CORA Cork Open Research Archive
Cartlann Taighde Oscailte Chorcaí

Title	The meeting of St. Paul and St. Anthony: Visual and literary uses of a eucharistic motif
Authors	Ó Carragáin, Éamonn
Publication date	1988
Original Citation	Ó Carragáin, É. (1988) 'The Meeting of St. Paul and St. Anthony: Visual and Literary Uses of a Eucharistic Motif', Keimelia: Studies in Archaeology and History in Honour of Tom Delaney, Galway University Press, pp. 1-58. isbn: 978-0907775331
Type of publication	Book chapter
Rights	© 1988
Download date	2026-11-17 04:34:31
Item downloaded from	https://hdl.handle.net/10468/15010

UCC
University College Cork, Ireland
Coláiste na hOllscoile Corcaigh

THE MEETING OF SAINT PAUL AND SAINT ANTHONY: VISUAL AND LITERARY USES OF A EUCHARISTIC MOTIF

ÉAMONN Ó CARRAGÁIN

In Belfast, in 1970, I had the great good fortune to get to know Tom Delaney. I was becoming particularly interested in *The Dream of the Rood*, the Anglo-Saxon poem from a tenth-century manuscript now preserved in Vercelli, Italy. An early version of this poem is inscribed on the Ruthwell Cross in Dumfriesshire, Scotland; and study of the poem led to an interest in the cross on which the early text is inscribed. Poem and cross provide a clear case where literary and archaeological approaches to a medieval culture are complementary.

No literary scholar could have had a more genial and stimulating mentor to introduce him to archaeological and iconographic study than I had in Tom Delaney. One of his greatest gifts was that, as well as being an excellent archaeologist, he had an instinctive sympathy with poetry: an understanding natural in one whose own mind was poetic. Our discussions developed into what amounted to a series of informal seminars, from Tom, on the iconography of the Irish crosses. The present paper explores an aspect of one theme of our discussions: that the traditions of monastic spirituality which are reflected on the Irish crosses perhaps provide evidence of cultural contacts between English and Irish monasticism; and at the very least provide useful comparative material for the study of the Ruthwell Cross. This paper has, therefore, had its inspiration in Tom Delaney's broad interests and generous sympathy for other approaches and disciplines. Its faults would have been fewer if it could have been written in collaboration with him.[1]

[1] I wish to thank various scholars who read versions of this paper and were generous with their criticism and suggestions for improvement, especially Jennifer O'Reilly, Ann Hamlin, Terence O'Reilly, Pádraig Ó Riain, Seán Lucy, David Howlett and Malcolm Parkes; and the librarians at University College, Cork, in particular Helen Moloney Davis, and Jill Lucey of inter-library loans, for their patient help with the bibliography. University College, Cork, provided a generous travel grant which enabled me to examine at first hand the Irish 'Paul

My aims are, first, to provide a checklist of Irish representations of the 'Paul and Anthony' scene, as part of the preliminary work towards a forthcoming collaborative edition of the Ruthwell and Bewcastle crosses; and second, to enquire about the possible theological significances of this scene on the monuments where it occurs. I wish to provide comparative evidence which will be of some use in interpreting the iconographic programme of the north side of the Ruthwell cross, on which a panel representing Paul and Anthony is to be found. I shall not try to contribute to the thorny controversy about the dating and the relative chronology of the crosses.[1] Instead, my approach in the present study is, in the simplest terms and within the limits of a general survey, structuralist: I examine some of the ways in which various sculptors establish significant relationships between their 'Paul and Anthony' panels and other features of the crosses on which they occur. Although in the Appendix I have tried to describe the Irish 'Paul and Anthony' panels fully and accurately, my primary concern is not the styles or iconographic details of the panels.[2] Instead I try to elucidate the various meanings which the sculptors expressed, by using this motif in contexts which vary from monument to monument. I proceed on the assumption that, within the figural programme of a monument, each panel acts as a unit – as it were, as a 'word' – from which different sculptors may build up *sententiae* which vary in profundity and sophistication. At the same time, I suggest that there is a large degree of consistency in the ways the 'Paul and Anthony' motif is used in Irish, Pictish and Anglo-Saxon sculpture. I examine how in the *Navigatio Sancti Brendani* an unknown author, probably Irish, put the 'Paul and Anthony' motif to original use; and I finally suggest some analogies between the ways the motif is used on the monuments and the way it is developed in the *Navigatio* and by Adomnán in his *Vita Columbae*.

and Anthony' panels. I am grateful to Dr Peter Harbison for Plates III and V(a), and for several useful references; and to Professor Rosemary Cramp for Plates I(a) and I(b). For permission to reproduce photographs of monuments under their care I wish to thank The Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical Monuments of Scotland (Plate II); The Commissioners of Public Works, Dublin (Plates IV, V(b), VI-IX) and The Department of the Environment (Archaeological Survey: Historic Monuments and Buildings Branch) Northern Ireland (Plates X-XII).

[1] On dating, see Henry 1933, 15–25; Stevenson 1956; Cramp 1959–60 and 1965; Roe 1981, 27–9; I. Henderson 1982. Photographs of the Ruthwell Cross may be found in Allen and Anderson 1903, figures 467–8; Saxl 1943; Schapiro 1944 and 1980 (reprint of 1944); Saxl and Wittkower 1948, Sections 15 and 16; and Okasha 1971, Plate 105.

[2] General surveys of the iconography of the 'Paul and Anthony' theme are to be found in Noordeloos 1941; in Aurenhammer 1967, 157–163, under 'Antonius Eremita' and (for the later medieval period) Kaiser 1950.

THE CONTEXT OF THE 'PAUL AND ANTHONY' PANEL ON THE RUTHWELL CROSS

The inscription around the Ruthwell Cross panel gives that panel – as Fritz Saxl (1943, 3–4) has pointed out – a eucharistic interpretation. It refers to the *fractio panis* of the mass, the breaking of bread for communion: 'SANCTVS PAVLVS ET A[NTONIVS] FREGERVNT PANEM IN DESERTO'[1] (see Plate I (a) and (b)). It is clear from Adomnán's life of St Columba that at Iona, in the seventh century, a rite of *co-fractio* was practised: when two priests were present they together broke the bread for communion (Anderson 1961, 304). Thus, as Saxl put it, the panel 'accompanied as it is by the words 'fregerunt panem' in the inscription, ... could only be understood as a symbol of the sacrament of the mass' (1943, 4).

This is not the only Eucharistic reference in the panels on the north side of the Ruthwell Cross. Directly above the 'Paul and Anthony' panel there is a panel showing Christ adored by the beasts (see Plate I(b)), which we shall discuss later. Above that panel, there is a representation of John the Baptist bearing the *Agnus Dei*; the inscription around the panel is now largely obliterated, but it included the word 'ADORAMVS'.[2] It is possible that this panel was inspired by the introduction of the chant '*Agnus Dei, qui tollis peccata mundi, miserere nobis*' into the Roman mass, in the late seventh century. This acclamation was sung while the bread was being broken by the celebrant for distribution in communion.[3] If this suggestion is correct, then the panel of Christ adored by the beasts is flanked above and below by panels which recall the rites in which the eucharist was broken for communion (a) in some Celtic monasteries (at least, in Iona), and (b) in monasteries which followed the Roman rite (dominant in Anglo-Saxon Northumbria).[4] George Henderson has recently argued (1985) that the panel below the 'Paul and Anthony' panel, which had usually been interpreted as representing the Flight into Egypt, in fact represents the return of the Holy Family from Egypt: St Matthew presented this return as the fulfilment of the prophecy that 'out of Egypt have I called my son' (Matthew 2:15, which quotes Hosea 11:1), and so as a re-enactment of Israel's exodus. Professor Henderson has shown how this panel, also, had a eucharistic significance: in crossing the desert back to

[1] Adapted from Okasha 1971, 110.

[2] See Saxl 1943, 4; Okasha 1971, 109 and 110. Paul Meyvaert (1982, 15–21) has argued that the Agnus Dei is borne here not by John the Baptist but by God the Father; but this interpretation has been convincingly challenged by George Henderson (1985).

[3] See Duchesne 1886–92, i, 376; Jungmann 1958, ii, 412–3; and Ó Carragáin 1978, 134.

[4] On the early liturgy in Northumbria, see Willis 1968.

the land of Israel, the Christ child revealed himself as the fulfilment of the manna which sustained the Israelites in their wanderings. Eucharistic themes therefore dominate the north face of the Ruthwell cross.

The panel representing Christ adored by the beasts in the desert (see Plate I(b)) is the central panel on the north side of the Ruthwell cross. The inscription around the panel is vital for its interpretation: 'IHS XPS IVDEX AEQVITATIS: BESTIAE ET DRACONES COGNOUERVNT IN DESERTO SALVATOREM MUNDI'.[1] The theme of recognition (COGNOUERVNT) was probably decisive for the way the figure of Christ is presented in this panel. The sculptors took the basic visual idea, a triumphant Christ with animals at his feet, from the widely-known illustrations of Psalm 90:13: 'Thou shalt walk upon the asp and the basilisk: and thou shalt trample under foot the lion and the dragon'. The fact that the word 'dracones' occurs in the inscription to the panel suggests that this verse was present in the mind of the Ruthwell sculptors. The phrase 'in deserto' in the inscription is also relevant to Psalm 90: the immediately preceding verses of the psalm were quoted by the devil when he tempted Christ in the desert (Matthew 4:6; Luke 4:10).[2] But the sculptors, while referring to Psalm 90 and its fulfilment in the gospels, have transformed the traditional scene from one of triumph over specific animals to one of recognition and adoration. Christ is not dressed as a warrior (as he often is in illustrations of Psalm 90:13); he holds a scroll in his left hand, and his right hand is raised in blessing. It is noteworthy that the animals cannot be identified as asps, basilisks, lions or dragons: it is not really possible to be sure what particular kinds of animals are represented in this panel of the Ruthwell Cross. It would seem that at Ruthwell, the sculptors wished to recall not only Psalm 90:13 but also the canticle of Habbakuk, which in the Roman office was sung every Friday morning at lauds. The Roman canticles were prescribed in the Benedictine Rule and so this use of the canticle of Habbakuk would certainly have been widespread in Northumbria.[3] The Old Latin text of the Canticle of Habbakuk, and not Jerome's Vulgate text, was the one used in the early medieval liturgy. It begins as follows:

Domine audivi auditum tuum et timui; consideravi opera tua et expavi.
In medio duorum animalium innotesceris; dum appropiaverint anni *cognosceris*.
Dum advenerit tempus ostenderis in eo; dum conturbata fuerit anima mea in ira, misericordiae memor eris ...

Lord, I have heard your voice and was afraid; I have considered your works and been terrified.
In the midst of two animals you will be revealed; when the years come to pass *you will be known*.
When the time comes you will be revealed in it; when my soul is totally shaken in [your] anger, you will remember mercy ...'

[1] Text adapted from Okasha 1971, 110.
[2] Saxl 1943, 1–2; Farrell 1978, 107.
[3] chapter xiii, see Vogüé and Neufville 1971–2, ii, 520.

Writing about AD 394[2] St Jerome stated that the common people saw the phrase 'in medio duorum animalium innotesceris' as referring to Christ, who is recognised between two thieves on the cross; Jerome himself, as we shall see (below, pp. 11 and 28), knew more esoteric interpretations for the phrase. This popular association of the canticle with the crucifixion, as early as the fourth century, probably reflects Roman liturgical use. The weekly use of the canticle, at lauds on Friday mornings, would have reminded a monastic community continually of the solemn way the canticle was used on Good Friday. On that day, mass was not celebrated; instead, at the ninth hour (3 p.m.) there began a service of readings and solemn prayers; this ceremony ended with the veneration of the cross and communion (the 'mass of the presanctified').[3] The first reading of this solemn Good Friday ceremony (Hosea 6:1–6) was followed by the singing of a responsory comprising the opening verses of the canticle of Habbakuk (Hesbert 1935, 94–95). A responsory based on Psalm 90 was, until the end of the eighth century, sung after the second Old Testament reading: therefore it would have been natural for the Ruthwell sculptors to have wished to refer to both of these texts in the same panel.[4] The sculptors have suggested a reminiscence of the canticle of Habbakuk by using the verb 'cognoscere' in the inscription, by having Christ adored by two unspecific animals, and by presenting Christ, not as trampling down upon, but as recognised by the animals. The two animals are placed just above the heads of, and thus visually related to, the figures of Paul and Anthony. This is significant: the 'Paul and Anthony' panel and the 'Christ over the Beasts' panel are both concerned with the recognition of Christ by, and between, two creatures (the two saints at the breaking of bread, and the two animals in the desert). As we shall see, other sculptors (at

[1] Text from the Vespasian psalter, where the canticle is given the rubric 'sexta feria': Sweet 1885, 407; on the liturgical use of the canticle see Mearns 1914, 51–3; *DACL*, ii, Part 2, columns 1975–94 under 'Cantiques'. Translation mine. For commentary on the Canticle, see St Jerome, *CC*, LXXVIA (1970), at pp. 618ff., and Bede, *CC*, CXIXB. Other scriptural quotations in this paper are from the Douay version; the most important phrases are also given in a Vulgate text. For the editions used, see bibliography under BIBLE.
[2] For the date see Kelly 1975, 159 and 163.
[3] Andrieu 1931–61, iii, pp. 271 and 292; Eisenhofer and Lechner 1961, 197.
[4] The liturgical uses of these responsories are discussed by Ó Carragáin 1986.

Nigg in Scotland and at Moone in Co. Kildare) seem to refer to the canticle of Habbakuk, not merely in the general context of a 'Paul and Anthony' panel, as at Ruthwell, but in their 'Paul and Anthony' panels themselves.

Once we recognise how important is the theme of recognition in the 'Christ and the beasts' panel at Ruthwell, the thematic links between that panel and the panels above and below can more clearly be seen. The 'Agnus Dei' panel is clearly concerned with the recognition of Christ in a symbolic form. In St John's gospel, the scene in which the Baptist hails Christ as the 'Lamb of God' is presented as a solemn recognition of the divine nature of Jesus (John 1:29 and 36). It is possible that Pope Sergius introduced the 'Agnus Dei' chant into the mass to emphasise that no less a person than the Baptist recognised Jesus in symbolic language (the pope may have wished to emphasise his rejection of the Trullan synod at Constantinople which had, in AD 691, forbidden the representation of Christ in symbolic form)[1]. The theme of 'recognition' is certainly relevant to the rite presented in the 'Paul and Anthony' panel, below: in St Luke's gospel (24:30–31), two disciples had recognised Christ at Emmaus in the breaking of bread:

> And they told what things were done on the way [in via]: and how they knew him in the breaking of bread [et quomodo cognoverunt eum in fractione panis] (Luke 24:35).

This verse, which explicitly unites the breaking of bread and the recognition of Christ, was naturally seen as an important statement of what the eucharistic action signified. Thus it is quoted in one of the acclamations at the communion ceremony in the Stowe missal: 'Cognoerunt dominum. alleluia. in fractione panis. alleluia' (Warner 1906–15, i, 34r; ii, 17).

The eucharistic meaning of the 'Paul and Anthony' panel is therefore brought out on the Ruthwell cross not merely by the way the saints are depicted in the panel itself, and in the phrasing of the inscription around the panel, but also by the context provided for the panel on the north side of the Cross. The references to the desert on this side of the cross reinforce the eucharistic theme: as George Henderson has pointed out (1985), the idea of manna in the desert lies behind the 'Return from Egypt' panel; the phrase 'in deserto' recurs in both the 'Paul and Anthony' panel and in that of 'Christ recognised by the beasts'; while John the Baptist, who recognised Christ at the Agnus Dei, was himself the 'vox clamantis in deserto' (Luke 3:4). As we shall see, the idea of 'breaking bread in the desert' is an important feature of the contexts of 'Paul and Anthony' panels on several Irish high crosses.

[1] See Ó Carragáin 1978, 135.

THE CONTEXTS PROVIDED FOR 'PAUL AND ANTHONY' REPRESENTATIONS ON PICTISH MONUMENTS

Before turning to the Irish crosses, it is worth while noting the ways in which the Pictish representations of Paul and Anthony emphasise the eucharistic significance of the scene. Three of the four extant representations are described and illustrated by J. Romilly Allen;[1] and all four are conveniently illustrated and compared by Isabel Henderson (1967, figure 35 and Plates). All four representations come from cross-slabs, and the most significant feature common to all four is the way in which the saints are juxtaposed to the representations of the cross on the slabs.

At Fowlis Wester and at Dunfallandy, the saints are not shown breaking the bread, nor is the raven, which brought the bread to them from heaven, shown. At Dunfallandy, two figures sit on high-backed chairs, facing each other, and contemplating a small cross which is placed between them. This side of the Dunfallandy slab has, as a kind of framing device, a representation of two monsters. The elongated body of each monster fills one of the longer vertical sides of the slab, and ends in a fish-like tail near the bottom of the slab. The two dog-like heads of the monsters meet (with open mouths and outstretched tongues) at the top of the slab, over the head of each saint. It is possible that we have here another reference to the canticle of Habbakuk: that the sculptors intended to represent two monks who recognise Christ (symbolised by the cross) 'in medio duorum animalium'. But in the absence of a eucharistic loaf or of a heavenly bird, the identification of the Dunfallandy figures with St Paul and St Anthony cannot be regarded as certain.[2] The best evidence that the Dunfallandy sculptors intended to refer to Paul and Anthony is the similarity between the Dunfallandy scene and that at Fowlis Wester. There, the saints are identified by their symbols – a date palm for St Paul and a winged figure, representing his heavenly vision, for St Anthony. They sit on high-backed chairs on either side of the elaborately decorated cross, and just under its ring.[3] Above the ring of the cross, at the top of

[1] Allen and Anderson 1903: Nigg (fig. 72), St Vigeans (fig. 278) and Dunfallandy (fig. 305B).

[2] On the cross-slab at Drumhallagh, Co. Donegal, two monks stand flanking the shaft of a cross which they contemplate (Henry 1963, 160 fig. 15a, and 161). The question of whether they are simply two monks, or more specifically Saints Paul and Anthony, is similar to that posed by the Dunfallandy stone, and similarly incapable of definite solution. At Drumhallagh, the monk to the left bears a crook-staff; but the monk to the right bears a Tau-shaped staff, which later (but not on other Irish high crosses) became a standard attribute of St. Anthony the hermit (see Aurenhammer 1967, 160).

[3] See I. Henderson 1967, Plate 44 and figure 35b.

the slab, there are figures which, as Isabel Henderson has suggested, 'evidently include a reference to the spewing forth of Jonah by the whale' (1967, 219). Because of the explicit statement attributed to Christ in Matthew 12:39–40, that 'as Jonas was in the whale's belly three days and three nights, so shall the son of man be in the heart of the earth three days and three nights', the miracle of Jonah's survival was regarded as the most clear and incontestable Old Testament prefiguration of the resurrection of Christ.[1] But in early Christian art the glorified Cross was itself a symbol of the risen and glorified Christ.[2] At Fowlis Wester and at Dunfallandy the seated figures are apparently represented as contemplating the symbol of the risen Christ, the glorified Cross. The sculptors of these two monuments seem to have been concerned to emphasise the devotional importance of recognising the risen Christ under symbolic forms. If this interpretation is correct, their devotional concerns were not incompatible with those of the Ruthwell sculptors, to whom the idea of the recognition of Christ (by the beasts in the desert, and as Agnus Dei) was evidently important. But the recognition of Christ under symbolic appearances was an important devotional aspect of the eucharist; and therefore, although in the representations of the saints at Fowlis Wester and Dunfallandy the raven bringing the loaf is absent, it is possible that both of these panels were intended to have a eucharistic significance.

