

## 1

## Introduction: problems and solutions

In libris mortuos quasi vivos invenio; in libris futura praevideo . . .<sup>1</sup>  
 Richard de Bury, *Philobiblon*

Oxford, Bodleian Library, Junius 11 is the only one of the four major Anglo-Saxon poetic manuscripts to be illustrated. It has been studied for its literary content and for the style and iconography of its drawings, but it must also be understood as an historical text. The four poems which make up the text, as has been noted many times, contain passages from older works that have been combined, rearranged and reworded to create a new poetic narrative in which the voices of the dead speak again, as if they were alive. Figures from biblical history appear in the drawings accompanied by attributes of Anglo-Saxon life, ensuring that they too become as if alive, and reminding us that the same figures we see here were very much a part of Anglo-Saxon ‘historical’ texts such as genealogies and chronicles. Their actions and histories also provided moral and spiritual exempla for their Anglo-Saxon readers – with whom they stood united in expectation of the Last Judgement. These people, the characters within the poems, the poets, artists, scribes and compilers of the manuscript, and the book’s original intended audience have fascinated scholars since the rediscovery of the manuscript in the seventeenth century. Scholarship on the book has helped to keep its varied dead alive, but has provided relatively little concrete information on when, where, why and for whom Junius 11 was produced. Questions and problems remain concerning all

<sup>1</sup> ‘In books I find the dead as if they were alive; in books I foresee things to come . . .’  
 R. de Bury, *Philobiblon*, trans. E. C. Thomas (Oxford and New York, 1970), pp. 16–17.

*Text and Picture in Anglo-Saxon England*

aspects of this manuscript. This book will leave many questions unanswered, but will, it is hoped, provide some solutions as well.

Junius 11, written and illuminated *c.* 950–1000, possibly at Christ Church Canterbury, is one of the most studied and most controversial of Anglo-Saxon manuscripts.<sup>2</sup> The majority of scholars today would agree that the manuscript was deliberately compiled according to a predetermined plan in order to create a narrative centred on the theme of Fall and Redemption. Yet questions still remain about the date and sources of the individual poems, the sources of the drawings that accompany them, and the relationship of the drawings to the text. Of central concern to this analysis of the Junius 11 manuscript is the relationship of the images to the text. Although only forty-eight drawings, covering the Creation to Abraham and Sarah's approach into Egypt on page 88 of *Genesis*, were completed, blank spaces left for pictures throughout *Exodus* and *Daniel* indicate that at least the Old Testament poems were originally to have been richly illustrated, and that these three poems, with their drawings, were envisaged as a unified book. The final poem, *Christ and Satan*, the

<sup>2</sup> Because of the unity of design and regularity of the punctuation in Junius 11, all passages cited are taken directly from the manuscript, and manuscript punctuation has been retained. Translations are my own. Any emendations to either text or translation are noted, and the reader is directed to the editions of the separate poems noted below for information on variant readings. For a discussion of the poems and their relationships to one another see: A. N. Doane, *Genesis A: A New Edition* (Madison, WI, 1978); A. N. Doane, *The Saxon Genesis: An Edition of the West Saxon Genesis B and the Old Saxon 'Vatican Genesis'* (Madison, WI, 1991); R. T. Farrell, ed., *Daniel and Azarias* (London, 1974); E. B. Irving, Jr., ed., *The Old English Exodus* (New Haven, CT, 1953; reprinted and revised New York, 1970); P. J. Lucas, ed., *Exodus* (London, 1977); M. D. Clubb, ed., *Christ and Satan: An Old English Poem* (New Haven, CT, 1925); R. E. Finnegan, *Christ and Satan: A Critical Edition* (Waterloo, 1977); I. Gollancz, ed., *The Cædmon Manuscript of Anglo-Saxon Biblical Poetry: Junius XI in the Bodleian Library* (London, 1927); C. W. Kennedy, *The Cædmon Poems Translated into English Prose* (Gloucester, MA, 1965); J. R. Hall, 'The Old English Book of Salvation History: Three Studies on the Unity of MS. Junius 11' (unpubl. PhD dissertation, University of Notre Dame, 1974); J. R. Hall, 'The Old English Epic of Redemption: The Theological Unity of MS. Junius 11', *Traditio* 32 (1976), 185–208; P. G. Remley, *Old English Biblical Verse*, CSASE 16 (Cambridge, 1996); B. J. Timmer, *The Later 'Saxon Genesis' Edited from Manuscript Junius 11*, 2nd edn (Oxford, 1954); F. Junius, *Cædmonis monachi paraphrasis poetica Genesios ac præcipuarum sacræ paginae historiarum, abhinc annos M.LXX. Anglo-Saxonice conscripta & nunc primum edita ...* (Amsterdam, 1655); B. Thorpe, *Cædmon's Metrical Paraphrase of Parts of the Holy Scriptures in Anglo-Saxon* (London, 1832).

