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CHAPTER 1

THE ROLE OF THE PROTOTYPE AND THE COPY IN THE STUDY OF
EARLY CHRISTIAN GENESIS ILLUSTRATION

The problems involved in a study of Early Christian manuscript illumination are based primarily on a scarcity of material. For example, in the case of our subject the early Genesis manuscripts illustrating the creation of Adam and Eve, we possess today only one actual manuscript which can be dated satisfactorily within the Early Christian centuries, the Vienna Genesis; we have fragments of another early manuscript which had been preserved in good condition until the 18th century when it was destroyed by fire, the Cotton Genesis; and we have echoes of Early Christian manuscripts in later medieval copies, Carolingian, for example,¹ where Early Christian illuminations were used as models.

In a study such as this, which is concerned primarily with iconography, this last category, later copies of early works, can provide

a substantial amount of material for a detailed comparative study. For it becomes increasingly apparent in the study of Early Medieval manuscript illumination that there was a tendency among copyists to reproduce not only the text as it appears in the model but the illustrations as well. And just as the nature of the paleography may change in the copying process while the text remains relatively stable, so the illustrations will tend to conform to the style of the current copyist while the basic elements of the composition and iconography remain, though not exactly the same, at least recognizable from model to copy. Based on this observation, the comparison of certain manuscript illuminations of early date with those of later periods which are related in subject has become standard procedure in the study of Early Christian and Medieval iconography.²

It has been suggested by a number of scholars, Kurt Weitzmann,³

---

² The student of manuscript illumination, while keeping in mind the changes in style which take place between the model and later copy, takes particular notice of details in background, position of figures, objects and their placement, and the general conception of the scene. For these are the basic elements upon which the style of the later copy is superimposed. But we are not dealing with an absolute. The imposition of style on iconography "prevents the reconstruction of even a single picture of a large cycle in its absolute purity." Kurt Weitzmann, *Illustrations in Roll and Codex*, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1947, p.182.

Of special note is Weitzmann's Chapter IV in *Roll and Codex* (pp. 182-192) in which he discusses the relation between the picture and the text in the application of techniques of criticism and pays particular attention to the problem of the intrusion of style into the picture copyists production, a problem of less than primary concern to textual criticism.

³ Weitzmann, *Roll and Codex*, p. 89.
Charles Rufus Morey,⁴ and Paul Buberl⁵ among them, that the existing Early Christian manuscript and fragments are also copies, and copies of even earlier models, and form, as it were, a link in the development from ultimate prototypes. What stage of development they belong to is hard to say, nor is there any certainty as to the age of the original from which the later works were copied.

The Greek version of the Old Testament known as the Septuagint (which is the text used by the Early Christian illuminators) was being translated from Hebrew as early as the third century B.C.⁶ Whether it was illustrated or not at the time is not known. However, C.R. Morey believes that there must have been illustrated Septuagint manuscripts at least within the period of the Christian catacomb frescoes.⁷ The frescoes appear in these subterranean cemeteries from the third century A.D. and possibly earlier and they continue to be produced well into the fifth century and even later.⁸ And indeed


⁷ Morey, Early Christian Art, p.65.

⁸ The terminal dates for the catacomb paintings are still in question. The followers of G.B. De Rossi whose own writings appear between 1864 and 1894 (Morey, op.cit. p.204, n.71.) suggest a date as early as the second half of the first century for the Catacomb of Domitilla in particular. They base their assumption on certain epigraphic evidence connection the tomb with a grand-niece of Vespasian (Morey, op.cit.p.62). LeClercq writing in 1907 accepts this first century date for certain rooms in the catacomb: the Gallery of Flavius and a single cubiculum.
it seems that the Hebrew prohibition against illustration of biblical text was no longer enforced among certain Jews during the first few centuries of the Christian era. The proof is in the frescoes of the synagogue discovered at Dura-Europos. These date around 250 A.D. and represent scenes of Moses, Abraham, Jacob, and other Old Testament personages. In these frescoes we have at least a precedent for Old Testament biblical illustration of some kind several centuries before the earliest illustrated manuscripts (which date around the fifth or sixth century) that have come down to us.

Further, Dura has provided examples of similar paintings in a Christian chapel contemporaneous with the synagogue.

In addition, those frescoes in the catacombs, already mentioned, bear witness to Christian biblical painting of this same early period around third century A.D. in Rome itself. However, all these paintings resemble the manuscripts in subject matter but not in their method of

Both contain figured and ornamental paintings including a Daniel in the lion's den in the first and a Good Shepherd in the second. (Dom Henri Leclercq, Manuel d'Archeologie Chretienne, Paris, Letrouzey et Ané Editions, 1907, I, 529.) If these dates are true, we have Christian figural painting very soon after the formation of the religion itself. One might examine the implications for manuscript illumination if the figural painting indicates a developed or developing iconography similar to that of our existing manuscripts. However, objection has been raised to these early dates, objections based on stylistic characteristics which according to Morey, would place the frescoes in the second or early third century (Morey, op.cit. p.62). And this date is at best only slightly earlier than the Dura date and those of other works cited in the body of the paper.

9 Morey, op.cit. p.65.


11 Morey, op.cit. p.65.
presentation; that is, these early wall paintings tend to be single scene
"formula" representations: in the case of Adam and Eve, the figures
stand on either side of the Tree of Knowledge. 12 No attempt is made
to develop a narrative sequence of several related episodes which
follow the textual account of the action. In the manuscripts the
subject, Adam and Eve, is developed in a series of pictures showing
not only the moment of the Fall but the events before and after, e.g.
the temptation of Eve or the expulsion from Paradise. Therefore,
while we cannot establish any terminus a quo for a narrative manuscript
recension based on catacomb or Dura finds, these frescoes are evidence
of the emergence of Christian and Jewish biblical painting at least
as early as the third century A.D. which is the date generally given
for both the Christian and Jewish wall paintings. 13 And we may suspect
that some sort of manuscript development in this direction also
appeared, perhaps even the prototypes for our surviving codices.