In the two other Pictish representations of Paul and Anthony, eucharistic symbolism is more explicit. At St Vigeans 7, the saints are again seated in high-backed chairs; they are again placed relatively near the intersection of the cross.[3] At St Vigeans, the raven is represented. It dives downwards with its beak on the loaf. The saints also grasp the loaf, breaking it between them (see below, p. 39). At Nigg, the most elaborate of the Pictish stones, the saints bow profoundly in adoration while the bird again flies down between them with the loaf in its beak (see Plate II). The loaf is shown just over a thin-stemmed vessel which has been interpreted as a paten, but is more likely to represent a chalice.[4] Isabel Henderson has emphasised the eucharistic significance of the scene (1967, 148). Further details strengthen the liturgical atmosphere of the Nigg panel. The circular loaf borne by the bird clearly has a segment missing from its lower left quarter. The significance of this detail can be understood by referring to the commentary on the mass preserved in Irish in the Stowe Missal, which envisages the priest, just before he divides the bread for communion, breaking a piece off from the eucharistic loaf and inserting that piece in the consecrated wine. This commentary, like most

[1] See Schiller 1971–2, i, 130 and 153; *DACL*, vii, Part 2, cols 2572–631, under 'Jonas'.
[2] See Schiller 1971–2, ii, 7–9; Raw 1970, 242–3.
[3] See I. Henderson 1967, Plate 45 and note.
[4] Allen and Anderson 1903, 76; I. Henderson 1982, 88.

other medieval commentaries,[1] interprets the communion-rite in terms of Christ's death and resurrection. The commentary specifies that the particle is to be broken off from the lower left-hand side of the loaf. It explains this by seeing the priest as re-enacting at the *commixtio* the role of Longinus on Calvary. The commentary envisages the mass as celebrated in an oriented church, in which the priest, standing before the altar (with his back to the congregation) to perform the rite, would have faced east:[2]

> The particle that is cut off from the bottom of the half which is on the (priest's) left hand is the figure of the wounding with the lance in the armpit of the right side; for westward was Christ's face on the Cross, to wit, *contra civitatem*, and eastward was the face of Longinus; what to him was left to Christ was the right.[3]

The segment missing from the lower left quarter of the loaf on the Nigg stone would seem to provide reliable evidence of the way in which the communion rite was performed at Nigg when the scene was carved.[4] The Nigg sculptors refer to a moment not three minutes earlier, in the mass, than the breaking of bread referred to at Ruthwell. The segment missing from the loaf on the Nigg stone renders it impossible to interpret the loaf other than as a eucharistic host as it would have appeared directly after the rite of *commixtio*, i.e., when it was ready to be broken for communion. In the light of the Stowe Missal commentary, it is possible that the loaf with its missing segment was seen by the Nigg sculptors as a symbol of Christ's body dead on the Cross, at the moment when blood and water issued from the wound in his right side. As the broken-off segment of the eucharistic loaf was at mass placed in the chalice (mingled with the consecrated wine, the blood of Christ), the bread and the chalice together form at Nigg a unified symbol: under the mingled species of bread and wine, Christ was to be known in the eucharist. The commingling of the consecrated bread and wine was an essential element of the communion-rite in the mass. The private prayer which the priest said over the chalice, at the moment he placed the particle in the chalice, indicates the importance of the *commixtio*:

[1] Jungmann, 1951–5, ii. 310.
[2] See *DACL*, xii, Part 2, cols 2665–9, and *ODCC*, p. 1008, under 'Orientation'.
[3] Stokes and Strachan 1901–03, ii, 254, par. 15. Although this tract was copied into the Stowe Missal in the eleventh century, Stokes and Strachan state that the language of the tract indicates that it was transcribed from 'a much older original' (ii, xviii); on the symbolic significance of the wound in Christ's side, see Louis Gougaud (1920, 134–6) and Ó Carragáin 1983.
[4] On the variety of ways in which the fraction was performed, see Warner 1906–15, i, fol. 34r; ii, 16–17; Jungmann 1951–55, ii, 311–21; Eisenhofer and Lechner 1961, 322–5 and Ní Chatháin 1980, 143.

Fiat commixtio et consecratio corporis et sanguinis Domini nostri Jesu Christi accipientibus nobis in vitam aeternam. Amen.

May the commingling and consecration of the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ become eternal life for us who receive it. Amen.[1]

Between the saints, two animals crouch with their heads next to the chalice. Cecil Mowbray (1936, 434–5) suggested that these are the two lions which helped St Anthony to bury St Paul, and this idea was taken up by Isabel Henderson (1967, 148). The idea is an attractive one: it allows us to see sculptors picking from Jerome's *Vita* a narrative detail, and incorporating it in their monument in such a way as to give it a wider symbolic meaning. But, following David McRoberts (1960–61, 307–8; 1965, 238), Isabel Henderson (1967, 148) also described these animals as 'doglike creatures'; and they look as much like dogs as lions.[2] McRoberts has shown that, if they intended them as dogs, the sculptors were probably referring, not to the *Vita Sancti Pauli*, but to a far more important text. In two of the synoptic gospels (Matthew 15:21–8 and Mark 7:24–30) a woman of Canaan, pleading with Jesus that he should free her daughter of a devil although she is a gentile, is at first met with an apparent rebuff. Jesus answers her:

It is not good to take the bread of the children and to cast it to the dogs. But she said: Yea, Lord; for the whelps also eat of the crumbs that fall from the table of their masters. Then Jesus answering, said to her: O woman, great is thy faith. Be it done to thee as thou wilt. And her daughter was cured from that hour (Matthew 15:26–8).

Jerome relates this passage to the 'wonderful turn of events' by which the gentiles have replaced the Jews at the Lord's table ('O mira rerum conuersio. Israhel quondam filius, nos canes'.[3] Bede quotes Jerome's comment, and enlarges on the theme of 'conversio'.[4] The eucharistic overtones of the episode were reinforced by the place which both Mark and Matthew give it in their

[1] *Ordo Romanus Primus*, No. 107: Andrieu 1931–61, ii, 102; a variant wording of the prayer is found in the Stowe Missal: Warner 1906–15, i, fol. 35v; ii, p. 18; Jungmann 1951–5, ii, 315–6.
[2] Isabel Henderson has identified the Nigg animals as 'crouching beasts with manes', and has shown them to be 'of the same breed as' a maned beast which she describes as a 'doglike lion' in the Book of Kells (1982, 91–2 and captions to her plates VIIb and VIIIa); but at Nigg the furrows on the sides of the beasts could perhaps be interpreted, not as manes, but as the ribs of (lean and hungry) dogs.
[3] Jerome, *In Matheum* 15:27; *CC*, LXXVII, 134.
[4] See below, p. 12.

gospels. Each evangelist tells this story just before the feeding of the four thousand with seven loaves and a few fishes. As we shall see (below, p. 16), this second feeding in the desert was seen as prefiguring the mission of the Church to the gentiles. But the Nigg sculptors have designed their panel in such a way as to make it, not merely an image of how the gentiles thankfully receive the eucharist, but also an image of how Christ is to be recognised in the eucharist. Whether the animals be dogs or lions, the sculptors have represented just two of them, and have placed them on either side of the chalice which has the heavenly bread directly above it. They apparently invite the onlooker to recognise in the eucharistic species Christ, known 'in medio duorum animalium'.

It is possible that the way in which the sculptors have made each saint gaze upon the book which each holds open in his hands, indicates that the Nigg community was familiar with Jerome's commentary on Habbakuk. In his discussion of 'in medio duorum animalium', St Jerome distinguished between simple interpretations of this verse and more profound ones. His commentary on the verse closes as follows:

Porro simplex interpretatio, et opinio uulgi de Saluatore intellegit, quod inter duos latrones crucifixus agnitus sit. Qui autem melius, hoc dicunt, quod in prima Ecclesia quae de circumcisione fuit, et de praeputio congregata, duobus populis se hinc inde cingentibus, intellectus sit Saluator et creditus. Sunt qui duo animalia, duo intellegant testamenta, nouum et uetus, quae uere animantia sint, quae uitalia, quae spirent et in quorum medio Dominus cognoscatur.[1]

Indeed, the simple interpretation, and the opinion of ordinary people, understands it as referring to the Saviour, in that he may be recognised crucified between two thieves. But those who [understand the matter] better, say that the Saviour is [here] to be understood and believed as in the primitive Church, which was brought together both from the circumcised and from the uncircumcised – the Saviour surrounding himself, on the one side and on the other, by two peoples. There are those who interpret the two animals as the two Testaments, Old and New, which may be said to be truly life-giving and full of life, to breathe [the Spirit], and between which the Lord can be known.

The Nigg sculptors, who represent the bread and chalice as flanked not only by animals but also by saints contemplating books, have created a unified symbol which operates on several levels. The two animals would have en-

[1] *CC*, LXXVIA (1970), 621; note, however, that the interpretation which for Jerome was simply the 'opinio uulgi', was to be central in Bede's commentary on the phrase: *CC*, XIXB, 383–4 (cf. *PL* 91:1238).

couraged the onlooker to recall and respond to the literal words of the canticle, while the saints and their books suggested a deeper significance – that Christ was revealed in the Church, whose life was nourished both by the eucharist and by meditation of scripture. But it is probable that for the Nigg community a reminiscence of the phrase 'in medio duorum animalium' would have been seen as referring directly to the saints themselves, not merely to the dogs or lions at their feet, or to the books they contemplate. Monastic tradition insisted that those reading the scriptures should ruminate upon them, so as properly to discern the relation of the Old Testament to the new, and to transform the scriptures into prayer. Meditative readers were thus to be like the clean beasts of Leviticus (11:2–3) and Deuteronomy (14:6): reading scripture, they should transform it into God's praise 'rememorando secum, et quasi mundum animal ruminando'.[1] Bede, for example, emphasises the importance of ruminative meditation in his commentary on the episode of the Canaanite woman. He lays stress on the detail that the dogs eat the crumbs that fall from the master's table, not crusts. Bede sees this as symbolising the way in which converts penetrate beyond the literal significance ('the crust') of scripture to the spiritual sense, which they are then able to embody in good actions.[2] Coming to know Christ through the ruminative meditation of scripture, and knowing him in the eucharistic breaking of bread, were evidently seen by Bede as closely related activities. This is hardly surprising: each mass began with scriptural readings, and ended with communion. The Nigg pediment provides a unified image of the two ways – chewing the cud of scripture and receiving the eucharist – in which the congregation were fed by Christ at mass.

Whether the Nigg tableau represents dogs or lions, it illuminates the theological idea behind the Ruthwell 'Christ over the beasts' panel in a most interesting way. At Ruthwell, Christ is recognised by animals which the inscription identifies as 'beasts and dragons'; at Nigg, he is adored in the eucharist either by dogs (formerly, under the Old Law, unclean animals) or by lions (as a rule, images of evil in the Psalms).[3] If the Nigg creatures are indeed lions, then the most remarkable fact about them is that they are lying down in adoration before the bread and chalice, which represent the body

[1] Bede's account of Caedmon, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, IV, 24: Plummer 1896, i, 260; Plummer (ii, 250) cites eleven examples of this metaphor in Bede. The classic description of the process of ruminative mediation is to be found in Gregory, *Homiliae in Ezechielem*, Book I, Homily 10; *PL* 76:887–91, commenting on Ezechiel 3:1–3. This and related metaphors for meditation are examined in Spitz 1972, 41–6 and 57–104.

[2] Bede *In Marcum* 7:28; *CC*, CXX, 524.

[3] e.g., the 'lion and dragon' of Psalm 90:13; on lions as images of evil in Pictish art, see Isabel Henderson 1982, 101–3.

and blood of the Agnus Dei (cf. Isaiah 11:6–9 and 65:25). Similarly, anyone who looks at the 'Christ over the beasts' panel at Ruthwell with an awareness of the traditional representations of Psalm 90:13 cannot help being struck by what reformed characters the Ruthwell 'bestiae et dracones' are: the Ruthwell sculptors could be said to have converted their beasts. The Ruthwell scene has long been recognised as a scene of messianic harmony; the Nigg scene should be interpreted in similar terms. The way animals are used symbolically at Nigg provides an analogue for their use in the Ruthwell 'Christ over the beasts' panel (and at Bewcastle, where a similar panel recurs). In each of these three panels, a pair of animals is transformed (from their previous symbolic roles) in their recognition of Christ. Those who commissioned the monuments evidently did not see the eucharist in gnostic or Pelagian terms: the panels emphasise that Christ was to be recognized in the eucharist not only by an intellectual or moral elite ('clean, ruminative animals' like Paul and Anthony), but also by creatures who like dogs were formerly unclean, or who (like the lion and dragon of Psalm 90) were even images of the devil. Both panels imply that recognition of Christ in the breaking of bread offers moral and spiritual conversion (as it were, a *conversatio morum*)[1] to all who make the act of recognition, however unworthy their previous histories. The Nigg, Ruthwell and Bewcastle monuments alike invite onlookers to recognise Christ, 'in medio duorum animalium' and in the breaking of bread, and in that recognition to be transformed by his grace.[2] The Nigg sculptors express in a single unified tableau the *sententia* which the Ruthwell sculptors express by juxtaposing their 'Paul and Anthony' panel to that representing Christ over the beasts. A comparison with the Nigg monument therefore suggests that at Ruthwell the 'Paul and Anthony' and 'Christ over the beasts' panels should not be interpreted in isolation from each other.

It would seem therefore that the recognition of Christ in the eucharist is an important theme of the Nigg stone, as it is of the Ruthwell cross. It is necessary finally to emphasise that the 'Paul and Anthony' scene at Nigg should also not be interpreted in isolation: it fills the pediment above a most beautifully decorated cross.[3] But, as we have seen, the glorified Cross was itself a symbol of the resurrected Christ. There is therefore a natural progression from the eucharistic bread and chalice on the pediment to the glorified cross, the central symbol of the monument. If the Nigg community saw the

[1] Benedictine Rule, chapter 58: Vogüé and Neufville, ii, 630.

[2] Though it does not have a 'Paul and Anthony' panel, the Bewcastle cross brings out the eucharistic dimension of its 'Christ over the Beasts' panel by placing an 'Agnus Dei' panel directly above it (as at Ruthwell: see above, p. 4).

[3] See Isabel Henderson 1967, Plate 61.

eucharist in the same terms as the author of the Stowe commentary on the mass, they would have understood the saints and animals on the pediment as adoring Christ's body on Calvary, at the moment that the last drop of his blood has been poured out for mankind. But the central feature of the monument is a symbol of that same body, glorified in its resurrection. At Nigg, as at Ruthwell, the saints are juxtaposed to a representation of Christ in majesty, 'iudex aequitatis ... salvatorem mundi'; although the Nigg sculptors (like other Pictish sculptors) represent the glorified Christ not by a human figure but through the symbol of the Cross.

THE PROXIMITY OF 'PAUL AND ANTHONY' PANELS TO REPRESENTATIONS OF THE CROSS OR CRUCIFIXION ON IRISH MONUMENTS

As Françoise Henry and Helen Roe have consistently emphasised, several of the Irish representations of Paul and Anthony have details which indicate that they were intended to recall the eucharist.[1] A chalice has been incorporated, between the saints, in both the Kells market cross[2] and Muiredach's cross at Monasterboice.[3] On both crosses the sculptors have represented the saints holding the bread above a chalice: they have therefore juxtaposed the two eucharistic species, as at Nigg. Thus Helen Roe, who has most recently described the monuments, has repeatedly emphasised that these panels have a eucharistic significance.[4]

But the eucharistic significance of the 'Paul and Anthony' panels in Ireland is most strikingly brought out, not by such occasional details as the ones just mentioned, but by the contexts provided for the panels on the crosses. For example, the sculptors seem to have tried with remarkable consistency to place their representations of Paul and Anthony near to representations of the Cross or of the crucifixion. At Bantry (iii) the 'Paul and Anthony' panel, and the *orans* panel higher up on this side of the shaft, are each placed directly under a cruciform design. The bird in the 'Paul and Anthony' panel could almost be said to issue from the panel directly above, a panel filled with a Greek cross. It is possible that the Bantry sculptors, like the Pictish artists, may have seen the Cross as a symbolic representation of the risen Christ. They may have sculpted cross-patterns above each figural panel in order to

[1] The fundamental work of Henry and Roe will be quoted and acknowledged at appropriate places in the text. To save space, I refer to the panels according to the small Roman numerals given to them in my checklist. In the following discussion I have confined myself to the ten panels [numbered (i) – (x)] which seem definitely to represent the saints, and I do not rely on the disputed panels numbered (xi) – (xv).

[2] checklist (viii).

[3] checklist (ix) and Plate VI.

[4] Roe 1954, 105; 1966, 42–3 and 14; 1981, 21. On these panels, see also below, p. 22.

present Christ as the object of liturgical and private prayer (the *orans* figure) and as present in the breaking of bread (the 'Paul and Anthony' panel).

At Arboe[1] and Armagh,[2] the 'Paul and Anthony' panels are placed on the less prominent, narrow sides of the crosses. Nevertheless, they are put towards the top of the cross-shafts, relatively near the rings which surrounded the figures of Christ crucified. On the small east cross on Galloon Island,[3] the 'Paul and Anthony' panel is on a broad side, and was originally placed just below the cross-piece. On the market-cross at Kells (viii), the saints have been placed at the end of an arm of the cross; but this position is relatively near the crucifixion-scene on the west side of the cross. Also on the crosspiece of this cross, on the east side, is a depiction of the sacrifice of Isaac. It is interesting that Abraham's sacrifice of Isaac should be placed in significant relationships to 'Paul and Anthony' panels on several Irish crosses: 'sacrificium patriarche nostri Abrache' is mentioned as a type of the sacrifice of the mass in the Stowe missal. The Stowe compilers were here following the Roman canon of the mass: the prayer was widely known, and is for example clearly illustrated in a mosaic in the Church of St Apollinare in Classe at Ravenna.[4]

The Castledermot sculptors demonstrated their interest in eucharistic themes by representing the miracle of the (five) loaves and (two) fishes on the base of each of the two surviving crosses (iv, v). It is therefore significant that 'Paul and Anthony' panels occur on the main (broad) faces of each of these crosses. On the east side of the Castledermot north cross (iv) the saints are placed immediately under the apostles who surround the crucifixion scene. On the west side of the Castledermot south cross (Checklist v, and Plate III), the saints are again placed just under the crucifixion scene, and are therefore in significant relationship to the sacrifice of Isaac (right arm) and to David the harpist (left arm), the scenes which flank the crucifixion. The psalms of David were seen as the first and most important of the prophetic books: in them most of the physical details of the Passion had been foretold.[5] David foretold the Passion, which Abraham's willingness to sacrifice his son had prefigured, and which the eucharist (symbolised by the 'Paul and Anthony' panel) re-enacted. At least as far as the relative positions of the 'Paul and An-

[1] Checklist (i) and Plate X.

[2] Checklist (ii) and Plate XI.

[3] Checklist (vi) and Plate XII.

[4] Warner 1906–15, i, fol. 28v/14–29r/1; ii, 13; Jungmann 1951–55, ii, 228–31; for the Ravenna mosaic, see E. Yarnold 1978, 192 and Plate 13.

[5] See Salmon 1959, especially his first series (pp. 45–74), common to the Cathach of St Columba, the pseudo-Bedan *De titulis Psalmorum* and the *Codex Amiatinus*. See also the psalter, glossed in Old Irish, preserved at Milan, partially edited by Stokes and Strachan (1901–3), i, 7–483 [at, for example, Psalm 2 (p. 16) and Psalm 21 (p. 125)]. On the Psalms in the Irish church in this period, see Martin McNamara 1973.

thony', Isaac and David scenes are concerned, and their relationships to the central crucifixion tableau, there seems little justification for Françoise Henry's remark (1964, 41) that 'on the south cross there is a complete disarray of scenes'.

