs. Central bosses and boundary rings have been omitted in order to focus on the animal ornament. Only one member of pairs has been used to illustrate the design. Needless to say, pairs differ in the finest detail (cf. Dickinson 1993, 34-5), but this is mostly immaterial to the present argument, and only where the difference is substantial, and if possible, has the specific brooch chosen been identified by a unique museum number in the figure caption. Likewise, only one of two or more creatures on a single brooch has been selected to illustrate a motif-form.

xiii. Haseloff 1981, 33-51, 103-104, 180-96, Abb. 20, 25, 62, 94, 97c; cf. Dickinson 1993, 26, figs. 33-34, and Dickinson forthcoming.

xiv. Cf. Haseloff 1981, 81-7,

xv. *Ibid.*, 90-4.

xvi. *Ibid.*, 99-131.

xvii. Avent and Evison 1982. The origins and chronology of the button brooch remains a matter of debate: for a critique of Avent and Evison=s argument, see Welch 1985, with whom I concur.

xviii. Haseloff 1981, 87-90,

xix. Leigh 1984a, 39; Haseloff 1981, 112, 115-120.

xx. The images are not properly coherent, however: they lack true heads and are actually made up of leg-elements, so the animals=orientation is, perhaps deliberately, ambiguous. Also, if a mirror-image arrangement had been intended, an even rather than odd number of animals would have been more appropriate.

xxi. Cf. Suzuki forthcoming.

xxii. Dickinson 1993, 26; Hines 1997a, 116.

xxiii. An arrangement of three anticlockwise creatures had already been essayed in the 5th century on applied brooches of Böhme=s type Muids, though given that these are the only instance known to date with complete pre-Style I animals, compared with the diversity of compositions with Style I animals, and that they depict backward-looking sea-monsters, it is perhaps less easy to argue that they are the direct ancestors of Style I arrangements (as Evison 1978, 265, implies) than that they too were conforming to established design-constraints.

xxiv. Leigh 1980, 117-20, discusses the use of >thick and thin= technique on Kentish and other metalwork.

xxv. Dickinson and Farley 1992.

xxvi. Boyle *et al.* 1995, 50-1, 78, fig. 73.

xxvii. Hines 1997a, 240, fig. 115e (panel in >south-east= quadrant). The corresponding panel on the pair, *ibid.*, fig. 115f (panel in >north-west= quadrant) has reduced the motif yet more - almost to >C-scrolls=.

xxviii. Leeds (1912, 182) wrote of these brooches: >Any attempt to decipher the pattern is bound to result in failure.=

xxix. Dickinson 1993, 25, revised slightly in Dickinson forthcoming. The grave numbers used here are those of the final Lechlade publication (Boyle *et al.* 1998), which differ from the excavation numbers used in Dickinson 1993.

xxx. Cf. Dickinson 1993, 22, fig. 23; the same design fills the inner field of the brooches in Figures 11b and 12. Radially-arranged heads were also, of course, an established design format for 5th-century applied saucer brooches of Böhme=s types Mahndorf and Typ Spong Hill, *op. cit.* in n.5.

xxxi. Closely comparable brooches come from Apple Down grave 13, Sussex (Down and Welch 1991, fig. 2.19) and Long Wittenham I, grave 5, Oxon: a hollow triangular motif replaces the leg on the former and a derivative-looking >V-shape= on the latter.

xxxii. John Hines (pers. comm.) has suggested to me that versions with seven running legs in the Surrey area might have been deliberately produced in counterpoint to seven running spiral designs more popular in the Upper Thames. In fact, both designs are represented in both areas, with both in greater numbers in the Upper Thames, and localised manufacture is indicated for each (cf. Dickinson 1993, figs. 19 and 61). But this need not invalidate the basic proposition that one was inspired by the other. The scarcity of five running legs in contrast to the ubiquity of five running spirals might be partly a consequence of their relative dates of production.

xxxiii. Cf. Haseloff 1981, 363-95. On the Prittlewell brooches, the motif is repeated three times between trapezoidal garnet inlays: Tyler 1988.

xxxiv. Dickinson 1993, 26, fig. 48. Cf. Hines= comments on this, Hines 1997a, 239.

xxxv. Leeds 1912, 179, pl. XXVII,1; Kennett 1971.

