

*When did King Redwald die?* Dr. Gordon Ward in his note on this question in the 1954 *Proceedings* (vol. xxvi, p. 231) suggested that Redwald need not necessarily have died when Eorpwald succeeded but that by abdication he might have survived till the Sutton Hoo boat-burial, which may thus have been in his honour. It may well have been so, his body perhaps having had Christian interment elsewhere (though he seems to have been but a half-hearted Christian) or having been lost as by drowning at sea, for we must remember it was not in the boat at Sutton Hoo. It is quite a possible theory—but the evidence is thin. Dr. Ward's chief evidence seems to be solely negative: that no other suitable claimant than Redwald can be found. But why not King Anna who died at just the right time (654 fits well with the numismatic evidence) but whom Dr. Ward does not in this connection even mention? Did he think him disqualified for the same reason as did Prof. H. M. Chadwick in *Antiquity*, xiv (1940), 76-7? I venture to suggest that this is a 'reason' resting on a false assumption. Anna, says the Professor, may be 'almost certainly eliminated', apparently because he was a very religious Christian, all his daughters became nuns, and he is said to have been buried at Blythburgh. No other reason is given and these would seem *non sequiturs*. A man's burial depends not merely on his own opinions during life but at least as much on the wishes of those who have charge of his body after death. In the case of a king the primary factor is the will of his successor. To illustrate by an extreme, if a king is succeeded by his conqueror he will get a very different funeral from what he would get from his son.

Anna was followed by his brother Aethelhere of whom it is recorded that his Christian wife, St. Hilda's sister, left him and became a nun, and that in the year after his succession he allied himself with the pagan Penda of Mercia, the very man who had just invaded his country and killed his brother and nephew, and that he made this alliance in order to march against Oswy, the king of Northumbria who, as he had sent St. Cedd of Lindisfarne to convert Sigbert of Essex, was doubtless a Christian. May we not then assume that Aethelhere was a worshipper of the old gods? If so, what is more likely than that when Anna and his son were slain near Blythburgh on Penda's invasion Aethelhere should order their interment indeed in the convenient monastery at that place according to the rites of their religion but that later, when order had been restored, he should have determined to give his brother, who had been a great king, a good old-fashioned 'funeral' according to the ancient custom of his house in what may well have been the royal *hoo*, near Rendlesham, at Sutton?

One may be pardoned also for wondering if a king of the power

and eminence of Redwald would have taken very kindly to abdication.

Mr. R. L. S. Bruce-Mitford in his very full account of this cenotaph in vol. xxv of our *Proceedings* comes tentatively to the conclusion that it was either for Anna or for Aethelhere. But the latter was succeeded by a Christian and it hardly seems feasible that a Christian king as late as 655 would have given his predecessor (though admittedly a brother) who reigned only one year and whose anti-Christian policy was a reversal of that which preceded and followed him pagan obsequies of quite so lavish a nature, and particularly that the grave goods would have included such obvious Christian conversion gifts as the Saulos-Paulos spoons.

F. H. A. ENGLEHEART, M.A., B.SC.

*Wall Painting in Boxford Church.* The Hon. Editor has drawn my attention to the recently discovered wall-painting over the chancel arch in the church at Boxford. I visited this church and took photographs on 29 April 1955. (Plate XXVI). The painting is high and it is possible only to get a general impression with the naked eye. With the aid of field glasses however, it can be seen quite clearly.

The design occupies the area of wall above the chancel arch, on the west side, and is therefore visible from the nave of the church. The work appears to have been carried out in *tempera*, direct on to the plastered wall surface, and not on boards as is sometimes the case in Doom paintings in a similar position.

It would appear that the clerestory was built about the middle of the fifteenth century and it is probable that the painting was carried out soon after the building was completed. Since the painting was executed, the woodwork of the roof has been altered and the wooden brackets which support the cambered beam are apparently larger than the originals, for to some extent they mask the upper part of the rear wing of each angel. In the centre of the tie-beam above the chancel arch is a shield carved with the initials R W and I G, possibly for churchwardens, and the date 16 - 85 flanks the shield. It seems reasonable to assume that the alterations took place at about this date.

The background of the painting is a warm red. At the apex of the chancel arch and in the centre of the composition is a small-scale painting of Our Lord in Majesty, seated and holding up his right hand in blessing. In the spandrels are angels swinging censers. Each angel wears a short-sleeved white alb with a golden collar and tied about the waist with a golden cord. The wings of the angels are large, almost filling the available space. They are painted a pale blue and the feathers are outlined in black.