THE EUCHARISTIC CONTEXT PROVIDED FOR THE 'PAUL AND ANTHONY' PANEL ON THE SOUTH CROSS AT KELLS

The 'Paul and Anthony' scene is again placed in significant relationships to Isaac and David on the east side of the south cross at Kells (vii and Plate IV). Here the saints (on the right arm) visually balance the sacrifice of Isaac (on the left arm). But the sculptors of this cross chose to place their crucifixion scene on the opposite (west) side of the cross. There they juxtaposed the crucifixion of Christ to an image of his second coming in glory. They were consequently free to devote the east side of their cross-head to an original arrangement of scenes, of which the central theme seems to be eucharistic. The 'Paul and Anthony' image, and the sacrifice of Isaac, flank the centrepiece of the cross, which consists of seven large bossed spirals on a square 'mat' of single cord interlace. Two crossed fishes, above the mat, act as a transitional device, leading the eye to the head of the cross.[1] On the cross-head, Christ and David the harper are seated facing each other. In front of Christ are five circular loaves, and at the top of the cross two rows of heads represent the multitude. The reference is clearly to the feeding of the five thousand in the desert, with five loaves and two fishes, the only one of Christ's miracles to be described in all four gospels (Mark 6:31–44; Matthew 14:13–21; Luke 9:10–17; John 6:1–13).

But Mark (8:8–10) added a second miraculous feast, with seven loaves and 'a few fishes', and in this he was followed by Matthew (15:32–9). Modern scholarship has made it clear that for the two evangelists the second feast was not merely a repetition of the first, but a symbolically significant variant. Whereas the first took place in Galilee, to the west of the sea of Galilee, the second took place in the Decapolis, to the east of the sea of Galilee. Whereas the first was a foreshadowing of the way in which eucharistic food would be offered to the people of Israel, the second (with the seven loaves) indicated that the same spiritual food would be offered to the gentile nations; indeed it has been suggested that Luke decided not to use the part of his source containing this second feast (and, for example, the episode of the Canaanite woman) because he wished to postpone his account of the mission to the gen-

[1] The sculptors used a similar transitional device, two beasts (one of which may be a griffin) to link Paul and Anthony visually to the mat and spirals.

tiles to his second volume, The Acts of the Apostles.' Patristic and medieval commentators were well aware of the symbolic distinction between the two feasts, and indeed emphasised it. Their interpretation of the feasts is consistent with that of modern scholars, although the medieval interpreters were not primarily interested in geographical symbolism (they do not stress, as do modern commentators, the relations of where the feasts take place to the sea of Galilee) but rather in typological and numerological correspondences between the Old and New Testaments. In the first feast, they saw Christ as transforming what the Old Testament had to offer: medieval commentators usually saw the five loaves as symbolising the Pentateuch, and the two fishes as symbolising the Psalms and the Prophets. In the second feast, medieval commentators saw Christ acting as the informing principle of the New Testament: the seven loaves were seen to symbolise the seven gifts of the Holy Ghost, given to the Church at Pentecost. The desert, in which Christ performed both miracles, was seen to symbolise the Church itself: only through Christ's presence could it become a source of life for men.[2]

In view of the unanimity with which the commentators emphasised the symbolic distinction between the two feasts, it seems natural for the Kells sculptors to have referred economically to both feasts, and to have preserved the distinction between them. Thus the two crossed fishes refer both to the two fishes of the first feast (Mark 6:41; Matthew 14:19) and to the inexplicit 'a few small fishes' of the second feast ('pisciculos paucos', Mark 8:7; compare Matthew 15:34). By depicting the two fish as crossed in the form 'X', the sculptors seem to have intended a visual pun. The fish had various symbolic meanings in Christian art: chiefly (a) Christ (the Greek word for 'fish', ἰχθύς, was associated with a Greek acrostic meaning 'Jesus Christ, Son of

[1] See, on Mark, Harrington 1979, 89–92 and 108–110; on Matthew, Fenton 1963, 241–4 and 258–60; on Luke, Drury 1976, 98–101.

[2] See Jerome's commentary on St Matthew (*CC*, LXXVII, 1969): on chapter 14:17 (p. 121); on chapter 15:34 (pp. 135–6). The late-seventh century Irish (Pseudo-Jerome) *Expositio Quattuor Evangeliorum* is familiar with such interpretations: e.g., on Matthew 14:15: '*quinque panes*, id est quinque libri Moysi' – *PL* 30:571. Likewise, Cummean, an Irishman who in the seventh century wrote a commentary on St Mark, identifies the seven loaves with the gifts of the Holy Ghost: 'Septem panes, dona sunt septem Spiritus sancti' – *PL* 30:634. On these Irish commentaries, see Bischoff 1976, 80–2. Bede's comments are entirely consistent with the ones quoted, although he sometimes expands on Jerome's interpretations: for example, he links the seven loaves not only to the gifts of the Holy Ghost, but also to the seven sacraments, 'quibus ad perpetuam salutem nutriendus erat mundus' – *PL* 92:206D–7B; *CC*, CXX, p. 529. On the equation of the desert with the Church, see Jerome on Matthew 14:13: 'desertum ecclesiae locum quae uirum antea non habuerat' – *CC*, LXXVII, 120. This comment is taken up by, for example, Bede on Mark 6:31 – *PL*, 92:191B; *CC*, CXX, 510.

God, Saviour'[1] (b) the eucharist (an association stemming naturally from the gospel passages at present under discussion) and (c) the newly-baptised Christian (who gained life by swimming in the waters of Baptism). Of these three meanings, the second, the eucharist, is clearly realized on the Kells cross by the context, the depiction of the miracle of the five loaves. But the first meaning, Christ, is also emphasised: not only are the two fish placed just under the feet of a depiction of Christ (forming, as it were, a visual 'title' for that depiction); in addition they are crossed in the form of the Greek letter *Chi*, the first letter of Christ's name. This letter was itself an important symbol for Christ in Irish art.[2] David the harper-king, on the head of the cross, is allowed to (fore)see the fulfilment of the Old Testament prophecies, in the feeding by the Messiah of the multitude with five loaves. But the central place is given to a symbolic reference to the seven loaves, the gifts of the Holy Ghost, with which the Church is fed in its pilgrimage to the heavenly Jerusalem. This central symbol is placed between two references to the mass: we have already seen how, in the canon of the mass, the sacrifice 'patriarche nostri Abrache' was seen as a prefiguration of the eucharistic sacrifice; and the 'Paul and Anthony' scene relates the theme of feeding in the desert to the monastic life itself.

Scholars have disputed whether the seven bosses are representations of loaves or are 'decorative rather than pictorial'.[3] The dispute was a sterile one, because the distinction was false. The bosses did not have to be realistic representations of loaves in order to remind the onlooker of the symbolic number seven. When a visual reminder of this number was made the centrepiece of a tableau which included representations of Christ's miraculous feast (top), the prophetic covenant with Abraham (left arm) and the miraculous feeding of Paul and Anthony in the desert (right arm), the reference to the second miraculous feast, the one which the commentators related specifically to the life of the Church, was too obvious for any educated onlooker to miss. It made sense for the sculptors to make a visual distinction between the five loaves from which Christ once fed David's people, and the

[1] For other examples of the fish as a symbol for Christ in Irish sculpture, see Roe 1965, 215–6.
[2] Lewis 1980) *DACL*, vii, cols 1990–2086 under 'IXΘYΣ'; *ODCC*, 514 under 'Fish'; Daniélou 1964, 42–57. In the 'loaves and fishes' panel on the west side of the Market cross at Kells, the two fish are also crossed in the form 'X': see checklist, (viii); Roe 1966, 38 and Plate XI; Brandt-Förster 1978, Plate 16 and figure 24. The anonymous Irish *Expositio Quattuor Euangeliorum* equates the two fish with 'duo Testamenta, sive duo ordines, sacerdotum et prophetarum, sive duo libri Joshuae' – *PL* 30:571. Familiarity with such traditions would have made it even more natural for the sculptors of the south cross at Kells to place the fish so that they form a visual 'title' to a scene in which the 'two orders' are represented: in which Christ, *priest* of the New Testament, is juxtaposed to his Old Testament forerunner, the *prophet* David.
[3] See Sexton 1946, 185.

seven loaves which symbolised the spiritual gifts by which Christ still sustained the life of the Church, the spiritual heirs of Abraham. Conversely, no educated medieval onlooker would have interpreted the seven intricate bosses as being 'merely decorative', as if all the carefully thought out eucharistic references in the figural panels encircled what was merely a symbolic void. It is clear that the Kells sculptors integrated their 'Paul and Anthony' scene into a rich complex of eucharistic images, and that the seven bosses form the symbolic centre of the complex. It is interesting to note that this cross also has, on its north side, the eucharistic motif of the inhabited vine, rare in Irish art but 'almost the hallmark of Northumbrian monuments'.[1]

Immediately below the 'mat' bearing the seven bosses, on this south cross at Kells, there is a representation of Daniel among the lions which is of particular interest. Helen Roe points out (1966, 13) that Daniel's 'arms and hands are extended in the ancient attitude of prayer. On either side is a formidable lion with lolling tongue and curled-up tail'. Daniel is found often on the Irish high crosses, as in early Christian art, because his trial among and deliverance from the lions prefigured Christ's death and resurrection. The essence of figural symbolism was that persons or events, without losing their historical reality, could also symbolise other events and facts of sacred history.[2] The Kells sculptors have particularly emphasised the figural significance of Daniel: not only is he placed just below the central symbol of the seven bosses, but he is represented with outstretched arms (reminiscent of Christ on the Cross, or of the celebrant at the *Te igitur* prayer, at the beginning of the canon of the mass);[3] and, significantly, he is here flanked by just two lions. Although the representation of Daniel between two lions is a common feature in early Christian art[4] this type is found comparatively seldom on Irish high crosses: they usually surround the prophet with a greater number of lions (the high cross at Moone, for example, provides seven lions). Helen Roe gives only two other Irish examples.[5] The closest parallel to the presentation of Daniel at Kells is St Martin's cross at Iona (Iona No. 1), where Daniel is again flanked by two lions, and is given an equally prominent position (just below the centrepiece, which depicts the Virgin and Child adored by angels). The Iona sculptors reinforced their presentation of Daniel 'in medio duorum animalium' by also placing an animal (a lion?) on

[1] Roe 1966, 23: she there notes only two other 'major instances' in Ireland of the inhabited vine: on the south cross at Clonmacnoise, and on the south (Muiredach's) cross, Monasterboice [see checklist (ix)].
[2] See Auerbach 1959.
[3] On the *Te igitur*, see Jungmann 1951–55, ii, 104–107; Kirschbaum 1968–76, ii, cols. 492–95 under 'Kanonbild'.
[4] See *DACL*, iv Part 1, cols 221–48, under 'Daniel'.
[5] At Arboe and at Killary (Roe 1966, 13): but see also the base of the [late] cross at Dysert O'Dea, Co. Clare (Henry 1964, 57).

arm of the cross, flanking the central tableau of the Virgin and Child. The historic links between Iona and Kells may explain this striking parallel in the theological symbolism of the two monuments.[1] In the figure of Daniel, the Kells sculptors seem clearly to have intended to suggest Christ, who was to be recognised, like his Old Testament prototype, 'in medio duorum animalium'.[2] The Kells sculptors acted unusually by transferring their crucifixion scene to the other side of the cross, where it was directly juxtaposed to the Last Judgment scene: but they probably felt that they had sufficiently recalled the Passion on this side, both by the prominence which they gave to the figure of Daniel between two lions, and by the way in which they integrated this *figura*, in which Christ was to be recognised, into a eucharistic context.[3]

PAUL AND ANTHONY 'IN MEDIO DUORUM ANIMALIUM' ON THE HIGH CROSS AT MOONE

The high cross at Moone (x and Plates V(a) and V(b)) has a particularly schematic and logical programme on its base. If the onlooker proceeds sunwise or following his right hand (Old Irish, *dessel*) around the monument, beginning (like the sun) at the east, he sees in chronological order a summary of salvation history. The east side is devoted to the Old Testament (Adam and

[1] On St Martin's Cross, Iona, see RCAHMS *Iona*, 204–208 and figs. *ad loc.*; Allen and Anderson 1903, 382 and figure 397A.

[2] There is evidence for the use of the canticle of Habbakuk in Ireland. It does not appear in the Antiphonary of Bangor [ed. F. W. Warren 1892–5]; but Dom Ferdinand Cabrol states, of the canticles sung after the 'fifties' of psalms in Ireland, that 'ce sont du reste les mêmes cantiques que l'église romaine' (*DACL*, ii, Part 2, col. 1988). James Mearns (1914, 68–9) lists the Old Latin text of Habbakuk as occurring after the hundredth psalm in three psalters with Irish connections: (i) Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Hamilton 553 (the so-called 'Psalter of St. Salaberga', eighth century. However, this *psalterium Romanum* may be of English, not Irish origin: see McNamara 1973, 262.) (ii) Cambridge, St John's College, the 'Southampton' Psalter (dated as of the beginning of the eleventh century: see McNamara 1973, 241–2); and (iii) London, BL Vitellius F.xi (*ca* AD 920). This psalter is of particular interest, as its colophon (now destroyed) indicated that it was copied under an abbot Muiredach (McNamara 1973, 237–8). More than one abbot, in more than one monastery, was named Muiredach; but the patron for whom the psalter was made just may be the patron commemorated on Muiredach's cross, Monasterboice. On Monasterboice, see below, pp. 22–31; but on the difficulties in assigning either the psalter or 'Muiredach's cross' with certainty to the abbot Muiredach of Monasterboice who died in AD 923, see Roe 1981, 18 and 27–9. McNamara (1973, 269–70) emphasises the antiquity of the custom of dividing the psalter into 'three fifties'.

[3] The juxtaposition of Crucifixion and Last Judgment on the other side of the cross may be another aspect of the eucharistic preoccupations of the Kells sculptors: compare the way in which passion, resurrection and second coming are juxtaposed in the words added by Moelcaich at the end of the words of consecration in the Stowe missal, quoted below, p. 31.

Eve; sacrifice of Isaac; Daniel and the lions); the south side moves from the Old Testament to the New (the three children in the furnace; flight into Egypt; loaves and fishes); the West side (as in the Castledermot crosses) juxtaposes the Crucifixion to images of the twelve apostles. The series ends, on the north side, with representations of St Paul and St Anthony. The miraculous feeding of the saints comes at the top of the base (as usual, nearest to the centre of the high cross); under it are depicted the temptation of St Anthony, and a panel of spirals forming interlaced animals. It is interesting to note that the Moone sculptors have given almost as much emphasis as the Ruthwell sculptors to episodes that take place 'in deserto': this theme dominates, not only the 'Paul and Anthony' scenes on the North side, but the flight into Egypt[1] and the 'loaves and fishes' panel on the opposite, south, side.

On the base, the sculptors have made several scenes symbolically relevant to the scenes on the opposite side: thus the fall of man (top of east side) is balanced by the crucifixion of the 'second Adam' (top of west side). It is therefore appropriate that the circular spirals of the monsters under St Anthony (bottom of north side) are visually recalled by the circular loaves of the 'feeding in the desert' panel (bottom of south side): the sculptors have even included two small 'monsters', one on each side of the loaves, to make the visual reference clear. But these two 'monsters' are oddly shaped: their doglike heads are attached to straight, baton-like bodies. It would seem that the sculptors wished to simplify the two figures as much as possible, and to make it as clear as possible that the figures flank the five loaves. The figures seem designed to distract as little as possible from the central eucharistic image of the five loaves; but they suggest, with perfect visual economy, a liturgical reminiscence. In this panel, the sculptors would seem to have intended to remind a monastic audience that they should recognise Christ in the eucharistic bread, by the visual device of placing the bread 'in medio duorum animalium'. The parallel with the symbolism of the Nigg stone is striking. Here, also, the sculptors have provided their animals with doglike heads, thus neatly combining a reference to the Canticle of Habbakuk with a reference to the gospel image of the whelps who eat the crumbs that fall from the table of their master.

On the north side of the base, the communion of Saints Paul and Anthony forms a striking contrast with the figure of Saint Anthony alone, hemmed in by two monsters, in the 'temptation' scene directly below. The high backs of the chairs on which Saints Paul and Anthony sit end in doglike animal-

[1] At Moone the figures proceed from left to right, while at Ruthwell (and on the high cross at Durrow Abbey, Co. Offaly) they proceed from right to left. George Henderson has argued (see above, p. 3) that such directional movement is symbolically significant: that the 'forward' left-to-right movement denotes an outward journey 'into' Egypt, and that the 'backward' movement from right to left signifies the return from Egypt.

heads; these high backs are the closest visual analogue, on the base, to the baton-like animals on the southern side. It would seem that the sculptors intended to link the loaves and fishes (on the south side) visually to the feeding of Paul and Anthony (on the north side). By such visual and spatial references, the 'Paul and Anthony' panel is, once again, integrated with eucharistic references elsewhere on a monument. Françoise Henry's comment on the 'Paul and Anthony' panel is therefore justified: 'this scene, as well as the simplified representation of the loaves and fishes on another [the opposite] side, can serve as a figure of the Eucharist' (1964, 41). In addition, it is possible that the dog-headed backs of the chairs were designed to call up the same scriptural reminiscences as the animals on the opposite side of the base: Saints Paul and Anthony are made to recognise Christ in the breaking of bread and 'in medio duorum animalium'.

THE CONTEXT OF THE 'PAUL AND ANTHONY' PANEL ON THE HOUSE-CAP OF MUIREDACH'S CROSS, MONASTERBOICE

The south cross at Monasterboice (Muiredach's cross) [checklist (ix) and (xv) and Plates VI-VIII] is, of all the insular high crosses, the one with the richest and best-integrated theological scheme. Its 'Paul and Anthony' panel [checklist (ix)] plays a small role within the massive programme, but the way in which the panel is related to the theological concerns of the cross as a whole is typical of the subtlety of the sculptors who erected (or perhaps of the patron who commissioned) this great monument. The 'Paul and Anthony' scene occupies a narrow side of the capstone of the cross. The sculptors have given this capstone the appearance of a church: 'the side walls shown as roofed by heavy shingling topped by a massive rooftree, the end walls under heavy gables rising to a peak and finished by crescentic or horned finials decorated with pelleting' (Roe 1981, 27). The panels on this house-cap exploit the symbolic dimensions of the concepts 'church' ('ecclesia') and 'temple' in patristic thought, to provide for the cross a 'corner stone' uniting the separate programmes of its two broad sides.

In the New Testament, the image of the 'cornerstone', as applied to Christ, is closely related to the idea of the 'Church'. In St Luke's gospel, after the entry into Jerusalem has been described, Christ is made to apply the image of the corner-stone to himself: 'What is this then that is written, "The stone, which the builders rejected, the same is become the head of the corner [Lapidem quem reprobaverunt aedificantes, hic factus est in caput anguli]".'[1] In Ephesians, St Paul uses the image of the cornerstone to refer to the

[1] Luke 20:17, which in turn quotes Psalm 97:22 (Vulgate numbering).

union that Christ achieved between Jews and Gentiles in God's house: 'Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone [ipso summo angulari lapide Christo Iesu]: in whom all the building, being framed together, groweth up into a holy temple to the Lord' (2:20–21). Robert Burlin remarks that 'in exegetical usage it is not always clear ... whether we are to see the joining stone in the foundation or at the top of the walls' (1968, 59). St Paul's image was taken up in one of the 'Great O' antiphons sung before Christmas: 'O King of the nations and their desired one, the cornerstone which makes each one, come and save man, whom you formed out of dust [O Rex gentium et desideratus earum, lapisque angularis qui facis utraque unum: veni, et salva hominem quem de limo formasti]'[1].