The controversy over the relationship between Early Christian
manuscripts and their prototypes has been continuous. 14 The necessarily
tentative nature of the hypotheses possible because of scarcity of
evidence assures a diversity of opinion. In the case of the manuscript

13 See above, pp.
14 See, for instance, Weitzmann's comments on Tikkanen's work
"Observations on the Cotton Genesis Fragments," Late Classical and
Medieval Studies in Honor of Albert Mathias Friend Jr., Princeton,
Princeton University Press, 1954, pp. 121-122.) and on Mcery's
attempt to derive the Cotton Genesis and the Vienna Genesis
from the same source (Ibid., p. 130, n. 67.).
which is to be the starting point of this investigation, the Vienna Genesis,\textsuperscript{15} much has been written in an attempt to establish the date and provenance of the surviving manuscript and to reconstruct the archetype upon which the manuscript is based.

It is now generally thought that the Genesis is the work of several artists, although opinions vary as to the number: Wickhoff, 7; Morey, 6; Gerstinger and Buberl, 8.\textsuperscript{16} In the matter of style, Wickhoff had noted in 1895 that the manuscript contained elements of what he called the "illusionistic" style and also a more linear manner. He considered the work transitional.\textsuperscript{17} The Russian Ainalov, on the

\textsuperscript{15} The Vienna Genesis, so called from its location in the Vienna National Library (where it is designated Cod. Vindob. theol. graec. 31), is a purple manuscript containing 48 pages. And there is reason to believe that there were originally more, possibly 96 in all with some 192 illustrations. The manuscript pages measure between 30.4 and 32.6 cm. in length and 24.5 to 26.5 cm. in width (\textit{Emmy Wellesz, The Vienna Genesis}, London, Faber and Faber Ltd., 1960, p.5).

The text is that of the Septuagint version of the First Book of Moses, but the manuscript as it exists today contains only those chapters from the Fall of Man to the Death of Jacob with gaps not only at the beginning and the end but in various sections in between. And the text itself is not a full text but condensed and shortened with passages left out (\textit{Ibid.}, p.5).

The writing was done by two scribes whose methods present obvious differences between them. The first scribe worked on folios I-XVI. He is characterized by a more ornamental style of calligraphy and by an attempt to fit all material pertinent to the picture onto the single page without carrying over to the next. To achieve his end, we find him leaving out unimportant words and crowding together the words at the bottom of the page. The second scribe, (folios XVII-XIV) on the other hand, lets the text run on from page to page without regard for a unity of text and illustration. His lines are evenly spaced throughout (\textit{Ibid.}, p.6).

\textsuperscript{16} Wellesz, \textit{op.cit.}, p.21.

contrary, writing in 1900 saw not a variety of hands responsible for
divergences in style but two different prototypes from which the artist
had to work. However, this hypothesis did not gain wide acceptance.
For in 1924 and again in 1929, Morey returns to the idea of a single
prototype and a number of artists whose characteristics he carefully
separates and describes. His answer to Ainalov's multiple model theory
is "... in spite of the more arrange effect of the final miniatures,
their action is still predominantly from left to right, as is the case
in the main with the preceding series. There seems no reason therefore
to consider the variety of handling as an indication of different
models, but rather as reflecting the different reactions and capacities
of a group of artists confronted with the task of reproducing or adapting
a single model in an unfamiliar style."20

Morey goes on to develop his own theories about prototype. His
identifications of two major trends, a linear and a painterly, in
Late Antique and Early Christian art enlarges on Wickhoff's early
observations. The linear style he calls "Neo-Attic." It is based on
an attempt to retain or regain the style of classical Greece.21 Yet
at the same time it moves East into Asia, the old Seleucid empire,
where its tendency toward flattening and "two dimensional clarity."22

---

18 D.V. Ainalov, The Hellenistic Origins of Byzantine Art, ed., Cyril

19 Charles R. Morey, "Notes on East Christian Miniatures," Art

20 Ibid., p16.

21 Morey, Early Christian Art, p.17.

22 Ibid., p.27.
and the replacement of modeling with a "coloristic pattern of light and shade" becomes more pronounced.

The alternate trend, the painterly, Morey calls the "Alexandrian" because he believes that it may have originated in Alexandria in Egypt, although he admits that "there is almost no evidence from Alexandria to support this indication." Be that as it may, the style is characterized by a landscape background including various elements of scenery such as mountains, trees, and garden walls or stele with urns set on top. And more important is the recognition of spatial depth, the third dimension, which is characteristic of the Alexandrian style as opposed to Neo-Attic two-dimensionality. In common with the interest in spatial depth is an interest in light effects, the rendering of an atmosphere with results in a kind of impressionism. The Alexandrian mode, according to Morey, is the style of the Latin West and Egypt.

Using the distinctions as he has set them up, Morey describes the Vienna Genesis as a mixture of Neo-Attic linearism and Alexandrian illusionism in a manner that indicates . . . that the manuscript was

---

24 Ibid., p.38.
25 Ibid., p.38.
26 Ibid., p.40.
27 Ibid., p.27. These statements are given here as explanation for the style terms Neo-Attic and Alexandrian which will be used in this paper. They do not imply that Morey's designations, particularly of locale for each style cannot and have not been questioned. For discussion see Sirarpie Der Nersessian, "Review of C.R. Morey's Early Christian Art," Art Bulletin, XXV, 1943, 80-86.
copied from an Alexandrian original. The physical appearance of this
Alexandrian original was, for Morey, a rotulus. The use of oblong
registers and the continuation of scenes from one register to another
without a break would indicate an illustrated roll as the model for
the present manuscript.