*Introduction: problems and solutions*

product of three scribes working within a generation of the scribe of the Old Testament poems, ends with the rubric 'Finit Liber II. Amen', and has no spaces left for pictures within its text; nevertheless, illustrations may have been intended for it too. Israel Gollancz in the facsimile of the manuscript,<sup>3</sup> Merrel Clubb in his edition of the poem,<sup>4</sup> J. R. Hall in his study of the overall unity of the manuscript,<sup>5</sup> and Barbara Raw in her analysis of the construction of the manuscript,<sup>6</sup> have all suggested that *Christ and Satan* may have been illustrated with a series of three to five full-page drawings designed to accompany the major divisions of the poem.<sup>7</sup> It is impossible to determine now whether such illustrations existed, or were ever intended; however, as the iconography of many of the surviving drawings is typologically related to the themes of the final poem, it is clear that the artists, like the compiler and/or scribes, understood that *Christ and Satan* was an integral part of the manuscript's narrative. Moreover, with its apocalyptic subject matter and descriptions of the Last Judgement it provides a New Testament counterpart to the Old Testament *Daniel*. It should also be noted that the number and distribution of the planned illustrations in *Christ and Satan* would have worked as a visual indication that this final poem, with its New Testament content, was a continuation of, yet also separate from, the preceding poems in which the drawings were integrated throughout the text.

How closely the illustrations relate to the text, however, has also been a matter of some debate. Junius did not include them in his 1655 edition of the manuscript, and indeed they were not reproduced in their entirety until Sir Henry Ellis's 1832 study of the poems.<sup>8</sup> Gollancz's treatment of the illustrations was largely descriptive, cataloguing the ways in which individual drawings and details accorded with the textual account of the events they were meant to 'illustrate', but failing to see the drawings as

<sup>3</sup> Gollancz, ed., *Cædmon Manuscript*, p. cv.

<sup>4</sup> Clubb, ed., *Christ and Satan*, pp. ix–x.

<sup>5</sup> Hall, 'The Old English Book of Salvation History', pp. 25–43.

<sup>6</sup> 'The Construction of Oxford, Bodleian Library, Junius 11', *ASE* 13 (1984), 187–207, at pp. 191 and 203; reprinted in *Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts Basic Readings*, ed. M. Richards (New York and London, 1994), pp. 251–75.

<sup>7</sup> See below, p. 206.

<sup>8</sup> H. Ellis, *Account of Cædmon's Metrical Paraphrase of Scripture History*, *Archæologia* 24 (1832). See ch. 5 for a more extensive treatment of these editions. For information on Junius, see ch. 6.

*Text and Picture in Anglo-Saxon England*

creating a narrative in their own right. Barbara Raw was primarily interested in the sources of the drawings, and the possible reasons for their occasional ‘dislocation’ from the text.<sup>9</sup> She suggested that the majority of the illustrations were derived from an Old Saxon exemplar which the Anglo-Saxon artists had, in places, misunderstood or had difficulty relating to the reworked text. In her analysis, for example, the illustrations and the texts of ‘*Genesis A*’ and ‘*Genesis B*’ (two parts of *Genesis* which some see as separate poems) form three awkwardly integrated narratives:

A comparison of the Junius drawings of the rebellion and fall of the angels and of the descendants of Adam with the text of *Genesis A*, *Genesis B* and the Old Saxon *Genesis* confirms this view. The drawings of the rebellion and fall of the angels correspond in detail to *Genesis B*, and hence to its Old Saxon original, even when they ostensibly illustrate *Genesis A*. The drawing on p. 2 shows God enthroned between two seraphs. To his right are two angels of whom one is haloed. The halo is appropriate to Satan of *Genesis B*, who is described as next in rank to God himself; the *A* text says nothing of Satan’s special position.<sup>10</sup>