A monastic community would have been alive to the symbolic possibilities in giving the headstone of a cross the shape of a church. At the most basic level, it was appropriate that sculptors who knew, on Christ's authority, that the Church had been founded on a rock (Matthew 16:18) should cap this greatest of stone crosses with an image of a church. St Paul's use of the cornerstone image to express the unity of Jews and Gentiles seems particularly relevant to the iconographic programme of Muiredach's cross. The east side of the shaft depicts Old Testament scenes; at the top of the shaft, the epiphany of the Christ child (the 'rex gentium') to the magi is presented as the fulfilment of the Old Testament. On the other hand, the west side of the cross is concerned with the central event of the New Testament. The panels on this side depict Christ's Passion and its aftermath: the recognition of the risen Christ by Thomas, and Christ's handing on of his power to the Church, in the persons of Peter and Paul. The images of Christ on the capstone emphasise his power to 'make each one', by fulfilling the Old Testament in the New, and fulfilling the New Testament in the heavenly Jerusalem. It is in such a context that the 'Paul and Anthony' image on the capstone is to be understood.

A full discussion of the theological implications of the house-cap on Muiredach's cross, and of how the iconography of the house-cap is related to that of the cross as a whole, would take us too far from our present theme; I hope to discuss such matters in a future paper. However, it is clear that the eucharistic significance of the panel is not merely suggested by the placing of a chalice on the ground between the saints: it is suggested even more strongly by placing the saints, receiving the heaven-sent bread, within a church; and by the symbolic dimensions of the concept 'church' which the capstone exploits. The sculptors of Muiredach's cross have placed their 'Paul and An-

[1] On the 'O Rex gentium' antiphon, see Burlin 1968, 41. I have not been able to find evidence of its use in Ireland at this period; but it cannot, in or after the Carolingian period, be considered unlikely that the 'Great O' antiphons were known in Ireland.

thony' panel, as a symbol of the eucharist, in a wider historical perspective than any other cross. The 'Paul and Anthony' panel here is far from being simply the representation of a moment in the lives of the two saints: it complements references on the cross to Christ's Passion; to the triumph of the Church over evil; and to the revelation of Christ (now recognised in the breaking of bread) in majesty on the Last Day. A visual detail of the 'Paul and Anthony' panel itself emphasises this theme of recognition (see Plate VI). The saints stand facing each other, with their backs to the side of the panel-'church'. The space between them, and between the bread (above) and the chalice (below) is filled by the crossed croziers of the saints. The 'Paul and Anthony' panel here is very similar to that on the Market Cross at Kells: each panel has a chalice as well as the heaven-sent bread, and in each panel the space between chalice and bread is filled by the saints' croziers, crossed to form an 'X'. But we have seen that in early Irish Christian art 'X' was itself a symbol for Christ (above, p. 18). The sculptors, here and at Kells, seems to have provided the images of bread and wine with a visual 'title' emphasising the significance of these eucharistic symbols.[1]

It is necessary to discuss two other panels of the house-cap, as one has mistakenly been taken to depict Paul and Anthony, and the other seems to refer to the Canticle of Habbakuk, with which 'Paul and Anthony' panels would appear to be associated on several crosses. The panel which has been identified as depicting Paul and Anthony is that on the (broad) east side of the housecap (see Plate VII). Arthur Kingsley Porter (1931, 9–10) interpreted this panel as the contest of Columcille with the druid Mongán mac Fiachna. R. A. S. Macalister, however, interpreted it as representing Saints Paul and Anthony, and described it as follows (1946, 41):

> One of the two hermits stands (to the spectator's left) holding his crooked staff in one hand and the loaf in the other: the other appears to be seated, although his stool is not clearly shown; he also holds a staff. In the corner below him is the bird.

However, Helen Roe has argued that his identification 'cannot be sustained'. She describes the scene as follows (1981, 43):

> The subject here consists of a cleric holding aloft a large *flabellum* or perhaps a processional cross with a decorated head while, with a crooked staff, he thrusts violently at a large bird-like creature (a demon?) low on the ground to the right of the scene. Behind the 'bird' is a large, heavily bearded man holding a spear who seems to flinch before the cleric's onslaught.

[1] That the crossed staves at Monasterboice and at Kells have the symbolic significance suggested here, is rendered more likely by the fact that both the Market Cross and the South Cross at Kells represent the miracle of the loaves and fishes with the fishes crossed to form an 'X' (see above, p. 17). The saints are represented with staff or croziers (indicating their dignity as desert 'fathers' [*abbates*]?) at Ardboe (i) and on the South cross at Kells (vii): but on these crosses the staffs are not crossed.

Helen Roe is surely right to reject Macalister's interpretation of the panel. Saints Paul and Anthony seem always to be represented, whether at Ruthwell, in Scotland or in Ireland, as symbols of the harmony, nourished by the eucharist, that should reign in a monastic community. In the *Vita Sancti Pauli*, the argument between the saints as to who should break the bread is a courteous one: each saint tries to persuade the other to accept the honour of breaking the bread (see p. 39). It would have been ridiculous to present the scene as a physical fight. Instead of being a figure from the *Vita Sancti Pauli*, the triumphant ecclesiastic on the left of the panel, bearing the cross-*flabellum*, seems to be visually related to the multitude of figures directly below him on the left arm of the cross who, headed by David the harper, adore the glorified Christ at the Last Judgment. The cringing figure on the right of the panel is similarly related to the group of damned souls below him on the right arm of the cross, driven away from Christ by a trident-wielding devil. The 'large bird-like creature (a demon?)' to the right of the panel, at whom the ecclesiastic thrusts with his staff, contrasts with the triumphant bird (eagle or phoenix?) which rises over the head of the glorified Christ as part of his eschatological triumph. Whether the sculptors had a particular ecclesiastical triumph in mind (such as the contest of Columcille with the druid Mongán, as Porter suggested), is relatively unimportant: they have in fact created for this face of the capstone-church an image of the triumph of the Church. They have also emphasised the symbolic significance of the capstone: it stands not simply for an individual church but also for 'ecclesia', the Church. Christ's prophecy that 'upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it' (Matthew 16:18) may be more relevant to the panel, and to the symbolic context provided for it on the cross, than any individual incident from the lives of the saints or from ecclesiastical history.

This panel does indeed seem to be related to the representation of Paul and Anthony on the neighbouring north side of the capstone- 'church'. The relationship is primarily one of visual contrast, however, rather than the literary relationship suggested by Macalister. Both scenes comprise two human figures and a bird. However, while the panel on the east side represents a scene of conflict (with the 'bird-demon' apparently on the side of the defeated enemies of the Church), the panel on the north side builds, out of similar figures, a scene of harmony in which Saints Paul and Anthony receive their

heavenly bread from a bird. The staves of the two figures on the east side of the house-cap, clashing in combat, contrast with the staves of Saints Paul and Anthony, on the north side, which cross in harmonious symmetry to form a symbol of Christ.

Helen Roe has also convincingly reinterpreted the panel on the other broad (west) side of the capstone-'church', the side above the great centre-piece representing the Crucifixion (see Plate VIII). She rejected earlier identifications of the trio of figures on this panel as Moses flanked by Aaron and Hur, and suggested that on each palm of the central figure 'a large nail-head may have been shown' (1981, 34). I agree with this observation: on the cross, a raised point is still clearly visible on both the hands of the central figure. Roe has also pointed out that each of the flanking figures holds 'a book or codex', and that each is equipped, not with a cloak, but with wings. This also appears to be correct: the wings hang much more rigidly, and are much more highly decorated, than the knee-length cloak which the central figure wears over his ankle-length robe. If these observations are right, the panel must represent Christ (either at some period between the resurrection and the ascension, or at the Last Judgment) flanked by two angels. Helen Roe has convincingly related the scene to the prophecy of Zechariah:

> And I will pour out upon the house of David and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem the spirit of grace and of prayers: and they shall look upon me, whom they have pierced [et aspicient ad me quem confixerunt]. And they shall mourn for him as one mourneth for an only son: and they shall grieve over him, as the manner is to grieve over the death of the firstborn (Zechariah 12:10–11).

I readily accept that this passage is relevant to the panel. The panel is on the cross placed immediately above the great Crucifixion-tableau; and in the Passion according to St. John (the Passion-narrative read at the hour of Christ's death on Good Friday) Zechariah 12:10 is paraphrased at the moment the crucifixion itself is described (John 19:37). Zechariah 12:10 is also paraphrased at the beginning of the Apocalypse:

> Behold, he cometh with the clouds, and every eye shall see him: and they also that pierced him [et videbit eum omnis oculus, et qui eum popugerunt]. And all the tribes of the earth shall bewail themselves because of him. Even so. Amen. I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, saith the Lord God, who is and who was and who is to come, the Almighty (Apocalypse 1:7–8).

The panel seems to have been designed to refer to the Crucifixion tableau below it. Influenced by Apocalypse 1:7, early medieval writers emphasised

that Christ would on the Last Day display his wounds as a judgment against the sinners for whom he had suffered them.[1] The panel emphasises that the Crucifixion, by which men were saved, would itself become a judgment against those who rejected their crucified Saviour.

However, as we have seen in our discussion of the Nigg stone, in monastic culture it rarely happens that artists are thinking of one scriptural passage to the exclusion of others: they aimed for richness of association, not logical exclusivity. I would suggest that the sculptors also intended this panel to recall to the onlooker the opening of the canticle of Habbakuk. A monastic community would, if their Good Friday ceremonies followed the Roman model, have found it natural to associate the Canticle of Habbakuk with Zechariah 12:10. We have seen that responsories from the Canticle of Habbakuk were sung after the first Old Testament reading on Good Friday, at the beginning of that ceremony of readings which culminated in the Passion according to St. John (in which Zechariah 12:10 is quoted). The Monasterboice panel depicts two angels, each of whom supports with one hand the arms of Christ, and each of whom bears a codex in the other hand. The prophecy of Zechariah cannot explain these aspects of the panel, but the canticle of Habbakuk, particularly when seen in the light of St Jerome's commentary on 'in medio duorum animalium', sheds light upon them. In his commentary on the verse, St. Jerome's theme is similar to that of Apocalypse 1:8, which refers to Christ as 'Alpha and Omega ... who is and who was and who is to come'. Jerome examines the way in which the mystery of the Trinity is progressively revealed in the Old and New Testaments. He bases his interpretation on two Old Testament passages which, as they are important for understanding Jerome's procedure, I shall quote. The first passage is the description in the Book of Exodus of how the ark of the covenant is to be made:

> Thou shalt make also two cherubims of beaten gold, on the two sides of the oracle. Let one cherub be on one side, and the other on the other. Let them cover both sides of the propitiatory, spreading their wings, and covering the oracle: and let them look one towards the other, their faces being turned towards the propitiatory wherewith the ark is to be covered. In which thou shalt put the testimony that I will give thee. Thence will I give orders, and will speak to thee over the propitiatory, and *from the midst of the two cherubims*, which shall be upon the ark of the testimony, all things

[1] For the recurrence of this motif in Irish medieval tradition, see Lambert McKenna, n.d., p. xvii; also McKenna 1919, p. ix. I am grateful to An t-Ath. Diarmuid Ó Laoghaire, S.J., for these references. The motif occurs in the tenth-century Anglo-Saxon Vercelli homilies: see Homily II (Max Förster 1932, 45, lines 18–22) and the closely-related account of the Last Judgment in Homily XXI (Szarmach 1981, 86, lines 127–30).

which I will command the children of Israel by thee [et loquar ad te ... *de medio duorum cherubim*, qui erunt super arcam testimonii, cuncta quae mandabo per te filiis Israel].[1]

These features of the ark, in the temple at Jerusalem, form the basis of Isaiah's first great vision:

In the year that king Ozias died, I saw the Lord sitting upon a throne high and elevated: and his train filled the temple. Upon it stood the seraphims: the one had six wings, and the other had six wings: with two they covered his face, and with two they covered his feet and with two they flew. And they cried one to another, and said 'Holy, Holy, Holy, the Lord God of hosts, all the earth is full of his glory.'[2]

St Jerome's commentary on 'in medio duorum animalium' builds on these passages; but it particularly stresses the way in which they have been fulfilled and superseded under the New Law, in which God's body is no longer veiled, but has been revealed and recognised through the testimony of the Son and of the Spirit:

Vel certe admiratione turbatus, in laudes tuas trepidus erumpo, dicens: *In medio duorum animalium cognosceris*. Quod multi putant de Filio intellegi, et Spiritu sancto, eo quod Pater per Filium intellegatur et Spiritum. Quae quidem et duo seraphim in Esaia, et duo Cherubim, scribi interpretantur in Exodo, quae contra se respiciunt, et in medio habent oraculum; et in Esaia uelantia caput et pedes Domini, in praesenti tantum saeculo uolent, et alter ad alterum mysterium inclament Trinitatis, et mittatur unus de Seraphim, quod interpretatur ardens, et ueniat in terram et mundet prophetae labia, et dicat: *Ignem ueni mittere super terram, et quam uolo ut ardeat* [Luke 12:49]. Hoc aestimant alii, et ad hanc interpretationem multis scripturarum utuntur testimoniis.[3]

Indeed, moved by awe, I burst out in fear in your praises, saying: *You will be known in the midst of two animals*. Many think this is to be understood as referring to the Son and the Holy Spirit, because the Father is known through the Son and the Spirit. They interpret it as referring to the two seraphim in Isaiah, and the two cherubim in Exodus, who look towards each other, and have the oracle in their midst. And [these

[1] Exodus 25:18–22. In this passage the term 'the propitiatory' or 'the oracle' refers to the covering of the ark, the 'mercy seat', on which Jahweh was supposed to sit on the wings of the cherubim, with the ark for his footstool.

[2] Isaiah 6:1–3. In this passage the Vulgate envisages the seraphim as covering God's face and feet (not, as modern versions usually translate, their own bodies) with their wings.

[3] *CC*, LXXVIA (1970) 620–1.

interpreters point out that] in Isaiah the head and the feet of the Lord are veiled; but that in the present age [the seraphim] are in flight, and that one calls out aloud to the other the mystery of the Trinity. And [they point out that] one of the seraphim (a name which means 'burning'), is sent and comes on earth, and cleanses the lips of the prophet, saying 'I have come to cast fire on the earth; and how I wish that it were kindled!' [Luke 12:49]. Others hold this view, and adduce many scriptural passages to support this interpretation.

Jerome then goes on to give the popular interpretation (Christ on the cross between two thieves). It is clear that for Jerome the various contexts within which the phrase can be understood are not randomly chosen or mutually exclusive: his final interpretation brings to completion the other passages which, as it were, foreshadowed it. Having surveyed the prefigurations of God's presence among men in the Old Testament, Jerome ends with its fulfilment after Pentecost. We have already quoted the end of his commentary, where he sees the phrase as referring to Christ known, in the life of the Church, through the Old and New Testaments, 'which may be said to be truly life-giving and full of life, to breathe [the Spirit], and in the midst of which the Lord is to be known' (see above, p. 11).

I do not wish to argue that the Monasterboice sculptors were necessarily familiar with Jerome's commentary on 'in medio duorum animalium'. They may well have been;[1] but it is equally possible that they created their image independently of Jerome, and that Jerome's long commentary is useful, not as a direct source for the panel, but as a guide to the scriptural materials which any monastic patron would be apt to associate with the verse from Habbakuk. On the house-cap, Christ seems to be flanked by two angels, who are reminiscent of the cherubim of Exodus 25. But, under the new law, these cherubim are made to recognise (not to veil) God's body. They do not look towards each other, but towards the spectator, inviting him to 'recognise him in the midst of two animals'. The codices they hold may be intended to represent the Old and New Testaments, which Christ has fulfilled and in which he is to be known.

The image on the west side of the capstone of Muiredach's cross is reminiscent of that created (by having Paul and Anthony contemplate codices) at Nigg, or of the cross-slab at Aberlemno in Scotland, where a decorated cross is adored by two angels (one on each side), each with a book open in its hands.[2] If the objects which hang from the arms of the seated Saints Paul and

[1] Fr. Martin McNamara, who is editing the 'Irish Reference Bible' has, in conversation, kindly confirmed Bischoff's observation (1976, 100) that the compiler of that work drew on Jerome for the minor prophets.

[2] See Allen and Anderson 1903, 214 and figure 228A (Aberlemno No. 3); I. Henderson 1967, 157 and Plate 58.

Anthony on the South Cross at Kells (vii and Plate IX) are indeed book-satchels, as Ann Hamlin has suggested, then the Kells sculptors may likewise have intended their 'Paul and Anthony' scene to emphasise that Christ was to be known in the rumination of scripture as in the breaking of bread. As we have seen, the act of breaking (eucharistic) bread was in medieval exegesis closely associated with the process of coming to know the spiritual meaning of scripture.[1] The relevance of such scenes to the Ruthwell Cross, on which Paul and Anthony breaking the bread are juxtaposed to the beasts who '*cognoverunt* in deserto Salvatorem mundi', is evident.

We have already argued that on the Monasterboice house-cap the scene of Christ between two angels was primarily eschatological, reminding the onlooker that Christ would on the Last Day be recognised by 'every eye' and by them also 'that pierced him' (Apocalypse 1:7). There is nothing contradictory in the idea that the panel should be at once a eucharistic revelation of Christ 'between two animals' and a scene in which Christ's pierced body appears as a judgment on those who caused his sufferings. In the earliest and most authoritative commentary on the eucharist, St Paul had warned that the eucharist, in which 'you shall shew the death of the Lord until he come' (I Cor. 11:26), would bring judgment upon those who unworthily partook of it 'not discerning the body of the Lord [non diiudicans corpus Domini]' (I Cor. 11:29).

A similar concern with the last things seems to be reflected in the fourth (south) side of the Monasterboice house-cap. This panel has been interpreted convincingly as Christ's entry into Jerusalem. But Christ himself triumphantly carries a book in this panel, and he not merely rides into Jerusalem but rides between the gables of the capstone 'temple'. As I shall argue fully in another paper, the scene seems not merely to represent the events of Palm Sunday, but also to look forward to the final union between Christ and the Church when the scriptures have been fulfilled, at the end of time (Apocalypse, chapters 21–22).

It would seem from the context which the patron of Muiredach's cross provided for its 'Paul and Anthony' panel that he saw the eucharist in a perspective very similar to that of the person who, well over a century earlier, had designed the Ruthwell cross. On both crosses the meeting of Paul and Anthony is juxtaposed to a panel which seems intended to recall the text 'in

[1] See Bede's interpretation of the crumbs eaten by dogs, cited above, p. 12; also the Irish *Expositio Quatuor Evangeliorum* on Matthew 14:19: '*fregit*, id est, historiam legis expressit in spiritalem sensum, et apparuit intellectus' – *PL* 30:571; and the comments on 'fregit panes' (Mark 6:41 and parallels) in the other medieval commentaries cited above, p. 17, note 2. For a full discussion of this *topos*, see Spitz 1972, 79–88.

medio duorum animalium innotesceris'; and through both juxtapositions the same theme is developed: that in the eucharistic breaking of bread Christ is to be recognised. On both crosses the juxtaposed panels are placed firmly in an eschatological context. In this way, the celebration of the eucharist is presented on both crosses as an act performed 'until he come [donec veniat]': as a preparation for Christ's final revelation of himself on the Last Day as 'iudex aequitatis'. Both the Ruthwell and the Monasterboice patrons would seem to have understood the eucharist in a similar way to the Irish scribe Moelcaich, who added to the formula of consecration in the Stowe Missal the following expanded paraphrase of I Corinthians 11:26:

in mei memoriam faciatis passionem meam predicabitis resurrectionem adnuntiabitis aduentum meum sperabitis donec iterum ueniam ad uos de celis (Warner 1906–15, i, fol. 28r-v; ii, p. 13).

