

Preface

The Old English *Genesis* is the sole illustrated Anglo-Saxon poem. In full appreciation of this unique concurrent execution of visualization and versification in a single manuscript, this multidisciplinary work explores the pictorial (Volume 1) and the metrical (Volume 2) organization of this illuminated verse narrative from both synchronic–structural and diachronic–comparative perspectives. While, autonomously conceived and independently implemented, each volume is solidly embedded in the respective scholarly tradition and pursues its own inherent disciplinary concerns and problematics, vigorous formal and cognitive reasoning and theorizing run commonly through both. By way of mutual corroboration and integration, the twin volumes eventually converge on the hypothesis that the earliest portion of the extant Old English *Genesis* (verse lines 1–966) derived from the corresponding episodes of an illustrated Tournonian Old Saxon *Genesis* in both pictorial and metrical terms.

The present volume is a formally and cognitively oriented art historical study of the Old English *Genesis*, with exclusive reference to the first twenty-two pictures contained in MS Junius 11 (Oxford, Bodleian Library). The primary objectives of this book are twofold. First, it will demonstrate that the first twenty-two pictures in the Old English *Genesis* are integrated into the system of pictorial organization that is predicated on the multidimensional, hierarchical network of opposition, complementation, parallelism, and variation in conceptual and compositional terms. Accordingly, all pictures are mutually dependent in their own different ways and with varying degrees of determinate force, with a few privileged core images located in the center of the system and controlling peripheral ones to a large extent. This systematicity of pictorial organization, it will be substantiated, is not simply a synchronically conceptualized descriptive state of affairs; rather, of no less relevance to the dynamic dimension, it would have played a formative role—largely through the intermediary of metaphor and metonymy—in motivating innovation and giving rise to novel images out of the inherited stock of resources. Thus, a subset of the Junius pictures would have been motivated on purely internal grounds without corresponding models elsewhere. In short, the pictorial system would have resided in the artist's mind as a mental overarching emergent scheme for images in the making.

Second, from a diachronic–comparative perspective, the pictorial system thus identified, as well as individual pictures and their constituents, will be shown to have been primarily founded on the Tournonian tradition and to have undergone reinterpretation and elaboration in accordance with its own organization principles and preferences. Specifically, while subject to extensive reorganization and restructuring in the course of adaptation, the resources drawn on are on the whole derived from the Cotton *Genesis* family in general and, for the most part, from its reflections in the Tournonian Bibles in particular. The resultant influence from the Tours School not only pervades the individual pictures involved but also permeates, through reorganization, all levels of visual representation, from static page layout to dynamic narrative progression, from mac-

roscopic configurations to microscopic features of individual figures, and from coordination of multiple sources to application of specific techniques of depiction. Therefore, the picture cycles under investigation in the Old English *Genesis* may be legitimately characterized as Touronian in their genealogical identities. As a corollary of the central claims formulated above, particularly the inference last adduced, it may follow that the original artist responsible for composing the twenty-two pictures—or at least a major subset of them—would have been a member of the School of Tours. Working at (or near) Tours in the mid-ninth century, he would have composed these illustrations as accompaniments to the relevant episodes of the Old Saxon *Genesis* not long after its emergence. Subsequently, the Anglo-Saxon artists would have reused these Old Saxon pictures in the earliest portion of the Old English *Genesis*.

Of paramount importance, the conjecture presented immediately above, derived from the integrity of the twenty-two pictures both synchronically and diachronically substantiated, receives independent corroboration from the metrical organization of the earlier portion of the Old English *Genesis*, verse lines 1–966 (comprising *Genesis A*, verse lines 1–234 and 852–966, and *Genesis B* in its entirety, that is, verse lines 235–851). As elucidated in sections 1.1 and 12.8, drawing on the companion volume (Suzuki 2023) for fuller demonstration, the earlier part of the Old English *Genesis* thus delineated is, as a whole, internally homogeneous in alliterative patterning and commonly differentiated from the remainder (verse lines 967–2936) by a significantly higher incidence of double alliteration. Such a metrical bisection at the boundary between verse lines 966 and 967 may be explained in a principled way as a consequence of the narrative unity of the Old English *Genesis* text portion at issue, as substantiated by the derivation of the first twenty-two pictures in Junius 11 from the Touronian images originally accompanying the corresponding Old Saxon *Genesis* episodes. Thus, while complementary to each other in their concerns and scope of inquiry, Volume 1 on the pictorial organization of the Old English *Genesis* and Volume 2 on its metrical organization may be viewed as fully integrated embodying a hermeneutic circle (hopefully not a vicious circle), each supplementing and enriching the other.