While Morey was working on the problem, a colored facsimile
dition appeared in 1931 accompanied by an exhaustive study by Hans
Gerstinger. He too suggests an Alexandrian rotulus as model for the
Genesis. But he thinks that the landscape backgrounds were a later
addition, and therefore, the ultimate prototype must have been
illustrated in a rather simple linear manner. This is in contrast
to Morey's hypothesis of an Alexandrian prototype - Alexandrian in
origin and "Alexandrian" in style.

In 1936 another extensive study of the Vienna Genesis was
published by Paul Buberl. He developed a series of theories which differ
greatly from those of his contemporaries. Firstly, he sees a certain
lack of quality in the work which leads him to the conclusion that it
is a copy and a copy produced in an extensive workshop. This work-
shop turned out numerous reproductions based on a pattern that had been
carefully worked out by theologians and artists. Secondly, he disagrees

29 Morey, Early Christian Art, p.75.
30 Wellesz, op.cit., p.17.
31 Buberl, op.cit., p.55.
with the roll theory and contends that the prototype, a codex, dates no earlier than the fourth century after the triumph of Constantine.\textsuperscript{32} For it is then that the demand for illustrated Christian manuscripts becomes great.\textsuperscript{33} In addition, the provenance of the Vienna manuscript itself, in Buberl's opinion, is Antioch rather than Alexandria. He places the \textit{Cotton Genesis} (cod. Cott. Otho B VII), another Early Christian manuscript illustrating the first book of the Old Testament, in Alexandria. But judging the \textit{Vienna Genesis} to be a different recension, he denies an Egyptian origin to it.\textsuperscript{34} Rather he suggests Antioch which was a center of Bible studies in the Early Christian period. There, Bible reading was a part of public worship. John Chrysostom, for example, writing in the second half of the fourth century, not only shows a profound knowledge of the entire Bible but devotes quite a bit of attention to the book of Genesis alone. Thus, Buberl feels that this intense interest in biblical studies and in Genesis also, makes it likely for a picture Genesis to have been produced in Antioch.\textsuperscript{35}

Kurt Weitzmann moves even further into new theories in his book \textit{Illustrations in Roll and Codex} in 1947.\textsuperscript{36} Based on his study of

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{32} Wellesz, \textit{op.cit.}, p.17.
\item \textsuperscript{33} Buberl, \textit{op.cit.}, p.56.
\item \textsuperscript{34} Wellesz, \textit{op.cit.}, p.17.
\item \textsuperscript{35} Buberl, \textit{op.cit.}, p.57.
\item \textsuperscript{36} Slightly earlier (1942) Morey's \textit{Early Christian Art} appeared which clearly established Morey's line of thought on Late Antique-Early Christian style and which developed more fully the ideas he presented twenty years earlier.
\end{itemize}
papyrus rolls and early codices, he develops a totally new format for the prototype of the *Vienna Genesis*. Between the rotulus and the existing codex is an intermediary form which is a link between the characteristic classical rotulus with its pictures inserted between the lines of text and the *Vienna Genesis* with its series of pictures arranged at the bottom of the page and removed from the lines of text actually related to the illustration.

The codex form was introduced in the beginning of the second century, according to Weitzmann, and gained ground slowly. Its general page layout consisted of a columned or multicolumned page interspersed with illustrations. It is to this stage of development that Weitzmann attributes the model of the *Vienna Genesis*. His reconstruction of this model resembles the rotulus in the distribution of illustrations within the columns of text; but the number of long and narrow columns is now limited to two on a page. He does not, however, suggest a date for it.

In creating the actual *Vienna Genesis* the artists have removed the illustrations from their position between passages of text and

---

37 Weitzmann, op.cit., p.78, fig.A.
38 Ibid., p.89.
39 Ibid., p.81.
40 Ibid., p.90, fig.D.
regrouped them along the lower section of the page. That this transposition had taken place might be seen from the placing of scenes of equal length side by side without their being related by formal means. Weitzmann postulates a loss of details through "condensation" of the picture in the copying process. He, therefore, attempts to supply the missing parts as in the case of his reconstruction of the miniature of Lot's Drunkenness in its original columned codex form.

Weitzmann says little about the provenance of the archetype. He does, however, assert that it belongs to a different recension than the Cotton Genesis, already mentioned, or the Byzantine Octateuch, the twelfth century Greek Bibles which appear to use Early Christian prototypes particularly in their beginning books. The style of the Vienna Genesis, in Weitzmann's opinion, is Syrian possibly Antioch. But he makes no statement about the place of origin of the prototype.

The Vienna Genesis is, thus, still a controversial work. The hypotheses concerning the manuscript itself are much more firmly based than those concerning its prototype. Some of these theories and the

---

41 Ibid., p.89.
42 Loc.cit.
43 Ibid., p.92, fig.E.
45 Morey, Early Christian Art, p.76.
evidence behind them will be surveyed in the next chapter.
CHAPTER II

THE QUESTION OF THE STYLE AND PROVENANCE

OF THE VIENNA GENESIS

The Vienna Genesis is a Genesis manuscript written in Greek and now generally believed to have originated in the Eastern part of the Roman Empire, this assumption being based on stylistic comparison rather than iconographic evidence. For the Genesis bears a number of similarities to two other Early Christian manuscripts: the Rossano Gospels, Codex Rossanensis,47 and the Sinope fragment (Paris, E.N. Supp.