You should do this in my memory; you will proclaim my Passion; you will announce my resurrection; you will hope for my coming, until I come to you again from the heavens.

LITERARY SOURCES. THE REWORKING OF THE 'PAUL AND ANTHONY' SCENE IN THE 'NAVIGATIO SANCTI BRENDANI'

Why were 'Paul and Anthony' panels so popular in Ireland and in Scotland, while they do not appear on surviving Anglo-Saxon monuments apart from Ruthwell? It is tempting to point to the evidence for a rite of *co-fractio* at Iona (see above, p. 3), and to suggest that this rite is referred to in all the 'Paul and Anthony' panels. But I have not come across any Irish literary source which connects the saints to a rite of *co-fractio*. A seventh-century Irish poem attributed with some likelihood to Adomnán refers to the meeting of the two saints, but does not mention the *co-fractio*:

7. Fil and sírchriss senPhóil déin
a díthrub co mbúaid
fo-úair Antón – inmain cléir –
isind úaim-sin úair.

There is the lengthy belt of vigorous old Paul from the wonderful desert, whom Anthony, beloved of the clerics, found one time in that cave.[1]

[1] Carney 1983, 33. On the detail of the long belt, see the note to this stanza by Carney, 38, referred to below, p. 39.

When the saints are mentioned in Irish sources, it is primarily as the exemplars and prototypes of the eremitic life, and hence of monasticism. Thus the Life of St Columcille in the Book of Lismore gives the monastic life as the first way by which men are summoned to knowledge of God; and the monastic vocation is described as 'the urging and kindling of men by the divine grace to serve the Lord after the manner of Paul, and of Anthony the monk, and of the other faithful monks who used to serve God in Egypt'.[1] In the Stowe Missal, likewise, Paul and Anthony are named as the exemplars of the eremitic life[2]. Saints Paul and Anthony seem to have been popular in Celtic lands because the Irish, and their Scottish settlements, revered them as prototypes of monasticism. For Anglo-Saxon monks, St Benedict of Nursia would usually have occupied this position of pre-eminent reverence. Wandering anchorites who met, however providentially, in the desert could not be honoured with unqualified reverence by communities founded on a vow of 'stabilitas loci'. For later Anglo-Saxon homilists, 'instability of place and wandering from place to place' ('unstaðolfæstnes stowe ond worung of stowe to stowe'[3]) was a product of *sleacnes* (sloth), one of the eight capital sins. It is therefore significant that Ruthwell, the only Anglo-Saxon community to represent Paul and Anthony on a surviving monument, should be situated close to Celtic Scotland.

Of the extant Irish references to the 'Paul and Anthony' legend, the *Navigatio Sancti Brendani* is the most interesting for the present argument. In chapter xxvi of the *Navigatio*, St Brendan and his monks visit a figure called 'Paul the Spiritual Hermit' ('Paulum eremitam spiritalem') who dwells alone on a circular island which consists entirely of rock. Carl Selmer, the editor of the *Navigatio*, is surely wrong simply to identify this figure with St Paul the First Hermit (1959, 91, note 92).[4] All of the life of this thoroughly Irish 'spiritual hermit' is clearly accounted for in the text, which thus goes out of its way to emphasise that he is a different figure from the famous Egyptian saint. Chapter xxvi of the *Navigatio* is in fact an imaginative reworking of the meeting of Paul and Anthony in the *Vita Sancti Pauli*. But the way in which the *Vita* is reworked provides evidence of how one Irish author understood the *Vita*; and the popularity of the *Navigatio* is evidence that this development

[1] Whitley Stokes 1890, 168–9, quoted in Porter 1931, 86.
[2] Warner 1906–15, ii, 15, quoted by Hamlin 1982, 71.
[3] Vercelli Homily XX, line 86, ed. Szarmach, 1981, 79; its source is Alcuin's *De Virtutibus et Vitiis*.
[4] The relation between this episode of the *Navigatio* and its source in the *Vita Sancti Pauli* is treated with more sophistication by Orlandi 1968, 110–13.

of the *Vita* was appreciated and valued in the ninth century, not only in Ireland, but in Europe.[1] Therefore, the themes developed in Chapter xxvi of the *Navigatio* provide evidence of the reception and interpretation of the meeting of Paul and Anthony in ninth-century Ireland.

Paul the Irish hermit grew up in 'St Patrick's monastery', and lived there until he was fifty. Then St Patrick (who had just died) appeared to him, and instructed him to set sail in a boat which brought him miraculously to the circular island. For thirty years he was fed on the island by an otter which brought him a fish, and firewood to cook it with, every three days. After thirty years on the little island, he came upon a feature of the landscape which St Brendan also sees when he first lands:

> two caves, the entrance of one facing the entrance of the other [duas speluncas, ostium contra ostium], on the side of the island facing east [contra ortum solis]. He also saw a minuscule spring, round like a plate [in modum patule], flowing from the rock before the entrance to the cave where the soldier of Christ lived. When this spring overflowed, the rock immediately absorbed the water.[2]

As the island is about two hundred yards in circumference,[3] it is clearly not just by chance that Paul the Spiritual Hermit stumbles upon the caves and spring after thirty years. They only become present to him when he has progressed so far in the spiritual life that he can recognise and use them. He now lives for sixty years entirely from the miraculously-revealed spring, without any other food: the otter, having done its work, appears no more. When St Brendan visits him, Paul is 140 years old, of which 90 years have been spent on the round rock.

We clearly have here, not another version of the life of St Paul the First Hermit, but a different figure, set in a new landscape which develops in an original way the themes of the desert scene in the *Vita Sancti Pauli*. This Irish Spiritual Hermit inhabits a landscape which is entirely symbolic; and its symbolism is primarily eucharistic. We have already seen the eucharistic significance of the symbol 'fish' (above, p. 17). The eucharistic significance of water that is miraculously given from a rock is equally central to Christian tradition. St Paul's gloss on the 'wandering rock' which accompanied the Israelites in the desert, 'petra autem erat Christus' is relevant to the island-rock which sustains this Spiritual Hermit.[4] The fact that the rock-island is

[1] In taking the text to be of Irish origin, and of the early ninth century, I follow O'Meara 1978, p. x.
[2] O'Meara 1978, 62; Selmer 1959, 71–2.
[3] 'Erat autem parua et nimis rotunda illa insula quasi unius stadii:' Selmer 1959, 71; cf. O'Meara 1978, 61.
[4] I Corinthians 10:1–4; in his use of the spring as an image for Christ's giving of himself as

circular, like all the loaves represented in 'Paul and Anthony' scenes, reinforces this eucharistic symbolism; and indeed it may also be significant that, like the loaf on the Nigg stone, the circular island seems to have a segment missing on one side. This break in the rock allows St Brendan and his companions to beach their boat on the island, which is otherwise impossible to land on, as it is as high as it is broad.[1] The island also, like the other eucharistic symbols we have examined, has eschatological dimensions: although round (like a eucharistic loaf) it is also, like the heavenly Jerusalem, as high as it is broad (Apocalypse 21:16). As Selmer points out (1959, 91 note 94), St Brendan's visit to this hermit is clearly intended to recall St Anthony's famous visit to the Egyptian St Paul the Hermit; but the author of the *Navigatio* has created a figure who, as we shall see, has progressed even further in the spiritual life than his Egyptian namesake.

John O'Meara has written of the 'discreet and charming allegory' to be found in the *Navigatio* (1978, p. xviii). In the present scene, this quality is perhaps best exemplified in the two caves, facing each other, on either side of the eucharistic spring. Although this detail appears puzzling and arbitrary at first, it contributes to the scene an important liturgical reminiscence. The two caves are mentioned just before the meeting of St Brendan and the spiritual hermit, which is then described as follows:

> Sanctus uero Brendanus cum appropinquasset ad ostium spelunce unius, de altera egressus est senex foras obviam sibi, dicens: 'Ecce quam bonum et quam iocundum habitare fratres in unum' (Selmer 1959, 72).
>
> When Saint Brendan had come near [the mouth of] one of the caves, the elder came out to meet him from the other, saying: 'How good and joyful it is that brothers live together' (O'Meara 1978, 62).

By giving the reader a clear picture of the spatial relationship of the two caves to each other and to the miraculous spring, the author unobtrusively presents the meeting of the two hermits as a symbolic tableau. The hermits are made to greet each other when each is standing in front of a cave; they face each other on either side of the miraculous spring. Paul's greeting of St Brendan is particularly appropriate for the encounter of two monks. He quotes

drink, the author of the *Navigatio* is probably thinking also of such texts as John 7:37–8 and John 19:34.

[1] 'inuenerunt portum strictum ita ut proram nauicule uix capere potuisset, et ascensum difficillimum ad ascendendum:' Selmer 1959, 71. We seem here also to have a punning reference (*portum/portam*) to the 'narrow gate' ('angustam portam') of Matthew 7:13 and Luke 13:24.

the first verse of Psalm 132, a psalm commonly seen as celebrating the fraternal unity that should reign in a monastic community.[1] Such a tableau seems designed, in its turn, to suggest that in the spring, which this tableau places 'in medio duorum animalium', the reader is to recognise Christ. The spiritual hermit lives in one of the caves, while St Brendan stands in front of the other. This is perfectly fitting: like other desert animals, hermits usually live in caves.

The point of all this eucharistic imagery is made clear at the end of the chapter, when Paul gives St Brendan and his companions water from the spring as their sole sustenance for their next voyage of forty days. The voyage ends on Holy Saturday (Selmer 1959, 76), and is therefore coterminous with Lent. The meeting between St Brendan and Paul the Spiritual Hermit must have taken place on or very near the first Sunday in Lent.[2] This temporal reference provides a vital clue to the way in which the author of the *Navigatio* has transformed the imagery of the *Vita Sancti Pauli*. Both Paul the Spiritual Hermit (for sixty years) and St Brendan and his companions (for Lent) are enabled to realise in their lives the scriptural truth that 'not in bread alone doth man live, but in every word that proceedeth from the mouth of God' (Matthew 4:4). This verse comes from St Matthew's account of Christ's victory over the devil in the desert: and that very lection (Matthew 4:1–11) was read at mass on the first Sunday in Lent.[3] The gospel reading for the first Sunday in Lent, in telling of Christ's sojourn for forty days in the desert, epitomised the devotional atmosphere of the whole lenten season. The Spiritual Hermit (and, following him, St Brendan and his companions) has needed no other food but Christ, the Word, in his anchorage. He can justly be seen as having progressed even further in the *vita theorica* than the Egyptian St Paul 'the first hermit' had.[4]

In this symbolic landscape, images of food and drink are used as precise equivalents of the stages in the spiritual life reached by those who partake of the food and drink. It is significant that for the first thirty years the otter brings Paul the Spiritual Hermit a fish (with kindling to cook it) every third

[1] St. Augustine indeed saw the psalm as having 'begotten' monasteries: 'Ista enim uerba psalterii, iste dulce sonus, ista suauis melodia tam in cantico quam in intellectu, etiam monasteria peperit.' – *Enarrationes in psalmos*, *CC*, XL, p. 1927; cf. Stokes and Strachan 1901–3, i 467.

[2] Easter Sunday falls six weeks, forty-two days, after the first Sunday in Lent. Brendan's lenten voyage ends on the day before Easter. Thus it apparently begins on the day after the first Sunday, and certainly on a day well within its octave.

[3] For full discussion of the uses of the lection, see Farrell 1978, 107–8, and Ó Carragáin 1986, p. 382, n. 15.

[4] For the *vita theorica*, see the seventh-century Irish *Expositio IV Evangeliorum*: 'theorica [vita] id est contemplativa' – *PL* 30:544B; and Leclercq 1961, 80–144.

day, and always at the ninth hour. The third day recalls the resurrection; and after his resurrection, Christ had himself cooked a fish by the sea of Galilee, so that his disciples could eat with him (John 21:9). The ninth hour was the traditional hour of Christ's death on the Cross. Because of this, during seasons of fasting mass was celebrated after the office of none. The faithful were required during those seasons not to break their fast until after the nonetide mass.[1] For a monastic audience alive to scriptural echoes, the miraculous cooked fish would have symbolised the hermit's dependence on what Christ through his death had provided to sustain him. After thirty years, the hermit can discern the spring which flows from between the two caves (the tradition which associates the 'two animals' with the Old and New Testaments seems relevant here, when seen in the perspective of the monastic tradition that monks should ruminate on scripture like 'clean animals').[2] Paul has now finally become a truly spiritual hermit: he has proceeded so far that he not merely lives on the rock, but is sustained entirely by water that springs from the rock. At this stage Paul the Spiritual Hermit is presented as being both grounded on and entirely nourished from the rock 'which was Christ'.

The *Vita Sancti Pauli* had expressed the theme of dependence on Christ by the image of heaven-sent bread. The author of the *Navigatio* had himself used the image of heaven-sent bread in chapter xii; there we were told of a monastic community in which each monk miraculously received a half-loaf every day, but a full loaf on Sundays and feast-days. Double rations were provided for all on the day St. Brendan and his companions arrived. There, the allusion to the *Vita Sancti Pauli* was direct and uncomplicated.[3] In contrast, in chapter xxvi the author omits all reference to the breaking of bread, heaven-sent or otherwise; instead he substitutes alternative scriptural symbols for the way in which Christ sustains the Christian's life. The key to the author's procedure is to be found in the references in the *Navigatio* to time, and in particular to liturgical seasons. Liturgical time, and liturgical ceremonies (in particular, scenes in which the eucharist is received), are central structural motifs in the *Navigatio*.[4] In chapters xxiv-xxv, Saint Brendan and his companions, now on the seventh year of their pilgrimage, were given visionary reminders of hell: they saw one of their number taken away by demons

[1] This regulation would seem to have provided a strong motive for the anticipation, in various European vernaculars, of the 'ninth hour' into 'noon' or its equivalents! See Dekkers 1955 (on the anticipation of this mass to noon or even earlier, pp. 109, 128); see also *OED* under 'Noon', *sb.*, 2.

[2] See above, p. 12, in particular Caedmon who, instructed by the monks of Whitby, retires to his cell and meditates at night; for a dark chamber as an aid to inspiration in Irish tradition, see Ó Coileáin 1978, 177–8.

[3] Selmer 1959, 32, and note 46 on p. 88; O'Meara 1978, 28.

[4] A point well made by Cynthia Bourgeault (1983, 114).

(chapter xxiv), and came across Judas on his naked rock (chapter xxv). Chapter xxvi is an important turning-point in the story. These grim warnings are now over, and the pilgrims enter on the final phase of their spiritual journey. The Lent which begins when they meet Paul the Spiritual Hermit will prepare them for the final Easter of their seven-year pilgrimage (chapter xxvii), and for reaching the Promised Land of the Saints (which they will attain forty days after the octave of Pentecost, chapter xxviii). In chapter xxvi, the themes of the eucharist, and of union with Christ, are restated, in contrast to the grim images of chapters xxiv-xxv; but they are restated in a lenten setting, and in a way which emphasises how far the pilgrims have travelled, during their seven-year voyage, from ordinary communal monastic experience. In this chapter, therefore, the pilgrims are made to meet a contemplative hero who, voluntarily marooned on a naked rock, has come to discern in that very rock the presence of Christ, and so has even gained from it his sustenance ('panem nostram supersubstantialem' – Matthew 6:11). His fidelity as hermit has been rewarded by water from the rock; this contrasts with the despair of Judas, wretched on *his* rock, in the previous chapter. What for Judas is merely a miserable respite from the worse pains of hell, has become for Paul a revelation of his closeness to Christ, and thus a foretaste of heaven. Paul the Spiritual Hermit is given some of the attributes of Moses: he tells St Brendan and his companions of the promised land which he will not see himself, and provides them with water from the rock for their lenten voyage on the sea-'desert'. The wit of the *Navigatio* depends on an unobtrusive mastery of paradox: the author demonstrates that the famous scene of the meeting of Saints Paul and Anthony can be re-enacted, not with bread alone, but with other images of how man is fed by God's word. He transforms the famous scene in the *Vita* in such a way as to suggest that fasting gives sustenance to the spirit, and that the contemplative vocation (the *vita theorica*) can provide fulfilment even on stony ground.

The details of chapter xxvi of the *Navigatio* can thus be seen to interact, as it were in a form of counterpoint, with the corresponding details in the *Vita Sancti Pauli*; and it can be seen that to appreciate the sophisticated virtuosity of the *Navigatio* it is necessary to have some recollection of the *Vita*. No doubt the author of the *Navigatio* felt he could depend on his monastic readership for such a recollection. In the scene in which St Brendan meets Paul the Spiritual Hermit, the author clearly was just as preoccupied with the eucharistic themes of the recognition of and union with Christ as Jerome had been in the *Vita Sancti Pauli*. The *Navigatio* therefore provides strong confirmatory evidence that for Irish audiences the meeting of St Paul and St Anthony had primarily a eucharistic significance. The way in which Paul the Spiritual Hermit is made to greet St Brendan with the verse 'ecce quam

bonum et quam iocundum habitare fratres in unum' suggests that the author of the *Navigatio* is making explicit another theme which he saw Jerome's account of the meeting of Paul and Anthony to imply: that friendship and community could, miraculously, be found even in the desert. This theme may also be relevant to the 'Paul and Anthony' panels on the high crosses, those monastic scenes of courteous friendship which the sculptors consistently placed in eucharistic contexts.

CONCLUSIONS: THE RUTHWELL 'PAUL AND ANTHONY' PANEL IN THE CONTEXT OF A CONSISTENT THEOLOGICAL TRADITION

The present study has argued that a wide range of sculptors, and the author of the *Navigatio*, all saw the meeting of Paul and Anthony in the context of a single theological theme: the recognition of Christ in the eucharist. An index of how consistently the 'Paul and Anthony' scene was interpreted in the period is the frequency with which, in various different areas, the scene seems to have been associated with reminiscences of the phrase 'in medio duorum animalium innotesceris' from the canticle of Habbakuk.[1] In addition, the ways in which monastic sculptors, and a monastic author, alluded to this liturgical phrase suggests how close was the interpenetration of literary and visual traditions in this period. On the crosses, panels are designed or juxtaposed in such a way as to suggest to the onlooker a verbal reminiscence of the canticle; while the author of the *Navigatio*, in order to suggest the same verbal reminiscence, arranges the meeting of St Brendan and Paul the Spiritual Hermit as a visual tableau. A visual analogue for the detail of the miraculous spring 'round like a plate [in modum patule]' in the *Navigatio* (see p. 33 above) is provided by the many representations of Paul and Anthony on the high crosses, holding between them a loaf which is also round 'in modum patule'. Both literature and the visual arts in this period draw on, and are to be understood within, the liturgical life of the monasteries which produced patrons, writers, scribes and sculptors. But liturgical performance itself depended on a fusion of literary and visual modes. It was semi-dramatic: in it, memorised texts were communally sung to the accompaniment of symbolic actions. Liturgical performance must quite naturally have nourished imaginations which associated scriptural texts with symbolic actions, and which visualized scenes so as to call to mind scriptural and liturgical texts.

[1] The Canticle of Habbakuk seems also to have influenced other scenes: for example, the development of the crucifixion-scene in insular art; and scenes where Christ is flanked by two figures (as in the representations of the 'Temptation' and the 'Arrest' of Christ, in the Book of Kells). Dr Jennifer O'Reilly and I hope to explore this complicated matter in further studies.