The 1970s saw appearance of important source studies of Junius 11, particularly Raw (1976) and Broderick (1978). Since then, however, virtually no comparably substantial work has been undertaken, although a scattering of investigations concerned with other aspects of Junius illustrations have appeared to date, notably Karkov (2001) on text–picture interrelationship and interaction as narrative strategies. While markedly different in specific claims and interpretations from earlier scholarship, this book is firmly situated in the Weitzmann–Kessler–Broderick tradition of the Cotton *Genesis* family research (Kessler 1977; Broderick 1978; Weitzmann/Kessler 1986). In contrast, while highly similar at first glance as far as the Touronian origins are postulated for a group of Junius pictures, Raw’s (1976) thesis is decidedly at variance with mine not only in specific claims and individual interpretations but also in general conceptual underpinnings, as outlined below in section 1.3 and detailed in subsequent chapters.

The dearth of relevant publications in recent times does not mean that the issues relating to the origins of Junius pictures have been settled. On the contrary, recent works including Karkov (2001) have given impetus to readdressing the traditional source issues from a new perspective of conceiving the Junius pictures synchronically as a highly integrated apparatus for visual narrative rather than a contingent assemblage of individual scenes subordinate to the text, as conventionally characterized. At the same time, however, Karkov's synchronic analyses of individual drawings and their interrelations in the Old English *Genesis* have left much unaddressed and unaccounted for, not least because of her not sufficiently sophisticated formal analytical techniques, particularly with respect to the paradigmatic dimension. Accordingly, drawing on my expertise in formal and structural analysis of verbal and visual representation in linguistics and archaeology (e.g., Suzuki 2008; 2014a), I will be exploring diachronic-comparative accounts within a framework of the pictorial system of the Old English *Genesis* that has been established with formal rigor in the synchronic part of this study. This system-based conceptualization in general, and the specific ranked relations posited between the pictures in particular, will make possible postulation of genealogical affinities hitherto unrecognized and formulation of derivational histories involved, as with the two images of God enthroned on the first two pages of the Junius manuscript—Pii (Pl. 1) and P2 (Pl. 2), the prime members of the pictorial system (section 2.1)—which are derived from the portrait of Charles the Bald in the Vivian Bible (fol. 423r, Pl. 32).

Chapter 1 lays out the framework of this study by providing an overview of the major empirical data and reviewing previous scholarship focusing on Raw (1953; 1976). Chapters 2 through 11 analyze and interpret individual pictures and their interrelationship according to their thematic-based grouping. Each chapter falls into two parts: the synchronic-structural and the diachronic-comparative, with the former providing a solid empirical basis for the latter. Piecing together the cumulative body of specific analyses and arguments adduced in the preceding chapters, Chapter 12 presents synthetic views on the synchrony and diachrony of the pictorial system of the Old English *Genesis*, with special reference to its Touronian heritage, its enrichment of the Cotton *Genesis* family, and its subsequent adaptation. Chapter 13 concludes the book with some conjectures for future study.

Initially supported by a grant from the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (JSPS KAKENHI)—a Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research C (#26370582)—and subsequently by another JSPS grant (#18K00398), this project successfully came to completion thanks to a Membership at the School of Historical Studies, the Institute for Advanced Study (IAS), that I had the honor and privilege of being awarded for the period of 2018–2019. During my stay at Princeton, I benefited immeasurably from all conceivable logistic support and service for intensively carrying out research, the peaceful and inspiring environment conducive to creative and imaginative thinking, and, above all, the perfect academic freedom that made possible exclusive concentration on my own project for a sustained period. For all this, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to Robbert Dijkgraaf, IAS Director and Leon Levy Professor, Patrick J. Geary, Andrew W. Mellon

Professor at IAS, and all staff members at the Institute. Brett Savage deserves particular mention for his competent and professional copyediting of a book manuscript at its various stages. As always, I am deeply thankful to Yoshitaka Tanimoto, President of Kansai Gaidai University, for his understanding and generosity in granting me a leave for my tenure of Membership at IAS. Special thanks go to Herbert R. Broderick and Thomas H. Ohlgren for advice and encouragement. I am immensely indebted to the libraries, museums, and publishers that gave me permission to reproduce their copyrighted materials, as individually acknowledged in the lists and captions of Plates and Figures.

Seiichi Suzuki
May 2019, Princeton, New Jersey