47 The Rossano Gospels or Codex Rossanensis gets its name from its present location in the Cathedral of Rossano in Italy (Morey, Early Christian Art, p.108). It is a purple vellum manuscript with silver letters (Ibid., p.111). It still retains one evangelist portrait; the others have been lost (Ibid., p.108) and it has a series of pictures which are distributed sometimes one, sometimes two on a page (Ibid., p.111). The composition of the page is developed, in the majority of cases by division into two registers. The upper contains the narrative scene played on a ground line against a neutral background. The lower register consists of four prophets shown half length, the remainder of their bodies being hidden by the scrolls which they hold in front of them. The scrolls are inscribed with prophesies which foretold the incident shown in the upper register (Ibid., p.112). The manuscript dates from the sixth century (Ibid., p.108; see also Ibid., p.214, n.208; for the prototype and its date, see William C. Loerke, "The Miniatures of the Trial in the Rossano Gospels," Art Bulletin, XIII, 1961).
Both Gospels have been securely placed in the Eastern empire primarily because of a distinctly Asiatic iconography. The most obvious example of this definitely Eastern iconography is the figure of Christ himself (Plate I). Granting some mixing of styles and influence back and forth between East and West, studies showed two distinct and separate conceptions of the Christ figure to have developed, one in the East and the other in the West. The Western type can be seen in many of the mosaics of S. Apollinare Nuovo in Ravenna (Plate II). He is beardless with long hair touching his shoulders. A slightly varied form of the same figure appears in Egypt. This Christ is exemplified by the Creator in the Cotton Genesis (Plate III) and the Christ who appears in Coptic art in

48 Codex Sinopensis (Paris B.N. Supplement gr. 1286) derives its name from its place of discovery, Sinope in Paphlagonia (Morey, Early Christian Art, p.113). It is a fragment of Matthew containing 44 leaves, 43 of which are in Paris (Andre Grabar, Les Peintures de l'Evangeliaire de Sinope, Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, 1948, p.7). While the Sinopensis uses the same iconographical theme of Old Testament forecaster of New Testament events as the Rossanensis, the composition is handled differently: two instead of four prophets appear and they are placed on either side of the picture rather than below. The Sinopensis is also dated around the sixth century partly on stylistic and partly on paleographical evidence (Ibid., P.26). Morey would like to date it later than the Rossanensis due to the disappearance of the ground line and the replacement of certain sfumato still seen in the Rossanensis by heavy black lines for contours in the Sinope manuscript (Morey, Early Christian Art, p.113).

general. He is also beardless but his hair is short and he often carries a scepter cross.\textsuperscript{50}

\textsuperscript{50} Edward Capps, Jr., "An Ivory Pyxis in the Museo Cristiano and a Plaque from the Sancta Sanctorum," \textit{Art Bulletin}, IX, 1926, 332. The definitive work in this area of New Testament iconography was done by E. Baldwin Smith (\textit{Early Christian Iconography and a School of Ivory Carvers in Provence}, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1918). He observed distinct and separate tendencies in the illustration of New Testament stories which developed between East and West. These diverse tendencies are divided by Smith into five large and somewhat flexible categories: Hellenistic (what we have called Western), Oriental-Hellenistic, Alexandrian-Coptic, Palestinian-Coptic, and Proto-Byzantine (\textit{Ibid.}, pp.159-186). This last corresponds roughly to what we have called Asiatic. The Oriental-Hellenistic and the Palestinian-Coptic are variants on the Hellenistic and the Alexandrian-Coptic respectively; that is to say, they show close affinities to these larger trends rather than constituting distinct styles within themselves. An example will help clarify the discussion. The following is Smith's system applied to the iconography of Christ Healing the Blind.

I Hellenistic: Christ is touching the eyes of a single blind man of small stature(\textit{Ibid.}, p.97).

II Oriental-Hellenistic: includes scenes of the Hellenistic type but of Eastern origin or inspiration, e.g. Brescia Casket, Doors of Santa Sabina (\textit{Ibid.}, p. 97).

III Alexandrian-Coptic: continuation of Hellenistic but with Coptic cross in Christ's hand. This type can be found on the ivory chair of Maximianus (\textit{Ibid.}, p. 98).

IV Syrian: two blind men instead of one are represented. It is seen for instance in the Rabula Gospels. It is a specifically Eastern type originating in either Syria or Asia Minor (\textit{Ibid.}, pp.98-99).

V Byzantine: this type represents the story of the blind man whose sight is restored after he washes his eyes in the pool of Siloam and is represented in the Rossano Gospels (though not in the \textit{Sinopensis}) and later in Byzantine manuscripts such as Paris B.N. 510. This motif too is of probable origin in Asia Minor (\textit{Ibid.}, p.101).

These last two groups represent Christ as bearded while in the first three he is beardless.

While these five examples are somewhat at variance with the five divisions first cited, i.e. Syrian instead of Palestinian-Coptic, they still serve to illustrate the type of analysis done by the author. The variations serve to emphasize the numerous cross currents of influence working on the development of iconography which causes it to resist division into tightly constructed categories. The divisions shown here were given by the author as general groupings in the summary of his findings and not as absolutes.
The Asiatic Christ differs from these in that he is heavily bearded with dark hair falling on his shoulders.\textsuperscript{51} This type appears in both the Sinopensis and the Rossanensis. But the firmest evidence of his presence in the East is found in the signed and dated Rabula Gospels (Paris syr. 33) which come from the monastery of Zagba in Syria.\textsuperscript{52}

Further iconographical evidence of Eastern provenance for the two manuscripts Rossanensis and Sinopensis is seen in the handling of subject matter. The Sinopensis provides among its five miniatures a scene of Christ healing two blind men. This seen has been shown to appear almost exclusively in Asiatic works.\textsuperscript{53} The Latin West and Egypt preferred the scene of Christ healing a single blind man.\textsuperscript{54}

The study of other aspects of the manuscripts leads to the same conclusion. In her study of Byzantine ornament, Alison Franz has shown that the Rossanensis contains an early example of certain decorative circle motifs which continue to appear in subsequent monuments of established Asiatic origin, the Rabula Gospels again being an example.\textsuperscript{55}

Grabar believes he sees a connection between the costume of the

\textsuperscript{51} Lawrence, \textit{op.cit.}, p.29.