Despite the theological consistency of the tradition, the present survey also makes it clear that the Ruthwell representation of the two saints is in some respects unique. Ruthwell is the only panel provided with an inscription. It is the only panel where the saints break bread without the bird being present, and so it is of particular interest that the Ruthwell inscription directs our attention to the breaking of bread, not to the preceding miracle of the raven. Arthur Kingsley Porter attributed this difference between the Ruthwell scene, on the one hand, and the Irish panels, on the other, to a difference between the various versions of the life of St Paul. Only St Jerome's Latin *Vita Sancti Pauli* has the incident of the 'contest in courtesy': when the raven brings the bread, St Paul insists that St Anthony, as his visitor, should have the honour of breaking the loaf, while St Anthony retorts that the honour belongs to St Paul, as the senior ('Paulus more cogebat hospitii, Antonius jure refellebat aetatis' – *PL* 23:26A). This saintly argument is resolved by the saints each grasping one end of the loaf and breaking it together. Kingsley Porter pointed out that this episode 'is not found either in the earlier Greek life of Saint Paul, or in the life of Saint Anthony written originally in Greek by Athanasius and translated into Latin by Evagrius'.[1] Thus, following Porter, Françoise Henry (1933, 133) attributed the universal presence of the bird in the Irish 'Paul and Anthony' panels to the use in Ireland of versions of the life of St Paul which were older than St Jerome's *Vita*: 'En Irlande ... il n'est généralement pas question du partage du pain. ... Habituellement, les sculpteurs irlandais se conformant aux plus anciens textes, ne représentent que le premier épisode'. Irish readers seem indeed to have known more than one version of the meeting of St Anthony and St Paul.[2] But it seems unlikely that only Greek versions of the life of St Paul were read in Ireland, or that St Jerome's Latin *Vita* was only read in Northumbria. In fact, it is by no means clear that the presence of the bird, in panels where the saints also grasp the bread, must exclude a reference to the 'contest in courtesy' which led to the breaking of the bread. Isabel Henderson has pointed out (1967, 148) that on St Vigeans 7 'a line drawn through the loaf indicates that the bread is about to break but the raven ... holds it in his beak, providing a neat conflation of the sequence of events'. Two Irish sculptors – at Bantry (iii) and at Monasterboice (ix) – conflated the miraculous feeding by the raven and the *co-fractio* of the loaf by the saints in precisely the same way as the St Vigeans sculptor did. Meyer Schapiro argued that even the Irish sculptors who did not represent the bread as broken nevertheless intended to conflate the miracle of the raven with the breaking of the bread.[3] It should also be remembered that al-

[1] Porter 1931, 85; cf. Porter 1929, pp. 25, 31 and 38.

[2] Carney (1983, 38) traces the detail of 'the lengthy belt of the vigorous old Paul' in the poem quoted above (p. 33) to a description of the meeting in the fifth-century Greek *Lausiac History of Palladius*.

[3] Schapiro 1944, 239 note 64.

though the bread is clearly represented as broken on only two of the Irish panels, many of the Irish crosses are badly weathered: it is dangerous to lay too much weight on the absence of such a detail, in the case of monuments which have endured more than a millennium of Irish rain.

The absence of the bird at Ruthwell is probably best explained, not by arguing as did Kingsley Porter that the Anglo-Saxons and the Irish had different literary sources for the scene, but by attending to the specific context which the Ruthwell sculptors provided for their 'Paul and Anthony' panel. The Ruthwell patron apparently wished to emphasise the theme of 'recognition': he had his sculptors juxtapose two animals whose upraised paws show their recognition of Christ, to two saints who recognise Christ in the breaking of bread. The introduction of a raven would have brought in a new idea, and interfered with the visual and thematic parallel between the 'Paul and Anthony' panel and the panel above it. The Ruthwell patron may also have instructed his sculptors to concentrate exclusively on the breaking of bread, in order to establish a clear thematic link between Paul and Anthony, engaged in the liturgical rite of *co-fractio*, and the 'John the Baptist' panel, immediately above 'Christ over the Beasts'. The Baptist's greeting of Christ as the Agnus Dei had recently been introduced into the Roman mass to accompany the act of breaking the bread for communion (see above, p. 3). The 'Paul and Anthony' panel and the 'Agnus Dei' panel seem to refer to precisely the same moment of the mass. They may together provide evidence of how the mass was celebrated at Ruthwell when the cross was erected.

Dom Louis Gougaud (1909, 353 and 361) warned against assuming that the Iona rite of *co-fractio* – in which two priests broke the bread between them for the communion at mass – was widely practised in Celtic lands. His cautious attitude to this question is confirmed by the present argument: the 'Paul and Anthony' panels, which might at first sight be adduced as evidence that *co-fractio* was widely practised in Ireland, can now be seen to reflect a richer and wider tradition of eucharistic symbolism. Three linked ideas seem basic to this symbolic tradition: (a) that the eucharistic bread is sent from heaven; (b) that in the breaking of bread in the mass Christ is to be recognised; and (c) that Christ is to be recognised 'in medio duorum animalium' (whether the word *animalia* is recalled through symbolic animals, through books representing the Old and New Testaments, through angels representing the cherubim and seraphim, or through priest-monks representing the monastic community itself). If this tradition was widely known, then the Iona rite of *co-fractio* may well have been simply another offshoot of it, as were the 'Paul and Anthony' panels. The *co-fractio* rite and the 'Paul and Anthony' panels may not have inspired each other: they may be independent manifestations of a

widely-known theological tradition. If so, 'Paul and Anthony' panels do not provide evidence that a particular monastic community which commissioned a panel necessarily embodied their awareness of the common tradition in the liturgical rite of *co-fractio*. The Iona community did so, and thus clearly participated in the common tradition; but we cannot be certain that other monasteries, who knew the tradition, embodied it in the same liturgical act. Only at Ruthwell is there some independent evidence that the sculptors may have been thinking directly in terms of liturgical actions: they seem to have wanted to establish a link between their 'Paul and Anthony' panel and their 'Agnus Dei' panel. Only there can we suggest with some confidence that the sculptors wished to allude directly to the Iona rite as well as to the Roman 'Agnus Dei' chant. It is not unlikely, though it is by no means certain, that the Ruthwell community enacted the breaking of bread for communion as a *co-fractio* in the Iona manner; it is certainly likely that they sang the 'Agnus Dei' chant at the breaking of bread.

In the episode in which he describes the Iona rite of *co-fractio*, Adomnán himself provides an excellent example of the way in which the semi-dramatic and symbolic actions of the liturgy could be used for literary purposes. Adomnán uses the Iona rite of *co-fractio* as the setting for a story which is just as much a contest in courtesy as was the meeting of Paul and Anthony in Jerome's *Vita*. Indeed it seems likely that Adomnán here intended his readers to recall the visit of St Anthony to St Paul, and to see in the action of St Columba a significant variant of the courteous contest recorded by Jerome. A bishop from Munster, visiting Iona, seeks in humility to conceal his rank; when celebrating mass for the community, he invites Columba to break the bread together with him, as though he, like Columba, were simply a priest. Columba, however, recognises the dignity of the bishop, and insists that he have the honour, due to his rank, of breaking the loaf alone.[1] Adomnán's story interacts with Jerome's in the same sort of imaginative counterpoint that we examined in chapter xxvi of the *Navigatio*. If Jerome told of a courteous contest which culminated in two saints breaking bread together, Adomnán describes an incident in which his hero Columba courteously avoided breaking bread with a visitor. To make a similar point to Jerome's, Adomnán recalls and reverses Jerome's story. In Adomnán's story, as in Jerome's, Christ is revealed by the actions of two holy monks, who have just met, at the breaking of bread. It is therefore interesting that the climax of Adomnán's story is the way in which the bishop recognises Christ in Columba, who has in humility avoided breaking bread with him. The episode in St Luke's gospel (24:30–35), of the pilgrim-disciples at Emmaus who recognise Christ in

[1] Anderson 1961, 304; see Ó Carragáin 1978, 136–7.

the breaking of bread, forms one thread in the contrapuntal pattern Adomnán is weaving here: it is significant that St. Luke, as well as Adomnán, speaks of pilgrimage ('tu solus peregrinus es', 24:18) and of a journey ('in via', 24:32). Jerome's account of the meeting of Paul and Anthony is another element in the pattern of reminiscences. But in his variation on the story, Adomnán develops further the idea of 'recognition'. He makes the whole Iona congregation participate in the miracle; they recognise and glorify God in the courteous exchange between the two holy men:

Quo audito sancti verbo humilis peregrinus valde stupefactus Christum in sancto veneratus est. Et qui inerant praesentes nimis ammirati glorificarunt deum (Anderson 1961, 304).

When he heard what the saint said, the humble pilgrim, very much astounded, revered Christ in the saint. And those present, filled with wonder, glorified God.

It is clear that for Adomnán the liturgical rite of *co-fractio* symbolised monastic harmony, based on courteous humility; it is also clear that the liturgical rite existed in his mind as a symbol that could be used imaginatively for literary purposes. Thus Adomnán's episode provides evidence of how the Iona community interpreted Jerome's episode. For the Iona monks the meeting of Paul and Anthony was apparently an important symbol. In the rite of *co-fractio*, they institutionalised the symbol as part of community life. Adomnán in his turn developed the symbol in an episode demonstrating the insight, and the humility, of the founder of the house. Through the episode he unobtrusively, but in a manner that his European monastic readership would have appreciated, presented Columba as having the virtues of St Paul the first hermit.[1] It is an index of the resonance of the 'Paul and Anthony' image for the Iona community that they should use it to beget fresh images, both in liturgy and in literature.

The close relationships between the liturgy and other cultural forms in this period gave to monastic art a confidence and urbanity it otherwise could hardly have possessed. Adomnán was able to use, as the setting of one of his episodes, a liturgical *consuetudo* perhaps peculiar to Iona, confident that his readers throughout Europe were experts in liturgical practice. He knew that, as professionals, they would be interested in such a liturgical variant. He also knew that they would appreciate that it was no barbarism, but showed that the Iona community was fully familiar with Jerome's monastic classic. Adomnán and his readers participated through the liturgy in a sophisticated

[1] On the audience for which Adomnán intended his *Vita*, see Picard 1982, 173–7.

international culture. They saw the *ordo Romanus* as the finest flower of Roman civilisation, as divinely ordained, and indeed as an image and foretaste of life in the court of heaven. It is surely from an awareness of this European culture that the visual and literary works we have examined get their confident readiness to transform older images in order to express new meanings. The way in which the 'Christ over the Beasts' panel on the Ruthwell cross converts the traditional illustrations of Psalm 90:13 to a new purpose, or in which the sculptors at Nigg, Moone, Kells and Monasterboice use visual puns and spatial relationships to encourage educated onlookers to recall a variety of scriptural passages, have their literary analogues in the way the author of the *Navigatio* and Adomnán both create new scenes, confident that their international readership will appreciate that these are variations on the famous scene in the *Vita Sancti Pauli*. Both in the best visual art of this monastic tradition and in its finest literature, we find an urbane and understated wit in the service of a profound and civilized spirituality. That modern scholars have been slow to appreciate monastic wit is due primarily to the understatement characteristic of the tradition, and perhaps also to the feeling, common in scholars, that what is serious and reverent should also be solemn.

The present survey confirms that on both sides of the Irish sea 'Paul and Anthony' panels were used as symbols of the eucharist. It also emphasises the consistency of this symbolic tradition in insular monuments from Ruthwell to Bantry. Irish monks would have been quick to appreciate the rich symbolism of the Ruthwell cross. It is an Irish liturgical compilation, the Stowe missal, which expresses most clearly the scriptural idea behind the Ruthwell 'Paul and Anthony' inscription: 'Cognoerunt dominum. alleluia. in fractione panis. alleluia' (see above, p. 6). Similarly, the way in which the Irish sculptors universally emphasised the importance of the heaven-sent raven in their 'Paul and Anthony' scenes seems to have much in common with the way in which the meeting of St Paul and St Anthony is summarised in *The Old English Martyrology*, a Mercian text dating from the ninth century. This does not mention how Paul and Anthony broke the bread, but says of St Paul:

ond þa æt nehstan fedde hine an hræfn sextig geara, se him brohte æghwelce dæge healfne hlaf: ond þa hwæne ær his ende com him to sanctus Antonius se ancra, ond þa sona brohte him se hræfn gehalne hlaf.
'At last he was fed sixty years by a raven who brought him half a loaf every day: a short time before his death St Anthony the hermit came to him, and immediately the raven brought him a whole loaf.'[1]

[1] Text and translation from Herzfeld 1900, 16–17; on the dating of the martyrology, see Kotzor 1981, i, 443–54.

In their pioneering studies, Arthur Kingsley Porter and Françoise Henry somewhat overemphasised the differences between the ways in which the Ruthwell sculptors on the one hand, and the Irish sculptors on the other, visualised the meeting of St Paul and St Anthony. Such differences as there are seem due, not to different sources or fundamentally different artistic or liturgical traditions, but to the different emphases that are to be expected within a rich tradition of theological symbolism. These differences of emphasis might be summed up by saying that, while the Ruthwell community emphasised what Jerome's scene owed to St Luke's account of the pilgrims at Emmaus, both the Irish crosses and *The Old English Martyrology* emphasise what Jerome owed to the 'Pater noster' (Matthew 6:11) and to the sixth chapter of St John's gospel:

> I am the living bread which came down from heaven. If any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever: and the bread that I will give is my flesh, for the life of the world (John 6:51–2).

Perhaps one reason for the popularity of the 'Paul and Anthony' scene, at Ruthwell and in Celtic lands alike, was that by placing the eucharist in a desert setting it epitomised the importance both of the eucharist and of the eremitic vocation. This desert miracle symbolised the vital role of the eucharist as *viaticum*: food for the exodus through the desert towards the 'visio pacis', the heavenly Jerusalem.[1] The 'Paul and Anthony' scenes presented the monastic vocation as a paradigm of faith: as a call to risk the desert in order to live on bread daily given from heaven, and in breaking that bread where two or three were gathered together, to know him (at once 'Agnus Dei,' 'salvatorem mundi' and 'iudex aequitatis') who gave *peregrini* life and the sight of peace.

[1] On the interpretation of the name 'Jerusalem' as 'visio pacis' or 'vision of peace' see Burlin 1968, 82–96; see also *DSp*, viii, cols 944–58, under 'Jérusalem céleste'.

APPENDIX

CHECKLIST OF THE IRISH REPRESENTATIONS OF THE MEETING OF SAINT PAUL AND SAINT ANTHONY

The bibliography of the individual crosses in this checklist is highly selective. It aims merely to indicate where the fullest descriptions and the best photographs of the 'Paul and Anthony' panels may conveniently be found. Sexton (1946) has a very full bibliography of the studies of each cross which had appeared by that date. My descriptions are based on a personal examination of all the definite 'Paul and Anthony' panels in Ireland [(i)-(x)], and of all the disputed ones [(xi)-(xv)] except Clonca (xii).

A. ACCEPTED IDENTIFICATIONS [(i)-(x)]

Ten panels on Irish high crosses have been identified with reasonable certainty as representing Paul and Anthony. They are, in alphabetical order:

(i) ARBOE, Co. Tyrone, south side (a narrow side of the cross), fourth panel from bottom (see Plate X).

Description: Badly weathered. The two saints are seen in profile, facing each other. It is not clear whether they are sitting or kneeling; it is unlikely that they are represented standing. If they are kneeling (which seems marginally more likely), this would be the only extant example of the saints in this position. The scrolled top of a crozier is visible above the head of each saint, as though the sculptors meant to imply that each saint was holding a crozier in the hand farthest from the spectator. The bird flies downward, holding a circular loaf in the air between the two croziers, above the heads of the saints. No sign that the bread was represented as broken can now be discerned.

Context on the south side of the cross: The lower panels on this side portray Old Testament scenes. Reading from the bottom of the cross, we have 1, Cain slaying Abel; 2, David overcoming the lion; 3, David slaying Goliath; 4, Paul and Anthony; 5, a band of decorative interlace (on the collar of the cross), and 6, a panel of formal designs just below the ring of the cross.

Published descriptions: Sexton 1946, 56–7; Roe 1956.

Published photographs: Porter 1931, fig. 138 (close-up); Henry 1933, Plate 68/2; Roe 1956, Plate II (south side).

(ii) ARMAGH, CROSS IN THE OLD CATHEDRAL, north side (a narrow side of the cross), third panel from bottom (See Plate XI):

Description: 'The Raven flies downward bearing the round bread. The saints appear to hold it with both hands and neither seems to have a staff' (Roe, 1955, 110). The saints are sitting in low-backed chairs, facing each other. The bird's wings are spread wide and swept gracefully backwards. There are various irregularities on the surface of the bread, but the whole panel is so damaged and pockmarked that it is impossible to tell whether the bread was represented as broken or not.

Context on the north side of the cross: reading upward from bottom, 1, the three children in the fiery furnace; 2, interlace pattern; 3, Paul and Anthony; 4, at the top of the fragmentary shaft, another abstract pattern.

Relevant details from other sides of the cross: for the panel on the east side of this fragmentary cross, which has been claimed to represent Paul and Anthony, see (xi) below.

Published descriptions: Sexton 1946, 61–3; Roe 1955, 110.

Published drawing and photograph: Henry 1933, 152, fig. 119 (drawing); Plate 63/1 (photograph).

(iii) BANTRY Co. Cork, KILNARUANE PILLAR STONE, north-western side, lowest panel (of four):

Description: The two saints are seated on very low seats with high backs. Each grasps the bread with one hand, breaking a piece off. The bread is clearly broken: the 'fragments' interrupt the circular outline of the loaf. The fissure in the loaf marking off the right-hand fragment is clearly visible in Hourihane's Plate II (1979); the fissure on the left, barely discernible in that plate, is much clearer on the pillar itself. Both fissures are wider and deeper than the cracks, due to weathering, which cover the stone. A small bird dives between the heads of the saints, and holds the loaf in its beak. It is represented in profile, with its head to the left and a claw to the right. Under the loaf and between the saints is an object shaped like a stubby 'T'. This object was identified by Henry (1933, 133) as a paten, on the analogy of the 'paten' (*recte* chalice, see above, p. 8) on the Nigg stone. This identification is unconvincing: the Nigg analogy is misleading, as the T-shaped object at Bantry is the wrong size and shape for either a paten or a chalice. The Hourihanes (1979, 67) more convincingly see it as a pedestalled table. However, there is no sign of the 'paten-like dish' on which the Hourihanes say the bread is resting: no object can be discerned below the loaf apart from the T-shaped table (this observation seems to be confirmed by the drawings in Henry [1933, 133, fig. 99] and Hourihane [1979, 66, fig. 1]). In discerning a paten, the Hourihanes seem to be influenced by Henry. But they seem not to have considered the validity of the parallel with the 'paten' at Nigg, on which Henry based her identification of the T-shaped object as a paten. Indeed, apparently misled by Henry's French text, they place Nigg in Spain and refer to it as 'from Iberia' (1979, 67). Ann Hamlin states (private communication) that she also has not been able to discern a paten between the bread and the table.

Context on the northwestern face of the pillar: Above the 'Paul and Anthony' panel we have (reading upwards): 2, a panel entirely taken up with a Greek cross; 3, an *orans*-figure; and 4, a panel in which a single-stranded ribbon interlace forms another (rather crudely shaped) cruciform design.

Published descriptions: Hourihane 1979, 67; Sexton 1946, 67.

Published drawings and photographs: Henry 1933, 133 fig. 99 (drawing); Hourihane 1979, fig. 1 (drawing); Plates II and IV (photographs).

(iv) CASTLEDERMOT, Co. Kildare, NORTH CROSS, east side, second panel from the bottom.

Description: The saints are standing facing one another, holding the bread between them. Each saint has one leg slightly advanced [compare (v)]. The bird is diving between their heads, with its wings close to its body [contrast south cross, (v)]; it holds the bread in its beak. There is no clear sign of breaking in the bread.