xxxvi. Scull 1993, 232.

xxxvii. Matthews and Hawkes 1985, 91-7; Dickinson 1993, 34.

xxxviii. Hines 1997a, esp. 198-204, 223-234 and, for comments on associations with saucer brooches, 239-241.

xxxix. Given that the number of great square-headed brooches is greater in full-late Phase 2 and Phase 3 compared with Phase 1 and early Phase 2, there is a slight drop in the number of associations with zoomorphic saucer brooches over time. This is partly a consequence of Phase 3 great square-headed brooches being concentrated in eastern England, outside the core area of saucer-brooch use (cf. Dickinson 1993, fig. 1 and Hines 1997a, fig. 102b), and partly because there are, surprisingly, five late examples associated with saucer brooches with geometric designs, despite the latter presumably having had their florescence earlier.

xl. A very late dating for Puddlehill II, grave 10 was advanced by Hawkes in Matthews and Hawkes 1985, 91-7; although her arguments for the typological derivation of the saucer brooches from Kentish composite brooches could be challenged (Dickinson 1993, 34), the dating of the European-type polychrome beads in the grave is assured by more recent work by Birte Bruggmann (pers. comm. and Bruggmann 1997, 58-61).

xli. Saucer brooches with back-to-back profile heads seem particularly problematic at present. The quality of some of their >helmet= heads in >thick and thin technique= (fig. 11d) is surprising if they continue to be interpreted as copies of Kentish garnet-inlaid disc brooches of Avent=s Class 3 (Leeds 1912, 192, pl. XXVIII 4-6; Dickinson 1993, 26, fig. 49), given that Bruggmann=s revised dating returns the latter to the late 6th century (Bruggmann 1997, 39-41, 94-101; contra Dickinson *op. cit.*). Alternatively, back-to-back heads were a more widespread motif, which was used in this instance earlier outside Kent. But the large size of many of the saucer-brooch examples and the recurrence of the motif in a middle field on the very large, and presumptively late, pair from Lechlade grave 144 (fig. 11g) would suit Bruggmann=s dating.

xlii. Arrhenius 1975 has been a major proponent of this hypothesis, especially with reference to the production of bracteate models.

xliii. For example, cf. Vierck 1976 with Leigh 1980, 131-287, Mortimer 1990, chs. 3 and 4, Dickinson 1993, 34-36, and Hines 1997a, 206-211.

xliv. Dickinson and Farley 1992; cf. Hines= Group I great square-headed brooches, Dickinson 1993, fig. 48.

xlvi. The idea, borrowed from social theory, that material culture of any kind is an active component of human behaviour, being at one and the same time a condition and outcome of social meaning, is becoming a widely held tenet of post-processual archaeology (e.g. Hodder 1991, esp. 73-5).

xlvi. It is possible that some apparently arrow-shaped or >Tiw-rune=-shaped punches, such as is used with the bird-headed motif on the pair from Luton (fig. 5a; Austin 1928, pl. XXVII), are truncated versions of this type of punch, and so are, effectively, geometricised legs.

xlvii. E.g. Haseloff 1981, 419-20; Leigh 1984a, *passim*. Gaimster 1998 usefully reviews the history of research into early medieval animal art in terms of an opposition between aesthetic/typological and iconographical approaches.

xlvi. The subject has been most extensively researched with reference to the gold bracteates by Hauck in his series >Zur Ikonographie der Goldbrakteaten=, cf. Axboe *et al.* 1985-89, esp. 71 -156 with references. Leigh (1980, 369-430) has used some of Hauck=s ideas to interpret Kentish Style I; for a recent application of the ideas to East Scandinavian Style I see Magnus 1999. Hines 1997b, 392-3, is far more sceptical about religious interpretations, but admits symbolic links to healing and social status.

xlix. Barrington A: Malim and Hines 1998, 57, fig. 3.45; Barrington B: Leeds 1912, pl. XXVII,2; Vierck 1976, Abb. 6,1. *Contra* Dickinson 1993, 26 (and in general terms, Hines 1997a, 242), the applied brooch versions are not superior to the cast, since they execute the design in a simpler, linear style.