\textsuperscript{52} Grabar, \textit{op.cit.}, p.23.

\textsuperscript{53} Lawrence, \textit{op.cit.}, p.29.

\textsuperscript{54} Morey, \textit{Early Christian Art}, p.113; also see above n.40.

\textsuperscript{55} Alison M. Franz, "Byzantine Illuminated Ornament," \textit{Art Bulletin}, XVI, 1934, 55.
figure of Herod in Sinopensis and those on Palmyrian funerary monuments.  

When taken together, the evidence points to either an Eastern origin or an Eastern artist for the Sinope and Rossano Gospels. Pinpointing the location has been more difficult. Syria or Mesopotamia, Asia Minor, and Cappadocia have been suggested. But it is enough for the purposes of this paper to accept simply an Eastern provenance for these manuscripts as opposed to Egypt or the West. For it has been noted above that the Vienna Genesis bears stylistic similarities particularly in figure style to these manuscripts, and it is on this basis rather than iconography that the Genesis has been given an Asiatic origin.

57 Ibid., p. 25.
58 Der Nersessian, op. cit., p. 80.

60 The three, taking into account the differences in date, show a similarity in style. In the drawing of the figure, all show a particular propensity for the figure to lean away from the vertical with the weight on one foot and with the other bent slightly outward, an echo of classical contraposto. The heads tend to be large and wider at the part of the head around the temples and with large dark eyes. The emphasis is put on these traits in varying degrees depending on the artist working. The styles of the Vienna Genesis vary from a soft painterly rendering in the beginning to a more linear approach further on in the manuscript.

In other aspects too, the Genesis resembles the Gospels: the cities are indicated in the same way in all; so are the doors. And the prison of the Baptist in the Sinope Gospels is like that of Joseph and Pharaoh's butler and baker in the Vienna Genesis. Morey, Early Christian Art, p. 114.

61 Morey, Art Bulletin, 1929, p. 12. Objection on the grounds that the
This roundabout method of determining the provenance of the
Genesis has been employed because of the difficulties involved in
distinguishing regional variations in Old Testament iconography.
An exception can be found in the Cotton Genesis, however, but for the
reason that the Christ is substituted for a symbolic representation
of the Creator. And the Christ is of the short haired beardless type
which has been shown to be of Egyptian origin. But in the Vienna
Genesis, and indeed in the Byzantine Octateuchs, the Logos is simply
shown as a hand appearing in the sky. Morey has pointed to the
emphasis on the Joseph story in the Vienna Genesis as an indication
of a connection between the Genesis and Egypt. (For the story of
Joseph in Egypt is one that both Egyptian Jews and Christians were
fond of.) At the same time, he describes a similar emphasis on
Joseph in the Cotton Genesis, a manuscript not related to the Vienna
Genesis in style. Similarities in subject matter do not always
imply a larger relationship. Nevertheless, Morey believes so
strongly in the connection between the Vienna manuscript, Alexandria,
and the Cotton Genesis that, basing his conclusion partly on a
similarity between the Flood scene in the Vienna Genesis and the
same scene in the narthex mosaics at San Marco in Venice, the whole

style of the Genesis is not similar to the Neo-Attic Gospel books
can probably be dispelled by suggesting that the "Alexandrian"
prototype of the Vienna Genesis provided a landscape model which
the prototypes of the Gospels never had. Loc. cit.

62 Ibid., p.21.

63 Morey, Early Christian Art, p.93.
cycle of which appears to have been copied from a manuscript of the Cotton Genesis recension, he asserts "that the artists of the Vienna Genesis had before them a Genesis illustrated after the manner of the Cotton manuscript. If this is so, then there must be some other similarities apparent in the Cotton and Vienna manuscripts.

Weitzmann, on the other hand, in a discussion of the Cotton Genesis makes the equal and opposite statement that the Vienna Genesis "represents a third recension related neither to the Cotton Genesis nor the Byzantine Octateuchs," these last being a cycle of illuminated Greek Bible texts with illustrations which appear to have Early Christian prototypes. Considering the tradition of pictorial recension characteristic of the Middle Ages, we can with caution accept these cycles as evidence of Early Christian iconography despite their 12th century date.

It will be our purpose in the remainder of this paper to explore these statements of two of the most prominent American authorities on Early Christian manuscripts. We will attempt to discover a relationship, if there is any, by comparing the iconography

64 Morey, Art Bulletin, 1929, p.12.
66 Of the manuscripts of the Byzantine Octateuchs that have come down to us, three: Lib. Bibl. Vaticana, gr. 746, L.B.V., gr. 747, and Istanbul, Seraglio 8, have scenes of the Creation and F'1l. In the case of L.B.V., gr. 746, for instance, there are some fifteen scenes of single and continuous narrative illustration depicting Genesis from the Creation of Adam and the World's animals through the Expulsion (Princeton Art Index). For this reason the Octateuchs are going to be included in this study as material for comparison with the Vienna Genesis.
of the scenes of Adam and Eve in the Vienna Genesis and the Cotton Bible using additional material in the form of the Byzantine Octateuchs, whose prototype is not only Early Christian but "Alexandrian" as well.67

Thus we will look at the two extant examples of Early Christian "Alexandrian" style and at the derivatives of this style in the 12th century Byzantine works. The study will concentrate on the narrative of Adam and Eve, whose illustrated story appears in all three recensions in the developed narrative form rather than in the symbolic single frame formula which we saw at Dura and in the catacombs and which was discussed earlier.

III

COMPARISON OF THE VIENNA GENESIS WITH

THE COTTON GENESIS AND THE OCTATEUCHS

The text of Genesis with which we are familiar today comes from
the Latin Vulgate and ultimately from the Hebrew Pentateuch\textsuperscript{68} version of
the Scriptures. But these are not the only translations available.
A less common form in the West is the Septuagint,\textsuperscript{69} a Greek translation
of the Bible. Its importance to us lies in the fact that it is the text
used in the Vienna Genesis.