Context on the east side of the cross (reading upwards): 1, Two standing figures, unidentified; 2, Paul and Anthony; 3, 'part of the general subject of the head on this east side. ... Taken together with the other three panels which surround the central subject, the three figures on each of the four panels are together considered to represent the twelve Apostles' (Sexton 1946, 92–3). A crucifixion scene fills the intersection.

Relevant details from other sides of the cross: The miracle of the (five) loaves and (two) fishes is represented on the base of the south side of the cross.

Published description: M. Stokes 1898, 4; Sexton 1946, 91–3.

Published photographs: M. Stokes 1898, Plate [3]; Porter 1931, fig. 134 (close-up of panel); Sexton 1946, fig. 5 (shaft) and 6 (cross-head); Brandt-Fõrster 1978, Plate 23 (east side).

(v) CASTLEDERMOT, Co. Kildare, SOUTH CROSS, west side, fourth panel from bottom of the shaft (see Plate III above).

Description: The figures are standing, facing one another, each holding the bread in the hand nearest the spectator. Each standing figure has the leg nearest the onlooker bent and advanced, thus filling the lower part of the panel. This gives an impression of movement, and makes the panel seem animated, in contrast to the relatively static representation in (iv). The bird appears at the top of the panel: it dives, wings outstretched, between the heads of the saints, holding the bread in its beak.

Context on the south side of the cross (reading upwards from bottom): base of cross: 'a panel with two figures and several animals which may represent the animals being driven into the ark' (Henry 1964, 41 and Plate 22; see also Sexton 1946, 95 and fig. 7); 1, (lowest panel of the shaft) Daniel in the lion's den; 2, the temptation of St Anthony; 3, Adam and Eve under the tree; 4, Paul and Anthony; 5, badly broken: three human figures. This fifth panel comes at the intersection of the ring with the

cross shaft, where the shaft narrows. The panel should probably be seen as part of a Crucifixion tableau which occupies the centrepiece of the head (see, above, the east side of the north cross at Castledermot). Directly above the Crucifixion scene, at the head of the cross, there are two further panels each containing three figures; the upper panel of these possibly represents the arrest of Christ. Left arm, David playing a harp; right arm, the sacrifice of Isaac.

Relevant details from the other sides of the cross: The miracle of the (five) loaves and (two) fishes is represented on the base of the south side of this cross, as on the north cross [see (iv)].

Published descriptions: Sexton 1946, 94–6; Henry 1964, 41.

Published photographs: Stokes 1898, Plate [6]; Porter 1931, fig. 133 (close-up); Sexton 1946, fig. 7; Henry 1964, Plate 23; Henry 1967, Plates 65 and 66; Brandt-Förster 1978, Plate 19.

(vi) GALLOON, Co. Fermanagh, EAST CROSS SHAFT, west (broad) side, third panel from the bottom (top panel on the surviving shaft, which has a mortice-hole in its top, but lacks a head). See Plate XII.

Description: The saints are standing, dressed in short tunics, facing the onlooker. They hold the circular loaf between them at the height of their heads. There is no sign of breaking on the loaf. The right shoulder and the body of the figure on the left is turned slightly inwards. He holds the loaf in his right hand: his right arm is held across his body, and has been made much longer (particularly in the forearm) than the inner (right) arm of his companion, which also holds the loaf. The inner (left) arm of the figure on the left is held slightly out from his body. It holds an object at the level of his waist, but weathering has reduced this object to a small, unidentifiable protrusion. The presentation of the inward turn of the body is impressive, but the figure's right forearm is grotesquely long; and as the sculptors have not made it clear which arm passes behind the other, the two arms merge in an awkward 'X' pattern where they cross. The unusual posture given to the figure on the left was possibly motivated by a desire not to have him hold the loaf in the, less honourable, left hand. The bird is diving downwards, wings outstretched, its body above the heads of the saints; it holds the loaf in its beak. Lowry-Corry (1934, 169) says that the saint on the spectator's right 'seems to be holding a staff in his left hand'; but no sign remains of either the hand or the staff. It is perhaps possible that the surface of the right of the panel has deteriorated since 1934; but it is more likely that Lowry-Corry mistook part of the raised frame of the panel for a staff.

Context on the west side of the shaft (reading from bottom; following Lowry-Corry): 1, Adoration of the Magi (now quite unclear); 2, Baptism of Christ (still decipherable); 3, Paul and Anthony.

Published descriptions: Lowry-Corry 1934; Sexton 1946, 156–7.

Published photograph: Lowry-Corry 1934, Plate XIX(b) (close-up).

(vii) KELLS, Co. Meath, SOUTH CROSS (TOWER CROSS, or CROSS OF St PATRICK AND St COLUMBA), East side, right hand arm of cross (See Plate IV and Plate IX):

Description: 'The two saints are seated in high-backed chairs opposite each other. They wear long heavy garments with cowls (?). Each holds a crook-head staff and each raises his hand to lay hold on the bread – shown as a wafer – brought by the Raven, flying down from above' (Roe 1966, 14). No fissure to indicate that the bread is broken is discernible. Ann Hamlin (in a private communication) has pointed out that a hanging object, like a book-satchel, is suspended from each saint's arm (see Plate IX). Weathering has made it impossible to be certain now what these objects are, but the suggestion is plausible, and gains force from comparison with the Nigg stone, where Paul and Anthony contemplate codices.

Context on the east side of the cross (reading from the bottom): 1, interlace patterns; 2, Adam and Eve, juxtaposed to Cain killing Abel; 3, The Three Children in the fiery furnace; 4, Daniel in the lion's den; 5, centrepiece of intersection: 'The centre field of the crossing is treated as though rectangular in shape. On a sort of mat of fine single cord interlace, a circular device of seven large bossed spirals is placed' (Roe 1966, 14); 6, left arm: The sacrifice of Isaac; 7, Right arm: Paul and Anthony; 8, top of shaft: David as harpist juxtaposed to Christ feeding the multitude. Two fishes (crossed one upon another) placed between the feet of Christ and David (above) and the mat with seven bossed spirals (below).

Published descriptions: The fullest is Roe 1966. See also Sexton 1946, 182–7.

Published photographs: Porter 1931, fig. 136 (close-up; incorrectly titled 'west face'); Henry 1933, Plate 57; Roe 1966, Plate II (east side), Plate IV (west side) and Plate VI (north side); Henry 1964, Plate 26 (east side); Plate 27a (north side); Henry 1967, Plate 75 (east side); Brandt-Förster 1978, Plate 39 (east side), Plate 21 (west side).

(viii) KELLS, Co. Meath, MARKET CROSS, north (narrow) side, end of arm:

Description: (The cross now faces north and south instead of east and west; following Roe, I have indicated the probable original orientation of the cross rather than its present orientation.) 'The saints stand facing each other. Each holds a crozier and each lays hold on the bread brought by the raven flying down from above. ... Between their feet is a chalice whereby the Eucharistic significance of the subject is made fully explicit' (Roe 1966, 42–3). No fissure to indicate that the bread is broken is now discernible. The saints are dressed in elaborate robes: ankle-length garments, with clearly distinct knee-length cloaks on top. Each saint has one leg advanced, and their heads are turned to face the spectator. Their croziers are symmetrically crossed to form an 'X' pattern (on this detail, see above, p. 24).

Relevant details from elsewhere on the cross: The miracle at Cana and the miracle of the five loaves and fishes are depicted on the shaft of the west side of the cross,

under the Crucifixion which forms the centrepiece (see Roe 1966, 39 and Plate XI). On the east side, the centrepiece is Daniel among the (four) lions; on the left arm of the cross is the sacrifice of Isaac; the right arm (next to the 'Paul and Anthony' panel at the end of the arm) may depict the temptation of St Anthony (see Porter 1931, 123; Roe 1966, 30–1 and Plate VII). A kind of parody of this scene of 'man among monsters', in which the central figure itself is represented as a manlike monster, is represented on the shaft of the north (narrow) side, just under the roundel and the 'Paul and Anthony' panel. The sculptors may, like those at Moone [see (x) below], have wished to place the scene of the meeting of the saints in a context of desert monsters.

Published descriptions: The most detailed is Roe 1966; see also Sexton 1946, 176–81.

Published photographs: Porter 1931, fig. 137 (close-up of panel, incorrectly titled 'east side'); Henry 1933, Plate 72/3 (north side, incorrectly titled as south side); Roe 1966, Plate XI (west side); Plate XII (north side); Plate XIII (close-up of 'Paul and Anthony' panel); Henry 1964, Plate 32 (north side); Plate 31 (east side); Brandt-Förster 1978, Plate 16 (west side); fig. 24 (drawing of the loaves and fishes panel); Plate 12 (east side).

(ix) MONASTERBOICE, Co. Louth, SOUTH CROSS (MUIREDACH'S CROSS), north (narrow) side, gable end of house-cap (see Plates VI-VIII):

Description: 'The saints stand facing each other, holding their crook-headed staves crosswise. From above the raven descends with a large circular loaf in its beak. Each saint takes hold of the bread to break it between them. A chalice is set on the ground between them. ... Above the saints' heads the angle made by the gable timbers is filled by a bold motif of three great snakes whirling out from a raised boss made by their knotted tails' (Roe 1981, 35). The saints are dressed in calf-length robes each with a hem decorated with a row of raised circular knobs. Each saint has the foot farthest from the spectator advanced. They hold the loaf with the hands farthest from the spectator, and their staffs with the hands closest to the spectator. The iconography of this scene is close to that of (viii), except that the crozier-heads are turned with the opening of their scrolls downwards here, and upwards in (viii). Here, as in (viii), the heads of the saints are turned outwards towards the spectator. The tonsure of the figure on the right clearly differs from that of his companion. He has a shoulder-length hank of hair hanging behind his left ear, and curled at the end. The figure on the left has shorter hair. Both saints are clean-shaven. A clear thin vertical fissure denotes the breaking of the loaf. There may be also a horizontal break at the top left quarter, where the saint on that side grasps the loaf; but the presence of several horizontal scratches on the panel makes it possible that this horizontal break may be due to damage, possibly received if the house-cap (carved from a separate block of stone) once fell.

Context on the house-cap of the cross: See above, pp. 22–31. See also (xv) below.

Published descriptions: the fullest is Roe 1981, 27–43; see also Sexton 1946, 223–34 and Macalister 1946, 33–44.

Published photographs: See Plates VI-VIII; Porter 1931, fig. 135 (close-up of 'Paul and Anthony' panel on north side of house-cap); Macalister 1946, Plate XI/41 (close-up of 'Paul and Anthony' panel); Plate X/42 (close-up of west side of house-cap); Henry 1967, Plate 76 (west side of cross); Roe 1981, Plate VIIa (north side of cross); Plate VIIb (south side); Plate IV (west side); Brandt-Förster 1978, Plate 11 (east side of cross); Plate 18 (west side).

(x) MOONE, Co. Kildare, HIGH CROSS, top panel of north side of base (see Plates V(a) and V(b)):

Description: The saints (in long garments) are seated facing each other on low chairs with high backs. The chair-backs culminate in animal-heads; the animal on the right is higher and larger than that on the left, and has its mouth open. The saints may be bearded, or they may simply (like some other figures on this cross) have long chins. Each holds the loaf with the hand nearest the spectator. They do not have staffs. There is no fissure on the bread to indicate breaking. A fat bird, facing right, occupies all the space above the heads of the saints, and above the chair-backs: it does not hold the bread.

Context of the panel on the north side of the cross-base: The base of the cross has (reading from the bottom): 1, 'a weird panel of monsters which may form part of the temptation [of St Anthony, above] or might represent the lions who buried Saint Paul the hermit. It may simply be, however, an effort at local colour, illustrating literally a sentence in Saint Jerome's Life of Saint Paul of Thebes where he speaks of "the desert which is full of monsters." ' (Henry 1964, 41); 2, temptation of St Anthony; 3, Paul and Anthony.

Published descriptions: for the programme of the cross as a whole, see Henry 1964, 39–41; see also Sexton 1946, 246–52.

Published photographs: Porter 1931, fig. 132 (close-up of panel, incorrectly titled 'west face'); Henry 1964, Plates 12–17 (north side of base at Plate 15); Henry 1963, Plate 70 (Paul and Anthony); Sexton 1946, figs. 28–32 (north side of base at fig. 31).

B. DOUBTFUL OR REJECTED IDENTIFICATIONS [(xi)–(xv)]

Five panels, once identified as representing the meeting of Paul and Anthony, must be rejected or at least regarded as doubtful.

(xi) ARMAGH, CROSS IN THE OLD CATHEDRAL, east side, fourth panel from bottom:

Description: badly damaged and now covered, except for its upper third, in cement. Identified as Paul and Anthony by Porter 1931, 130: see Sexton 1946, 62. In view of the 'Paul and Anthony' panel, (ii), on the narrow north side of this cross, Porter's suggestion was highly unlikely. Roe (1955, 109) dismissed it, and instead interpreted the panel conjecturally as the Incarnation or the Prophecy of Isaiah – 'Behold a Virgin shall conceive'. The heads of two human figures are still visible. They appear to be in profile. A small squarish object between them bears no resemblance to a loaf. There is no sign of a bird.

Published photographs: Henry 1933, Plate 62 (lower); ARMAGH pamphlet, p. 10 (east side of cross, taken before the cement was applied).

(xii) CLONCA, Co. Donegal, 'St BUODAN'S CROSS', east side, top of shaft, and/or west side, middle of shaft:

Description: The panel at the top of the east side of the shaft was identified as Paul and Anthony by Crawford (1915, 189–90), and he was followed by Weir (1980, 126). However, Killanin and Duignan (1967, 193) and Harbison (1970, 65) identified it as the miracle of the loaves and fishes; Lacy (1983, 256) confirmed this interpretation, which is quite convincing.

The panel at the middle of the west side, depicting two human figures seated together with folded arms, facing the spectator, was tentatively identified as Paul and Anthony by Harbison (1970, 65). As the panel contains neither bird nor heaven-sent loaf, the identification cannot be strongly sustained. A slight confirmation of Harbison's suggestion might be seen in the pair of animals with wedge-shaped faces which is represented directly above the seated figures. 'What appears to be the head of a volute crozier' appears above the back of each animal [Lacy 1983, 256; cf. the croziers in Arboe, (ii)]. The animals just might be a version of the lions at Iona (see above, p. 19) or the dogs or lions at Nigg (see above, p. 10). As the 'loaves and fishes' scene on the east side indicates, the Clonca sculptors were indeed interested in eucharistic symbolism. But the presence of the two animals is hardly enough to make Harbison's suggestion certain. Lacy (1983, 255–6) does not try to identify this panel.

Published descriptions: The best is that of Lacy 1983, 255–6; see also Sexton 1946, 97–9.

Published photographs: The best are in Lacy 1983, Plate 33 (west side); Colourplate V (east side); see also Weir 1980, 63, fig. 52 (west side).

(xiii) KILLAMERY, Co. Kilkenny, north side, end of arm of the cross, panel at lower left:

Description: The end of the north arm of the cross is divided into four panels. Margaret Stokes (1901, 573) identified the panel at lower left as 'two figures holding bell'. Henry (1930, 96 and 102) stated that Paul and Anthony were represented on this cross. She later (1933, 132–3) identified this panel as 'sans doute' representing

the saints (see Sexton 1946, 200). Henry later repeated the identification but in less than certain terms (1963, 176). However, Roe (1969, 47) by implication rejects this identification: 'Despite the fact that they are clearer in detail the two lower scenes remain unexplained.' Two human figures stand facing each other, with one foot advanced. Between them they hold a large rectangular object. It does not look at all like a loaf of bread: Stokes' identification of it as a bell seems much more likely. There are some raised, curved lines above the squarish object and between the heads of the human figures. These lines seem to have been identified by Henry 1933 as the raven; but this identification cannot be confirmed on the monument in its present state.

Published descriptions: Henry 1933, 132–3; Roe 1969, 47.

Published drawing and photographs: Drawing and photograph, Stokes 1901, Plate L; photographs: Henry 1933, Plate 29/1, north side; 30/2 (close-up, incorrectly captioned as south side); Roe 1969, Plate XX/1.

(xiv) KILREE, Co. Kilkenny, end of south arm, one of the upper panels:

Description: The end of the south arm of the cross is (like the end of the north arm of the Killamery cross) divided into four panels. Henry (1930, 96) stated that the 'Paul and Anthony' scene was to be found on this cross. Sexton (1946, 209) referred to Henry, and speculated that the scene 'may possibly be represented in either one of the upper panels'. Roe (1969, 49) dismissed this suggestion; and the two upper panels are now so badly weathered as to be quite impossible to identify.

Published description: Sexton 1946, 208–9; Roe 1969, 49–53.

Published photographs: Roe 1969, Plate XXI/2.

(xv) MONASTERBOICE, Co. Louth, SOUTH CROSS (MUIREDACH'S CROSS), east side, house cap (see Plate VII):

Description: For descriptions of the panel, and the controversy about its identification, see above, pp. 24–6.

Published descriptions: Porter 1931, 9–10; Macalister 1946, 41; Sexton 1946, 229–30; Roe 1981, 21–2 and 43.

Published photographs: Porter 1931, fig. 3 (close-up); Macalister 1946, Plate X/40 (close-up); Sexton 1946, fig. 20 (close-up); Henry 1964, Plate 42; Henry 1967, Plate 83.

ADDENDUM

The following studies have appeared since the present paper was set in type in 1984. It has not been possible to take account of their arguments in the text of the paper. Kristine Edmondson Haney (1985, 225–6) argues that the Paul and Anthony panel at Ruthwell is not eucharistic: but she takes no account of the Pictish and Irish analogues which consistently establish eucharistic contexts for the Paul and An-

thony motif. She interprets the Ruthwell Christ over the Beasts panel (p. 219) as a reference to the phrase 'bestiae Christum loquuntur' in Jerome's *Vita S. Pauli*, without adverting to the fact that this reference had already been proposed by Elisabeth Okasha in her standard handbook (1971, 110). While the passage is certainly relevant to the panel, the panel is too rich and multivalent to be explained as an illustration of a single passage in a single saint's life. Peter Harbison (1986) notes three panels which might be added to my 'B' ('doubtful') list. Following Henry (1940, 109) he identifies the two robed figures bowing over a table on the Inishkeel slab as 'almost certainly' Paul and Anthony, and compares the Nigg pediment. He more tentatively suggests that pairs of robed figures on the Drumhallagh slab (see above, p. 7 n 2) and the Carndonagh stele might represent Paul and Anthony, but has since concluded (personal communication) that they may be pairs of pilgrims.

REFERENCES AND ABBREVIATIONS

Alcuin, *De Virtutibus et Vitiis Liber ad Widonem Comitem*, *PL* 101:613–38.

Allen, J. Romilly and J. Anderson. 1903. *The Early Christian Monuments of Scotland*. Edinburgh.

Anderson, A. O. and M. O., edd. 1961. *Adomnán's Life of Columba*. London.

Andrieu, Michel, ed. 1931–61. *Les Ordines Romani du haut moyen âge*, 5 vols. Louvain. Spicilegium Sacrum Lovaniense, vols 11, 23, 24, 28 and 29.

Armagh Pamphlet = *The Cathedral Church of St. Patrick, Armagh* (Armagh, n.d.).

Auerbach, Erich. 1959. 'Figura', in *Scenes from the Drama of European Literature*. New York.

Augustine, Saint. 1956. *Enarrationes in Psalmos*, edd. Eligius Dekkers and Johannes Fraipont, *CC*, XXXVIII–XL, 3 vols. Turnhout.

Aurenhammer, Hans. 1967. *Lexikon der Christlichen Ikonographie*. Vienna.

Bede, Saint. 1896. *Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum*, ed. Charles Plummer, *Venerabilis Bedae Opera Historica*, 2 vols. Oxford.