Why should we expect the artist to provide line-by-line, literal illustrations of the text? The details of the halo and crown worn by Lucifer may be intended simply to help us identify him in the visual narrative of his fall (pls. IIa, IIb).<sup>11</sup> Similarly, Raw believed that details that were not in accord with any of the texts were derived from separate visual or textual sources – the ladder in the drawing of the creation of Eve (pl. IV) from an illustration of Jacob’s ladder, or the scene of ploughing in the drawing of Noah and his family on page 77 (pl. XXXIX) from a separate literary source – but she offered no explanation as to why such details may have been incorporated into the manuscript.<sup>12</sup>

George Henderson contributed the first in-depth analysis of the ‘programme’ of illustrations intended for the manuscript as a whole, not just the *Genesis* poem, though he saw that programme as ‘very irregular,

<sup>9</sup> ‘The Probable Derivation of Most of the Illustrations in Junius 11 from an Illustrated Old Saxon *Genesis*’, *ASE* 5 (1976), 133–48.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 146–7.

<sup>11</sup> The turning position of God and the downward gesture of his right hand also provide a visual transition from the frontal, iconic image of God enthroned on page 1 to the vertical narrative of the fall of the rebel angels.

<sup>12</sup> Raw, ‘Probable Derivation’, pp. 140 and 136.

*Introduction: problems and solutions*

with marked dense patches of illustrations and one surprisingly bare patch'.<sup>13</sup> Like Raw, Henderson attributed what he interpreted as problems with the programme to the artists' copying of a model that provided 'an elaborate but only partial programme of scenes'.<sup>14</sup>

Thomas Ohlgren and Herbert Broderick were the first to consider the illustrations as forming a significant narrative cycle in their own right, though Broderick remained more interested in source study than visual narrative.<sup>15</sup> While attributing a high degree of originality to the artists, Broderick identified three principal sources for the Junius drawings: a lost Early Christian Genesis manuscript with illustrations in the Cotton Genesis tradition,<sup>16</sup> the Utrecht Psalter (Utrecht, Biblioteek der Rijks-universiteit, MS 32, produced at Reims c. 830 and brought to England sometime before the year 1000), and contemporary Anglo-Saxon illuminations.<sup>17</sup> Following Raw and Henderson, however, he concluded that the manuscript contained an 'odd and often unsuitable apportionment of picture-spaces', and that the synchronization of text and picture was

<sup>13</sup> G. Henderson, 'The Programme of Illustrations in Bodleian MS Junius XI', in *Studies in Memory of David Talbot Rice*, ed. G. Robertson and G. Henderson (Edinburgh, 1975), pp. 113–45; reprinted in G. Henderson, *Studies in English Bible Illustration*, 2 vols., vol. I, (London, 1985), pp. 138–83, at p. 146. All references are to the 1985 reprint.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 160.

<sup>15</sup> T. H. Ohlgren, 'The Illustrations of the Cædmonian Genesis as a Guide to the Interpretation of the Text' (unpubl. PhD dissertation, University of Michigan, 1969); H. R. Broderick III, 'The Iconographic and Compositional Sources of the Drawings in Oxford Bodleian Library, MS Junius 11' (unpubl. PhD dissertation, Columbia University, 1978); H. R. Broderick, 'Observations on the Method of Illustration in MS Junius 11 and the Relationship of the Drawings to the Text', *Scriptorium* 37 (1983), 161–77.

<sup>16</sup> On the 'Cotton Genesis tradition' see K. Weitzmann and H. L. Kessler, *The Cotton Genesis: British Library Cotton Otho B.VI* (Princeton, NJ, 1986). According to Weitzmann and Kessler the drawings in Junius 11, along with the images in several other medieval Genesis cycles, were ultimately derived either directly or indirectly from the illustrations in the late-fifth-century Cotton Genesis.

<sup>17</sup> 'Iconographic and Compositional Sources', pp. 365–6; 'Observations on the Method of Illustration', pp. 162–3: 'Careful study of the distribution of picture-spaces in the text as well as the methods of illustration employed by the two artists has enabled us to conclude that it is more than likely that these artists were not working from an illustrated exemplar with text and illustration combined, but were probably supplying this collection of biblical poems in the vernacular with a set of pictures for the first time' (p. 162).