The textual recension of the Septuagint is possibly as much as
four centuries older than the prototypes of the more familiar Old
Testament texts. For all the latter are translations of the Hebrew
"masoritic" texts which began to take definite shape only as late as
100 A.D. (Although they reached their final form in the seventh century

\textsuperscript{68} See Appendix I.

\textsuperscript{69} See Appendix II.
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under the guidance of the Masoretes, the Hebrew "traditionalists.") This text is an alteration of an older writing and ultimately replaced the earlier recension of which the Septuagint is a surviving example.\textsuperscript{70} The observation of textual differences becomes important with the consideration of iconography. The change of a single word or phrase can appear in an iconographical detail, a detail which may when related to the traditional biblical texts seem puzzling. We shall see an example below.

Of the three cycles of illustration which survive, the cycle of the Vienna Genesis provides the fewest miniatures. For part of the manuscript is lost. The Vienna Genesis contains only six scenes of Adam and Eve drawn from Genesis 3:6-3:24. They cover only two pages of continuous narrative scenes in the manuscript, three on a page. To describe the illustrations briefly, the first page (Plate IV) shows a pale ivory colored Eve in the act of bringing the pink fruit to her lips and handing another to a slightly darker Adam. This is immediately followed by their awareness of Nakedness as they first cover themselves and then hide in the bushes upon hearing God walking about the garden. Above them, in the center of the page, is the hand of God gesturing from out of the clouds toward the last scene of the couple hiding. No doubt this refers to God's question, "Adam, where art thou?" (Genesis 3:9).

The second page (Plate V) continues the story. While the orange serpent appears coiled around the tree with its head turned from the

\textsuperscript{70} Kueses, \textit{opcit.} pp.xxi-xxii.
couple, Adam and Eve clothed in short, green tunics prepare, heads bowed, to leave the garden. This time the hand of God points toward the left. The entrance to the garden is a heavy blue door with a double wheel of fire in front of it and an angel in blue, yellow, and pink—indistinct because of the condition of the manuscript—standing nearby. Adam and Eve appear once again standing on the bare ground outside the lush garden accompanied by a wingless figure in blue and yellow with a pink mantle who joins Adam in glancing back at the garden.71

These two pages provide the sum total of the illustrations of the first three chapters of Genesis extant in the Vienna Genesis. It is probable, however, that there were once more illustrations of the Creation story in the Genesis. Our other examples of Early Christian Genesis illustration, the Cotton Genesis and the Byzantine Octateuch, both contain scenes of the events leading up to the Temptation and Fall, i.e. the Creation of Adam and Eve, so it would seem reasonable to expect the same from the Vienna Genesis in its original form.

In discussing the iconography of the Genesis in Vienna, we turn to the other existing Genesis cycles for comparison. If Morey is correct in assuming a very close association of sources for the Cotton and Vienna manuscripts, then a comparison of the two should bear this out.

Our knowledge of the Cotton Genesis does not come entirely from the

71 Hans Gerstinger, Die Wiener Genesis, Wien, Dr. Benno Felser Verlag GMBH, II, 1931, pls. 1, 2.
manuscript itself. For in 1731 it was burned and almost entirely destroyed. We retain today only fragments and copies of two of the miniatures drawn in 1618 in preparation for an engraved edition which was never completed.\textsuperscript{72} The manuscript had contained some 250 miniatures in 165 folios before its destruction.\textsuperscript{73} In its original state it may have had as many as 315 folios with about 330 miniatures.\textsuperscript{74} Our conception of the manuscript's contents comes from another source entirely.

It was noted by Tikkanen in 1889\textsuperscript{75} that there was a strong resemblance between the remaining miniatures of the \textit{Cotton Bible} and the mosaics in the narthex of San Marco in Venice.\textsuperscript{76}

Further, Koehler in his \textit{Die Schule von Tours}, 1933\textsuperscript{77} demonstrated that the three Carolingian Bibles: the Moutier-Grandval (London, Brit. Mus. cod. add. 10546), the Vivian Bible (Paris, B.N. cod. lat. 1), and the \textit{Bible of S. Paolo-fuori-le-Mura} in Rome, the earliest full Bibles preserved today,\textsuperscript{78} belong to a Genesis recension related to the \textit{Cotton Bible} and the Venice Mosaics. The Carolingian Bibles are not, however, as close to the Early Christian manuscripts as the

\textsuperscript{72} Weitzmann, \textit{Studies in Honor of Friend}, p.113.

\textsuperscript{73} \textit{Ibid.}, p.115.

\textsuperscript{74} \textit{Ibid.}, p.117.

\textsuperscript{75} Green, \textit{op.cit.} p. 341, n.5.

\textsuperscript{76} \textit{Ibid.}, p.341.

\textsuperscript{77} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 341, n.6.

\textsuperscript{78} Weitzmann, \textit{Roll and Codex}, p.193.
mosaics appear to be. 79 Into the same family Rosalie Green has brought the Hortus Deliciarum of Herrad of Landsberg of the twelfth century and has made mention of another manuscript, the Millstatt Genesis (Klagenfurt Mus. Cod. VI 19), which also reflects the Cotton iconography. 80 Thus the images of the destroyed Cotton Genesis can be partially recovered from the numerous copies which remain. 81

The Cotton recension differs from the other two manuscript recensions to be investigated in the use of the Christ as Logos rather than the symbol of the hand expressing the Word. That the Christ figure appears in the Cotton Genesis can be seen not only from the mosaics but from the fragments of the manuscript itself (Plate VI). This is not to say that the hand symbol never appears in the Cotton Genesis. 82 But the role of the Creator has been taken over by the Christ figure. To repeat, it is partly on the basis of the type of Christ figure represented that the Cotton Genesis has been assigned to Alexandria or at least to an Egyptian provenance. 83 For this is the short haired and beardless Christ carrying a scepter cross who is found only on monuments of Egyptian origin. 84

---

79 Green, op.cit. p.341.

80 Ibid., pp.340-347.

81 Caution, however, is advised by Weitzmann due to compositional changes and changes in format which probably took place in the copying process, particularly in the mosaic. Weitzmann, Studies in Honor of Friend, p.120.