i. IK42 - Darum (I)-B (Axboe *et al.* 1985-89, vol.1,3) shows a figure with conjoined arm and leg, but both are human, whereas the Upton motif has a human arm and an animal leg. Alternatively, the Upton motif is a contraction of the C-bracteate image of the man on a horse: cf. IK133 - Öjorna-C, where a raised human hand projects from an otherwise standard horse. Interpreting the rear >pony tail= is also uncertain: Leeds 1912, 176 was clearly mistaken in reading the grasping fingers of the hand as the same creature=s hip, and might thus have been misled into seeing the curved element above as a trunk and the coiled tip below as a leg, which had >degenerated into a tail-like appendage=, rather than as a plume or hair. Coiled and striated plumes occur on C-bracteates of Axboe=s main production groups, H2 and H3 (Axboe 1998, 243), both on human heads and as the horse=s tail, but the knotting is different except on those where it springs from the front of a backwards-tipped head, such as IK381 - Viby-C, which Axboe (*op. cit.*, figs. 5,6 and 8) indicates is a *leitform* of Group H3.

li. Cf. Axboe and Kromann 1992.

lii. Cf. Vierck 1967; Hauck in Axboe *et al.* 1985-89, vol. 1,1, fig. 13. On the cast brooch version from Beckford B, grave 38 (Evison and Hill 1996, fig. 25), however, the two bold boundary rings disrupt the relationship. The image appears probably earlier, but less strikingly, on those applied brooches of Böhme=s type Spong Hill which place a hexafoil at the centre of the six masks (Böhme 1986, Abb. 65,3, 8-10.

liii. My thinking has been stimulated by discussions of two ethnographic examples. The first is the way Aboriginal peoples in Arnhem land, in northern Australia, portray their Ancestral Beings. The Yolngu of the east use not only instantly recognisable zoomorphic forms, but also geometric images, especially where the transformational nature of the Ancestral Beings is represented (Morphy 1989b); the Kunwinjku of the west use >X-ray= paintings to focus on multiple, inner meanings rather than literal and outer identity (Taylor 1989). For both groups, the complexity of the encoded meanings is learnt progressively and through structured initiation. The second analogy concerns the early 20th-century, Palestinian rural bridal dress (Seng and Wass 1995), which is being >reinvented= among modern and ex-patriate Palestinian women as a focus for constructing national identity. Of

particular relevance is the way the dress embraces a continuum of female activities: women prepare the bride and her possessions (the specially embroidered dress) for the wedding (itself a female-centred ceremony, though symbolising links between kindred and land); women also play a special part in oral ritual, both reciting poetry at the wedding and telling folk tales at home, with the embroidery itself sometimes a trigger to or component of the tales. I would not extend the analogy to suggest that saucer brooches too were made by women, though it might be worth entertaining. And in the Anglo-Saxon context, funerals are as likely to be the *locus* for this web of activities as weddings.

liv. See especially Brush 1993; Stoodley 1997 and 1999.

lv. Dickinson 1991.

lvi. Høilund Nielsen 1997 and 1999.

lvii. Cf. Hines 1997a, figs. 101-102.

lviii. E.g. Dickinson 1992, fig.1; Dickinson 1993, fig. 46.

lix. The distribution of Style I saucer brooches does not differ significantly from the overall distribution of cast saucer brooches: cf. Figure 15 and Dickinson 1993, fig. 1. Given the current state of post-processual theorising about cultural/ethnic identities, however, clear correlations should perhaps not be expected: cf. Jones 1997, 84-127, but esp. 112-116.

lx. Hines 1997a, 240.

lxi. A systematic comparison of motifs between saucer brooches and great square-headed brooches is unfortunately not possible using the photographs and line drawings which support Hines 1997a.

lxii. Cf. also Haseloff 1981, 491-521, esp. 517 citing Nissen Fett 1941, on this phenomenon in later continental Style I. And, of course, the initial development of Style I in Scandinavia had itself involved a combination of Late Antique geometric motifs and new animal images.

lxiii. Matthews and Hawkes 1985, 97.

lxiv. Geake 1997; Høilund Nielsen 1999.

lxv. If Hines' dating of his Phase 3 brooches in eastern England does prove too high, then comparable arguments might be applied to them too. Indeed, the process would have accompanied a stricter separation between great square-headed brooch- and saucer-brooch-wearing communities (cf. footnote 39): perhaps both strategies were adopted by traditionalist families in the face of new political pretensions in the south-east.