*Text and Picture in Anglo-Saxon England*

further marred by the artists' reliance on independent pictorial models.<sup>18</sup> In 1969, Ohlgren interpreted the illustrations as more complex visual glosses that in some cases added additional layers of meaning to the text, an argument that he has expanded in subsequent articles.<sup>19</sup> Yet Ohlgren too has tended to understand the drawings as ultimately remaining within the Cotton Genesis tradition, and has continued to explore the sources and meaning of individual details and scenes rather than reading the pictorial narrative as one level within the manuscript's larger narrative structure. Source study, in other words, continues to fragment this manuscript by failing to consider the poems and drawings as part of a coherent whole.<sup>20</sup>

As vital as the search for sources and exemplars may be to many contemporary scholars, such issues, if they concerned the manuscript's Anglo-Saxon audience, would have concerned them differently. As with Anglo-Saxon homiletic writing,<sup>21</sup> references to the writings of earlier authors, as well as traces of the oral in the written text created a complex and highly learned intertextuality while at the same time giving the text the weight of authority; nevertheless, the function and overall content of the manuscript would have been primary.<sup>22</sup> The preoccupation of art historians with the apparent lack of coherence between the manuscript's visual and verbal narratives has led us to assume disorder, and perhaps to ask the wrong questions as a result. In asking why episodes that we feel should be illustrated are not and episodes that strike us as unimportant are copiously illustrated,<sup>23</sup> we are assuming that the 'authors' and readers

<sup>18</sup> Broderick, 'Observations on the Method of Illustration', pp. 162–3.

<sup>19</sup> T. H. Ohlgren, 'The Illustrations of the Cædmonian Genesis: Literary Criticism through Art', *Medievalia et Humanistica* 3 (1972), 199–212; 'Some New Light on the Old English Cædmonian Genesis', *Studies in Iconography* 1 (1975), 38–73.

<sup>20</sup> See most recently Remley, *Biblical Verse*. Remley's detailed study of the Old Testament poems in Junius 11 fails to consider the role of the illustrations, the inclusion of *Christ and Satan* in the manuscript, and the way in which sources might have been used by the poets as tools in the construction of a new and larger narrative rather than as simple exemplars.

<sup>21</sup> See C. Lees, *Tradition and Belief: Religious Writing in Anglo-Saxon England* (Minneapolis, MN, 1999), p. 103.

<sup>22</sup> For an excellent consideration of this issue see W. Noel, *The Harley Psalter* (Cambridge, 1995), pp. 1–27.

<sup>23</sup> Henderson, 'Programme of Illustrations'; Broderick, 'Observations on the Method of Illustration'.

*Introduction: problems and solutions*

of the manuscript shared our tastes. It would be more productive to ask why the illustrations are distributed in the way that they are, and whether there might not be reasons why certain episodes may have been more appealing to an eleventh-century audience than they are to us today. That is not to say that we should ignore modern readings and interests, but simply that we must be open to alternative ways of considering such things as composition, structure and textual unity. Similarly, rather than looking for reasons to explain the apparent disunity between text and illustration, it might be more rewarding to ask if there is a unity of design, function or content that our assumptions about what constitutes an illustration have prevented us from seeing. If there are logical reasons for the copying of charters, letters, and other types of additional material into the pages of gospel books,<sup>24</sup> there are likely to be similarly logical reasons for poems clearly related by biblical themes to be bound together and illustrated with drawings that pick up on those related themes.<sup>25</sup>

EXEMPLAR VS INTERPRETATION

Crucial to an understanding of the role of the drawings within the manuscript is a consideration of the ways in which picture and text relate to each other in Anglo-Saxon art. 'Illustration' is the conventional term used to describe the images in a book or manuscript, and is retained here for the sake of convenience; however, in the Anglo-Saxon world an image was rarely intended as nothing more than a literal illustration of an accompanying text, and an illustration or illustrated cycle was rarely nothing more than a copy of its model.<sup>26</sup> Recent analysis of manuscripts as diverse in time and function as the Book of Cerne (Cambridge,

<sup>24</sup> See S. Keynes's comments on the Old English additions to the York Gospels in *The York Gospels*, ed. N. Barker (London, 1986), p. 81.

<sup>25</sup> The repetition of motifs, words and phrases in *Genesis* and *Exodus* has led some scholars to see the two poems as written to accompany each other, with *Exodus* most likely written or emended to accord with a preexisting *Genesis*. See especially C. Stévanovitch, 'Envelope Patterns in *Genesis A* and *B*', *Neophilologus* 80.3 (1996), 465–78, esp. 474–5.