82 See, for example, Ibid., pl. XIV, figs. 5, 6.

83 Morey, Art Bulletin, 1929, p.5.

84 Capps, op.cit., p. 332.
Confining ourselves first to the scenes of Genesis Chapter Three, since these can be compared using pictures from all three surviving cycles, we find a larger number of episodes illustrated in the Cotton recension than in the Vienna Genesis. The Vienna manuscript begins with Adam and Eve reaching for the fruit. The manuscripts of the Cotton recension begin the story of the Temptation of Eve alone being enticed by the serpent to eat the fruit. Even in the manuscripts of the Cotton recension there are slight variations: in the Millstatt Genesis and in the Grandval Bible (Plate VIIa) the serpent offers Eve the fruit from his mouth; at San Marco Eve seems to be plucking the fruit from the tree itself (Plate VIIb).

Within the boundaries of the same frame at San Marco is the next act of the drama. Eve turns to Adam to offer him the fruit. Here again, there is no counterpart in the Vienna Genesis.

Interestingly these two scenes are shown in almost the same manner in the twelfth century Byzantine Octateuchs (this example: Vat. gr. 746, Plate VIIIa). Within a single frame are three scenes. Eve is standing by the tree facing in the reverse direction to the Eve in the San Marco mosaics. She appears to be in conversation with the serpent who is represented as a four legged beast with a long neck (Plate VIIIb). She looks toward the tree and holds out her hand. In the center scene of the three, Adam and Eve stand together with no tree between them (Plate IX). Their posture is not very different from the figures at San Marco except that in the mosaic Adam's hand is raised to his mouth as if he were eating
something (Plate VIIb). In the *Octateuch* neither figure seems to be holding anything. Rather, Eve appears to be enjoining Adam to eat with her.

The climax of the action in the *Octateuch* takes place in the last scene of the three scene frame which, though damaged, shows Eve, and Adam with her, in the act of removing the fruit from the tree (Plate Xa). In this one instance, the composition shows some similarities with the Vienna illustration (Plate Xb). However, it must be remarked that the representation of Adam and Eve flanking the tree is the composition used to symbolize the entire story in the catacombs, at Lura, and in most examples of an other than narrative representation of the episode. Therefore, it is not impossible that both models incorporated the best known illustration of the scene in their cycles and developed the other pictures anew.

The scene of the Awareness of Nakedness is represented in all. In the Vienna manuscript the figures bend forward together and press leaves against their bodies in an expressive gesture (Plate XIa). But in the Cotton recension the figures are separated. Adam turns away from Eve and she looks after him (Plate XIb). In the other manuscripts of this family, the *Millstatt Genesis*, the *Moutier-Grandval Bible*, and the *Vivien Bible*, this scene has been omitted completely; the scene of God reproaching Adam and his wife which follows the Awareness in the Early Christian manuscripts may have been thought to bring the idea across just as well.

In the *Octateuch* the Awareness of Nakedness seems to be combined with a slightly later episode. For Adam and Eve are not only aware
of their own nudity but of God's presence in the garden (Plate XIIa). Their facial expressions can be compared to those of Adam and Eve in the Vienna scene not of the Awareness but of the couple hiding in the bushes, the last scene of folio I,1 (Plate XIIb). However, the Byzantine figures are seated on rocks without any suggestion of unusually heavy foliage.

The picture after the Awareness in the Cotton recension at San Marco contains an illustration which shows Adam and Eve probably hiding among the trees awaiting the Lord's approach (Plate XIII). That they are hiding is problematical because the density of foliage throughout tends to make it unclear whether the trees are meant as background or as separating elements between the figures. In this case it appears to be the latter; Adam is moving away from Christ who is separated from him by a tree and Eve has her hand near her face in a manner like a child's gesture of hiding. This scene is then the counterpart of the Vienna picture in which the couple is almost totally hidden by the dense green foliage. But at San Marco the subject is developed through the gestures and movements of the figures against the background rather than by enveloping them in it as in the Vienna manuscript.

While the scene of Hiding is the last in the Fall sequence (folio I,1) of the Vienna Genesis, both the Octateuchs and the San Marco mosaics carry the story through the questioning of the pair by God and the passing of guilt from Adam to Eve to the snake. In the Cotton recension, San Marco has the largest number of scenes. The
other members of the family show fewer scenes than San Marco between the moment of the Fall and the Expulsion. Both the Millstatt Genesis and the Carolingian Touranian Bibles illustrate only the passing of guilt from one to the other. All the other scenes around this essential one are omitted.

Moving on to the second page of folio one of the Vienna Genesis, we encounter a clothed Adam and Eve, heads lowered, preparing to leave the garden. Behind them is the serpent coiled around a fruit tree, most likely the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil (Plate XIVa). The prominent position of the coiled snake may stand as an indication of the Lord's curse upon the snake: "Upon thy breast and belly thou shalt go . . ." (Gen. 3:14). The Lord's corresponding indictment against the human pair is evident from their downcast look as they turn toward the heavy door of Paradise. When they have finally been put out of Eden, they turn and look back (Plate XIVb).

The Octateuch interpretation is similar to the above. Adam and Eve, clothed in fur-like garments, move hesitantly through the heavily corniced gate of Paradise (Plate XVa). They are commanded to go by a hand from the clouds, which although differently placed is not unlike the hand in the Vienna manuscript. On the other side of the door, this couple too pauses to look back. Unlike the Vienna Genesis story of Adam and Eve which ends at this point, the Octateuch illustration moves on within the same frame to Genesis Chapter Four, a depiction of Adam and Eve with little Cain.