Bede, Saint. 1960. *In Lucae Euangelium Expositio; In Marci Euangelium Expositio*, ed. D. Hurst, *CC*, CXX. Turnhout. [Cf. *PL* 92:131–301 (Mark); 301–364 (Luke).]

Bede, Saint. 1983. *Expositio Bedae Presbyteri in Canticum Abacuc Prophetae*, ed. J. E. Hudson in *Bedae Venerabilis Opera*, Part II, *Opera Exegetica*, *CC*, CXIXB. Turnhout. [cf. *PL* 91:1235–54.]

Benedict, Saint. 1971–2. *La règle de Saint Benoît*, edd. Adalbert de Vogüé and Jean Neufville. 6 vols. Paris.

Bible:

– *Biblia Sacra iuxta Vulgatam Clementinam*, nova editio, Biblioteca de autores cristianos (Madrid, 1965).

– *The Holy Bible translated from the Latin Vulgate* (London, 1914).

Bischoff, Bernhard. 1976. 'Turning-points in the History of Latin Exegesis in the Early Middle Ages', in McNamara (1976), 74–160 [a translation of 'Wendepunkte in der Geschichte der Lateinische Exegese der Frühmittelalter', in *Mittelalterliche Studien*, 2 vols (Stuttgart, 1966–7), i].

Bourgeault, Cynthia. 1983. 'The Monastic Archetype in the *Navigatio* of St. Brendan', *Monastic Studies* 14, 109–23.

Brandt-Förster, Bettina. 1978. *Das Irische Hochkreuz: Ursprung, Entwicklung, Gestalt*. Stuttgart.

Burlin, Robert B. 1968. *The Old English Advent: A Typological Commentary*. New Haven, Connecticut.

Carney, James, ed. 1983. 'A Maccucáin, Sruith in Tíag', *Celtica*, 15, 25–41.

CC = *Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina* (Turnhout, 1953–).

Cramp, Rosemary. 1959–60. 'The Anglican Sculptured Crosses of Dumfriesshire,' *Dumfriesshire and Galloway Natural History and Antiquarian Society, Transactions*, 3rd Series, 38, 9–20.

Cramp, Rosemary. 1965. 'Early Northumbrian Sculpture', Jarrow Lecture, 1965. Jarrow.

Crawford, Henry S. 1915. 'The Crosses and Slabs of Inishowen', *JRSAI* 45, pp. 189ff., and illustrations on pp. 188, 196.

Cummean, *Commentarius in Evangelium secundum Marcum*, *PL* 30:589–644.

DACL = *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie*, 15 vols (Paris, 1907–53).

Daniélou, Jean. 1964. *Primitive Christian Symbols*. London.

Dekkers, Eligius. 1955. 'La messe du soir à la fin de l'antiquité et au moyen âge: notes historiques', *Sacris Erudiri* 7, 99–130.

Drury, John. 1976. *Tradition and Design in Luke's Gospel: A Study in Early Christian Historiography*. London.

DSp = *Dictionnaire de Spiritualité* (Paris, 1937–).

Duchesne, Louis, ed. 1886–92. *Le Liber Pontificalis*, 2 vols. Paris.

Eisenhofer, Ludwig, and Joseph Lechner. 1961. *The Liturgy of the Roman Rite*. Edinburgh and London.

Expositio Quattuor Evangeliorum, see (Pseudo-)Jerome.

Farrell, Robert T. 1978. 'The Archer and Associated Figures on the Ruthwell Cross – a Reconsideration', *Bede and Anglo-Saxon England*, ed. R. T. Farrell, British Archaeological Reports, 46, 96–117. Oxford.

Fenton, J. C. 1953. *The Gospel of Saint Matthew*. Harmondsworth.

Förster, Max, ed. 1932. *Die Vercelli-Homilien: I–VIII Homilie* (Hamburg, 1932; reprint Darmstadt, 1964).

Gougaud, Louis. 1909. 'Les rites de la consécration et de la fraction dans la liturgie celtique de la messe', *Proceedings of the Nineteenth Eucharistic Congress*, pp. 348–61. London.

Gougaud, Louis. 1920. 'The Earliest Irish Representations of the Crucifixion', *JRSAI* 50, 128–39.

Gregory the Great, Saint, *Homiliae in Ezechielem*, *PL* 76:785–1072.

Hamlin, Ann. 1982. '*Dignatio Diei Dominici*: an Element in the Iconography of Irish Crosses?', in *Ireland in Early Medieval Europe: Studies in Memory of Kathleen Hughes*, ed. Dorothy Whitelock, Rosamond McKitterick and David Dumville, pp. 69–75 and plates. Cambridge.

Haney, Kristine Edmondson. 1985. 'The Christ and the beasts panel on the Ruthwell Cross', *Anglo-Saxon England* 14, 215–31.

Harbison, Peter. 1970. *Guide to the National Monuments of Ireland*. Dublin.

Harbison, Peter. 1986. 'A Group of Early Christian Carved Stone Monuments in County Donegal', in John Higgitt, ed., *Early Medieval Sculpture in Britain and Ireland*, British Archaeological Reports, British Series, 152, pp 49–85. Oxford.

Harrington, Wilfrid. 1979. *Mark*. Dublin.

Henderson, George. 1985. 'The Saint John the Baptist Panel on the Ruthwell Cross', *Gesta* 24, 3–12. I am grateful to Professor Henderson for allowing me to read this paper before its publication.

Henderson, Isabel. 1967. *The Picts*. London.

Henderson, Isabel. 1982. 'Pictish Art and the Book of Kells', in *Ireland in Early Medieval Europe: Studies in Memory of Kathleen Hughes*, ed. Dorothy Whitelock, Rosamond McKitterick and David Dumville, pp. 79–105 and plates. Cambridge.

Henry, Françoise. 1930. 'Les origines de l'iconographie irlandaise', *Revue Archéologique*, fifth series 32, 89–109.
Henry, Françoise. 1933. *La Sculpture Irlandaise pendant les douze premiers siècles de l'ère chrétienne*. Paris.
Henry, Françoise. 1940. *Irish Art in the Early Christian Period*. London.
Henry, Françoise. 1963. *L'art irlandais*, I. Paris.
Henry, Françoise. 1964. *Irish High Crosses*. Dublin.
Henry, Françoise. 1967. *Irish Art during the Viking Invasions (800–1020 AD)*. London.
Herzfield, George, ed. 1900. *An Old English Martyrology*, Early English Text Society, original series, 116. London.
Hesbert, René-Jean. 1935. *Antiphonale Missarum Sextuplex*. Brussels.
Hourihane, Colum P. and James J. 1979. 'The Kilnaruane Pillar Stone, Bantry, Co. Cork', *Journal of the Cork Historical and Archaeological Society* 84, 65–73.
Jerome, Saint, *Vita Sancti Pauli*, *PL* 23:17–28.
Jerome, Saint. 1969. *Commentariorum in Matheum Libri IV*, edd. D. Hurst and M. Adriaen in *CC*, LXXVII. Turnhout.
Jerome, Saint. 1970. *Commentariorum in Abacuc Prophetam ad Chromatium Libri II*, ed. M. Adriaen in *CC*, LXXVIA, 579–654. Turnhout.
Pseudo-Jerome, *Expositio Quattuor Evangeliorum*, *PL* 30:531–90.
JRSAI = *Journal of the Royal Society of Antiquaries of Ireland*. Dublin.
Jungmann, Josef A. 1951–5. *The Mass of the Roman Rite*, 2 vols. New York.
Jungmann, Josef A. 1958. *Missarum Sollemnia: Eine genetische Erklärung der römischen Messe*, fourth edition, 2 vols. Freiburg im Breisgau.
Kaiser, Leo M. 1950. 'Medieval and Post-Medieval Iconography of SS. Paul and Antony – a Tentative Listing', *Saint Louis University Studies*, Series A (Humanities), 1 No. 3, 53–72.
Kelly, J. N. D. 1975. *Jerome: His Life, Writings and Controversies*. London.
Killanin, Lord and Michael V. Duignan. 1967. *The Shell Guide to Ireland*. London.
Kirschbaum, Engelbert, ed. 1968–76. *Lexikon der christlichen Ikonographie*, 8 vols. Rome.
Kotzor, Günter, ed. 1981. *Das altenglische Martyrologium*, 2 vols. Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist. Klasse, Abhandlungen, neue Folge, 88. Munich.
Lacy, B. 1983. *Archaeological Survey of County Donegal*. Lifford.
Leclercq, Jean. 1961. *Études sur le vocabulaire monastique du moyen âge*. Studia Anselmiana, 48. Rome.
Lewis, Suzanne. 1980. 'Sacred Calligraphy: the Chi Rho Page in the Book of Kells', *Traditio* 36, 139–59.
Lowry-Corry, Dorothy. 1934. 'The Sculptured Crosses of Galloon', *JRSAI* 64, 165–76, and plates XIX–XXII.
Macalister, R. A. S. 1946. *Monasterboice, Co. Louth*. Dundalk.
M'Kenna, Lambert, n.d., ed., *Dán Dé. The Poems of Donnchadh Mór Ó Dálaigh and the Religious Poems in the Duanaire of the Yellow Book of Lecan*. Dublin.
M'Kenna, Lambert, ed. 1919. *Dánta do chum Aongus Fionn Ó Dálaigh*. Dublin and London.
McNamara, Martin. 1973. 'Psalter Text and Psalter Study in the Early Irish Church (AD 600–1200)', *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy* 73, Section C, 201–98.
McNamara, Martin, ed. 1976. *Biblical Studies: the Medieval Irish Contribution*. Proceedings of the Irish Biblical Association, No. 1. Dublin.
McRoberts, David. 1960–61. 'The Ecclesiastical Significance of the St Ninian's Isle Treasure', *Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland* 94, 301–14.

McRoberts, David. 1965. 'The Ecclesiastical Character of the St Ninian's Isle Treasure', *The Fourth Viking Congress*, ed. A. Small. Edinburgh and London.
Mearns, James. 1914. *The Canticles of the Christian Church, Eastern and Western, in Early and Medieval Times*. Cambridge.
Meyvaert, Paul. 1982. 'An Apocalypse Panel on the Ruthwell Cross', *Medieval and Renaissance Studies: Proceedings of the Southeastern Institute of Medieval and Renaissance Studies, Summer, 1978*, ed. Frank Tirro, pp. 3–32. Durham, North Carolina.
Mowbray, Cecil. 1936. 'Eastern Influences on Carvings at St Andrews and Nigg, Scotland', *Antiquity* 10, 428–40.
Ní Chatháin, Próinséas. 1980. 'The Liturgical Background of the Derrynavlan Altar Service', *JRSAI* 110, 127–48.
Noordeloos, Door P. 1941. 'De Ikonographie van het bezoek van Antonius den Groote aan Paulus van Thebe', *Het Gildeboek* 24, 33–73.
Ó Carragáin, Éamonn. 1978. 'Liturgical Innovations Associated with Pope Sergius and the Iconography of the Ruthwell and Bewcastle Crosses', in *Bede and Anglo-Saxon England*, ed. R. T. Farrell, British Archaeological Reports 46, pp 131–47. Oxford.
Ó Carragáin, Éamonn. 1983. '*Vidi Aquam*: the Liturgical Background to *The Dream of the Rood* 20a: "Swætan on þa swiðran healfe"', *Notes and Queries* 30, 8–15.
Ó Carragáin, Éamonn. 1986. 'Christ over the Beasts and the Agnus Dei: Two Multivalent Panels on the Ruthwell and Bewcastle Crosses', in *Sources of Anglo-Saxon Culture*, ed. Paul E. Szarmach, pp 377–403. Kalamazoo.
Ó Coileáin, Seán. 1978. 'Irish Saga Literature', in *Heroic Epic and Saga: an Introduction to the World's Great Folk Epics*, ed. Felix J. Oinas, pp. 172–92. Bloomington and London.
ODCC = *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, edd. F. L. Cross and E. A. Livingstone, second edition, revised (Oxford, 1978).
OED = *The Compact Edition of the Oxford English Dictionary* (Oxford, 1971).
Okasha, Elisabeth. 1971. *Hand-List of Anglo-Saxon Non-Runic Inscriptions*. Cambridge.
O'Meara, John J. 1978. trans., *The Voyage of Saint Brendan*. Dublin.
Orlandi, Joannes. 1968. '*Navigatio Sancti Brendani*', vol I, *Introduzione*. Milan.
Picard, Jean Michel. 1982. 'The Purpose of Adomnán's *Vita Columbae*', *Peritia* 1, 160–77.
PL = Jean-Paul Migne, ed., *Patrologiae Latinae Cursus Completus*, 221 vols (Paris, 1844–64).
Plummer, Charles. 1896. see Bede, Saint.
Porter, Arthur Kingsley. 1930. 'An Egyptian Legend in Ireland', *Marburger Jahrbuch für Kunstwissenschaft* 5, 25–38 (also paginated separately [1–14] and published as a pamphlet; the pagination of the *Jahrbuch* volume has been used here).
Porter, Arthur Kingsley. 1931. *The Crosses and Culture of Ireland*. New Haven, Connecticut.
Raw, Barbara. 1970. '*The Dream of the Rood* and its Connections with Early Christian Art', *Medium Aevum* 39, 239–56.
RCAHMS Iona = *Argyll: an Inventory of the Monuments*, vol. 4, *Iona*. The Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical Monuments of Scotland. Edinburgh.
Roe, Helen M. 1954. 'Antiquities of the Diocese of Armagh: A Photographic Survey. Part I, The High Crosses of Co. Louth', *Seanchas Ardmhacha* 1, No. 1, 101–114 and Plates I–XIII.
Roe, Helen M. 1955. 'Antiquities of the Diocese of Armagh: A Photographic Survey. Part II, The High Crosses of Co. Armagh', *Seanchas Ardmhacha* 1, No. 2, 107–114 and Plates I–XI.
Roe, Helen M. 1956. 'Antiquities of the Diocese of Armagh: A Photographic Survey. Part III, The High Crosses of East Tyrone', *Seanchas Ardmhacha* 2, No. 1, 79–89, Plates I–XI, and map for all three parts of the survey.
Roe, Helen M. 1965. 'The Irish High Cross – Morphology and Iconography', *JRSAI* 95, 213–26.

Roe, Helen M. 1966. *The High Crosses of Kells*. Revised reprint. Kells.
Roe, Helen M. 1969. *The High Crosses of Western Ossory*, second edition, reprint. Kilkenny.
Roe, Helen M. 1981. *Monasterboice and its Monuments*. Dundalk.
Salmon, Pierre. 1959. *Les 'Tituli Psalmorum' des Manuscrits latins*, Collectanea Biblica Latina, XII. Rome.
Saxl, Fritz. 1943. 'The Ruthwell Cross', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 6, 1–19.
Saxl, Fritz, and Rudolf Wittkower. 1948. *British Art and the Mediterranean*. Oxford.
Schapiro, Meyer. 1944. 'The Religious Meaning of the Ruthwell Cross', *Art Bulletin* 26, 232–45; reprinted in *Late Antique, Early Christian and Mediaeval Art: Selected Papers [of] Meyer Schapiro*, Vol. iii (London, 1980), pp. 150–76.
Schapiro, Meyer. 1980. See Schapiro 1944 (reprint).
Schiller, Gertrud. 1971–2. *Iconography of Christian Art*, 2 vols. London.
Selmer, Carl. 1959. ed., *Navigatio Sancti Brendani Abbatis*. University of Notre Dame, Publications in Medieval Studies, 16. Notre Dame, Indiana.
Sexton, Eric H. L. 1946. *A Descriptive and Bibliographical List of Irish Figure Sculpture of the Early Christian Period*. Portland, Maine.
Spitz, Hans-Jörg. 1972. *Die Metaphorik des geistigen Schriftsinns*. Münstersche Mittelalter-Schriften, 12. Munich.
Stevenson, R. B. K. 1956. 'The Chronology and Relationships of Some Irish and Scottish Crosses', *JRSAI* 86–7, pp. 84–96.
Stokes, Margaret. 1898. *The High Crosses of Castledermot and Durrow*. Dublin.
Stokes, Margaret. 1901. 'Notes on the High Crosses of Moone, Drumcliff, Termonfechin and Killamery', *Transactions of the Royal Irish Academy* 31, 542–50.
Stokes, Whitley. 1890. *Lives of Saints from the Book of Lismore*. Anecdota Oxoniensia: Mediaeval and Modern Series, 5. Oxford.
Stokes, Whitley and John Strachan. 1901–03. edd., *Thesaurus Palaeohibernicus: a Collection of Old Irish Glosses, Scholia, Prose and Verse*. 2 vols. Cambridge.
Sweet, Henry. 1885. ed., *The Oldest English Texts*, Early English Text Society, o.s., 83. London.
Szarmach, Paul E. 1981. ed., *Vercelli Homilies IX–XXII*. Toronto.
Vogüé, Adalbert de, and Jean Neufville. 1971–2. see Benedict, Saint.
Warner, George F., ed. 1906–15. *The Stowe Missal*, 2 vols. Henry Bradshaw Society, vols 31, 32. London.
Warren, F. E. 1892–5. *The Antiphonary of Bangor*, 2 vols. Henry Bradshaw Society, vols 4 and 9. London.
Weir, Anthony. 1980. *Early Ireland, A Field Guide*. Belfast.
Willis, G. G. 1968. 'Early English Liturgy from Augustine to Alcuin', in *Further Essays in Early Roman Liturgy*, Alcuin Club Collections, vol. 50, pp. 189–258. London.
Yarnold, Edward. 1978. 'The Liturgy of the Faithful in the Fourth and Early Fifth Centuries', in *The Study of Liturgy*, edd. Cheslyn Jones, Geoffrey Wainright and Edward Yarnold, pp. 189–201. London.



Ó Carragáin, Pl. I(a): Ruthwell Cross, detail of north side. (a) Saints Paul and Anthony. (Photo: R. Cramp).



Ó Carragáin, Pl. I(b): Ruthwell Cross, detail of north side. (b) Christ recognised by two animals. (Photo: R. Cramp).



Ó Carragáin, Pl. II: Upper fragment of the Nigg cross-slab. 'Paul and Anthony' pediment and top of incised cross. (Photo: RCAHMS, Edinburgh).



Ó Carragáin, Pl. III: Castledermot, South Cross, detail of west side, showing the relationship between the 'Paul and Anthony' panel (below the ring), 'the prophet David' (left arm) and 'Abraham's sacrifice of Isaac' (right arm). (Photo: P. Harbison).



Ó Carragáin, Pl. IV: Kells, south cross, east side, detail. (Photo: OPW).



Ó Carragáin, Pl. V(a): The high cross, Moone. (a) North side of base. (Photo: OPW).



Ó Carragáin, Pl. V(b): The high cross, Moone. (b) South side of base. (Photo: OPW).



Ó Carragáin, Pl. VI: Muredach's cross, capstone, north side: Saints Paul and Anthony. (Photo: OPW).



Ó Carragáin, Pl. VII: Muredach's cross, capstone, east side: the triumph of the Church(?). (Photo: OPW).



Ó Carragáin, Pl. VIII: Muredach's cross, west side: Christ displays his wounds on the last day. (Photo: OPW).



Ó Carragáin, Pl. IX: Kells, south cross, east side: Saints Paul and Anthony (Photo: OPW)



Ó Carragáin, Pl. X: Arboe, Co. Tyrone, south side of cross:
'Paul and Anthony' panel. (Photo: DOENI).



Ó Carragáin, Pl. XI: Armagh, cross in the Old Cathedral, north side:
'Paul and Anthony' panel. (Photo: DOENI).

CORK



Ó Carragáin, Pl. XII: Galloon, Co. Fermanagh, east cross shaft, detail of west side, showing the 'Paul and Anthony' panel. (Photo: DOENI).