<sup>26</sup> Even the Harley Psalter (London, British Library, Harley 603), generally described as a copy of the Utrecht Psalter (Utrecht, University Library, MS 32), differs dramatically from its exemplar. See Noel, *Harley Psalter*.

*Text and Picture in Anglo-Saxon England*

University Library, Ll.1.10),<sup>27</sup> the Benedictional of St Æthelwold (London, British Library, Add. 49598)<sup>28</sup> and the Tiberius Psalter (London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius C. vi),<sup>29</sup> has revealed that in each case the miniatures function as a visual gloss or exegesis of the text, and are one of the primary tools used by scribes and artists to relate different texts or portions of texts to each other. Kathleen Openshaw and Robert Deshman have shown how Anglo-Saxon psalter illustration is often symbolic, with individual miniatures used to establish a typological programme that relates Old and New Testament events.<sup>30</sup> The psalter was an extremely popular form of book in Anglo-Saxon England, as it was throughout early medieval Europe, and the text of the psalter was one of the most important sources for the Junius 11 poems.<sup>31</sup> The influence of illustrated psalters on other types of manuscript is undoubted, and many of the details in the Junius 11 illustrations, along with those of other eleventh-century Anglo-Saxon manuscripts, have been traced back to the Carolingian Utrecht Psalter,<sup>32</sup> but there was also an Insular tradition of symbolic psalter illustration that seems to have been equally influential.<sup>33</sup> A significant number of the Junius 11 drawings have a typological function, yet they work in a slightly different way from the psalter illustrations, combining symbolic and literal content to create a visual narrative that both illustrates the poetic text and translates it into a new pictorial language. Like the poems they accompany, the drawings require

<sup>27</sup> M. P. Brown, *The Book of Cerne: Prayer, Patronage and Power in Ninth-Century England* (London and Toronto, 1996). See particularly ch. 4, 'Decoration as Elucidation'.

<sup>28</sup> R. Deshman, *The Benedictional of Æthelwold* (Princeton, NJ, 1995). Deshman identifies a series of interrelated programmes related to the liturgy, monastic life and the court, that run throughout the manuscript. He also notes that 'the miniatures are iconographically interrelated on various levels', and that repetition of motifs and themes is used to create what he terms a 'cyclic symbolism' (p. 7).

<sup>29</sup> K. M. Openshaw, 'The Battle between Christ and Satan in the Tiberius Psalter', *JWCI* 52 (1989), 14–33.

<sup>30</sup> K. M. Openshaw, 'The Symbolic Illustration of the Psalter: An Insular Tradition', *Arte medievale* 2nd series 6 (1992), 41–60; R. Deshman, 'The Galba Psalter: Pictures, Text and Context in an Early Medieval Prayerbook', *ASE* 26 (1997), 109–38.

<sup>31</sup> Remley, *Biblical Verse*, pp. 69, 175–8 and 257–8.

<sup>32</sup> See especially Raw, 'Probable Derivation', and Broderick, 'Iconographic and Compositional Sources'.

<sup>33</sup> Openshaw, 'Symbolic Illustration'. See also Deshman, 'Galba Psalter'; J. O'Reilly, 'Early Medieval Text and Image: the Wounded and Exalted Christ', *Peritia* 6–7 (1987–8), 72–118, esp. pp. 86–93.

*Introduction: problems and solutions*

an audience capable of reading and interpreting correctly;<sup>34</sup> indeed the need to read and interpret properly is one of the central themes of the manuscript. At every level the manuscript itself demands the active participation of each reader/viewer at each new reading.

The poetic and pictorial narratives are not the same, but there are stylistic similarities between them which help us to create a unified reading that bridges the gulf between the verbal and the visual. Like the text, which includes different types of voice (description, dialogue, gnomic sayings, authorial interventions), the illustrations address both text and audience in different ways. Raw, for example, questioned why Enoch should be depicted on page 60 (pl. XXIX) haloed, holding an open book and standing on a dragon, when none of these details is mentioned in the poem.<sup>35</sup> All three details, however, help to identify Enoch as a type of Christ, and to establish the relationship of this episode to the Harrowing of Hell and the Last Judgement, New Testament events that are both foreshadowed in verbal and visual motifs throughout the Old Testament poems and recounted at length in *Christ and Satan*. Enoch stands over the dragon as does the Christ prefigured in Psalm XC who tramples on the beasts, an episode repeatedly linked to the Harrowing of Hell and the Last Judgement in Anglo-Saxon art and literature.<sup>36</sup> Moreover, as a symbol of the devil and Antichrist, the dragon is a reminder that Enoch returns to earth to do battle with the Antichrist, at which time he will be slain and ascend to heaven for a second and final time. In his treatise 'On the Old and New Testaments', a text roughly contemporary with the Junius 11 manuscript, Ælfric explains:

Enoh wæs geciged se sefoða man fram Adame; he worhte Godes willan and God hine ða genam mid andsundum lichaman of þisum life upp, and he ys cucu git, swa swa Helias, se æðela witega, þe wæs eal swa genumen to þam oðrum life, and

<sup>34</sup> For an analysis of the relationship of audience to narrative in Anglo-Saxon poetry, see C. B. Pasternack, *The Textuality of Old English Poetry*, CSASE 13 (Cambridge, 1995); P. Head, *Representation and Design: Tracing a Hermeneutics of Old English Poetry* (Albany, NY, 1997); R. Frank, 'Some Uses of Paronomasia in Old English Scriptural Verse', *Speculum* 47.2 (1972), 207–26; S. Lerer, *Literacy and Power in Anglo-Saxon Literature* (Lincoln, NE and London, 1991).

<sup>35</sup> Raw, 'Probable Derivation', p. 136.

<sup>36</sup> See below, p. 61. See also K. M. Openshaw, 'Weapons in the Daily Battle: Images of the Conquest of Evil in the Early Medieval Psalter', *Art Bull.* 75 (1993), 17–38; and Openshaw, 'Battle between Christ and Satan'.

*Text and Picture in Anglo-Saxon England*

hi cumað begen togeanes Antecriste, þæt hig his leasunga alecgon þurh God, and beoð þonne ofslegen þurh ðone sylfan feond, and hi eft arisað, swa swa ealle men doð.<sup>37</sup>

The open book not only connects Enoch with the image of God and Christ as Creator and Judge, and particularly with the image of Christ in majesty holding the book of judgement, but also mirrors the open manuscript we read. It has been suggested that the open book and text displayed by Enoch may refer to the tradition that Enoch invented writing,<sup>38</sup> certainly a possible interpretation as this is the only drawing in the manuscript in which the artist has indicated writing on the open pages of a book. But beyond this, the image is also an example of the motif of reading and writing that runs throughout the manuscript, creating a self-referentiality that unites the writing of the first story with the writing of this manuscript and its continual reading and interpretation (each a form of rewriting) by its audience. The open book might also be understood as reflecting Enoch's loyalty to God ('him wæs þeoden hold, rodera waldend', *Gen.* 1202b–1203), which leads to his salvation. The image refers us back to the opening words of the manuscript which instruct the reader to love and to praise God as a means to salvation. The drawing thus serves to unite the beginning and end, Creation and the Last Judgement, *Genesis* and *Christ and Satan*, and helps to locate narrative and reader within the continuum of Christian history. Katherine O'Brien O'Keeffe, Martin Irvine and Carol Pasternack have emphasized the fact

<sup>37</sup> 'The seventh man from Adam was called Enoch, he did God's will, and God took him up with his whole body, up from this life, and he is living yet, just as is the noble prophet Elias, who was also taken to the other life, and both shall come against Antichrist, to conquer his lies through the power of God. They will then be slain by that same fiend, and they will rise again just as all men will do.' *The Old English Version of the Heptateuch, Ælfric's Treatise on the Old and New Testament and his Preface to Genesis*, ed. S. J. Crawford, EETS OS 160 (Oxford, 1922; repr. 1969 with additional texts transcribed by N. R. Ker), p. 23. All translations from Old English are my own. See also Augustine, *De civitate dei* xv. 19 (CCSL 48), pp. 481–2; Bede, *In Genesim* (CCSL 118A), p. 96; and P. Clemons, 'Cynewulf's Image of the Ascension', in *England Before the Conquest: Studies in Primary Sources Presented to Dorothy Whitelock*, ed. P. Clemons and K. Hughes (Cambridge, 1971), pp. 293–304 (repr. in *Cynewulf: Basic Readings*, ed. R. E. Bjork (New York, 1996), pp. 109–32).

<sup>38</sup> Gollancz, ed., *Cædmon Manuscript*, p. xlv; T. H. Ohlgren, *Anglo-Saxon Textual Illustration: Photographs of Sixteen Manuscripts with Descriptions and Index* (Kalamazoo, MI, 1992), p. 95.