The San Marco mosaic of the Expulsion is different from the other two. The Hand of God of the preceding manuscripts has again become
a figure of Christ who is gently pushing Adam and Eve out of the arching gate (Plate XVa). In this representation they are actually in the act of passing through the door. In the other Expulsion scenes discussed, we see them before and after. Further the artists of the Byzantine recension (Plate XVIa) and the Vienna Genesis (Plate XVIb) adhered more closely to the text of Scripture in that they posted guardians at the gate.

The gate in the Vienna Genesis is guarded by two figures. One is an angel with a single pair of wings who stands outside the door, and the other is a double wheel of bright fire. Gerstinger, in discussing the wheel, finds it a puzzle because the Bible describes the garden as being guarded by a "flaming sword which turned every which way," (Gen.3:24) and the figure in the miniature does not resemble a sword. The artist, he suggests, may have had the passage from Ezekiel in mind (Ezekiel 1:15, 1:16) which describes the double wheel as an attribute of the Cherub, the angel who was supposed to be guarding the gate. The usual multiwinged form had not been created at this time. However, it would seem that an artist having the text of Ezekiel in mind or before him would sooner attempt to portray the Cherubim themselves which are very minutely described in the text.


86 Gerstinger, op.cit., p.72.

87 Ibid., p.71; see also, Frits Lugt, "Man and Angel," Gazette des Beaux Arts, ser 6, 25, 1944, 268, n.3, for the ancient Jewish conception of Cherubim.
rather than their attributes alone. The anthropomorphic figure in the Vienna manuscript, though in poor condition, is clearly a two-winged angel. Rather, a simpler solution suggests itself.

The image of the flaming sword belongs to that later biblical recension which is called "masoritic". So do all our current Bible translations. Only the Septuagint, the Greek Old Testament, does not. In that text there is no mention of a flaming sword as the weapon keeping the humans out of the garden, but rather a "whirling flame of fire." (Gen. 3:24).\textsuperscript{88} If we can assume that it was this version rather than the masoritic that the artist was working from, the image becomes clearer. For one of the possible ways of representing "whirling . . . fire" is in the form of a flaming wheel.

Neither of the other manuscripts contains this iconographical motif. At San Marco, Adam and Eve move through the gate into empty barren land. In the Octateuchs, a side view of the gate is shown and standing against it is a multi-winged and halced Cherub. Considering the fact that these are twelfth century copies which go back eventually to an early model, it is difficult to say whether the Cherub eventually was added or was original with the prototype. There is, however, an anthropomorphic angel who guides the couple out of the garden (Plate XVII). He is not mentioned at all in the Bible text.

While the Cotton and Byzantine illustrations conclude the story of Genesis Chapter Three with the scene just mentioned and begin

\textsuperscript{88} Muses, op. cit. p. 5.
Genesis Chapter Four with Adam and Eve working or sitting outside the garden—enclosed in the same frame as the Expulsion, the Vienna Genesis ends with a more poignant scene. The couple is shown outside the garden accompanied by a third figure (Plate XIVb). Adam and the figure look back regretfully at the garden, while Eve, whose face has been obliterated, seems to be looking in the other direction. This third figure, who is taller than the humans, is dressed in a pink mantle and appears to have no wings. It has been suggested that she (or he) is a personification, perhaps Metanoia (Repentance), accompanying Adam and Eve out of the garden. Or she may have some allegorical significance. She does not appear in either of the other manuscript recensions; in fact no personifications seem to occur in the Cotton Genesis at all. Nor is she in the Bible text.

89 Morey, Early Christian Art, p. 75.
90 Gerstinger, op. cit., p. 69.
92 Frits Lugt, in his article on angels (op. cit., pp. 269-274), gives numerous examples of wingless angels, e.g. an ivory of the Three Maries at the Tomb in Munich (Ibid., p. 274), the Meeting of Joshua and the Angel in Santa Maria Maggiore (Ibid., pp. 271-2). It is conceivable that the figure accompanying Adam and Eve is just such an angel. For we cannot be sure of the sex of the figure.

Objection might be raised on the grounds that the illustration already contains an angel whose identity is readily established by its wings, and, therefore, it is inconsistent for a second angel to be represented wingless. One possible answer to this problem is the existence side by side of both traditions during the Early Christian period. For we also have winged figures from this time such as the pair who hold a monogram of Christ on a sarcophagus in Constantinople dated fourth century (Ibid., p. 274). If one form had not as yet become the only established form by the fourth century, then it is possible
Even this short study reveals the many differences between the three cycles of pictures. Morey's theory of the Vienna artist having a copy of a Cotton type or prototype manuscript seems untenable in the light of the very great differences between the representations in the Vienna and Cotton recensions. However, let it be clear that this statement is being made on the basis of more subtle differences than the obviously Christianized interpretation of the Creation in the Cotton manuscript as opposed to the apparently older form in the Vienna Genesis. We refer to differences in general iconography already discussed and to a difference in the spirit in which the illustrations are conceived. If some of the purely iconographical differences can be attributed to adaptations of the prototype, the basic differences cannot. The artist of the Vienna Genesis sees Adam and Eve together fundamentally as a unit. With the exception of the scene of the Fall itself, they appear side by side in all the miniatures. In the Cotton recension, they are conceived of individually; they appear separated, rarely touching. Further, perhaps because of the larger number of scenes developing the story, there seems to be a greater emphasis on the guilt of Eve at San Marco and in the Millstatt Genesis, e.g. the use of an entire scene given over to the Temptation of Eve and then the obvious thrust of her hand in giving the fruit to Adam. In the Vienna manuscript, Adam seems to be reaching for the fruit as Eve hands it

that the artists of the prototype of the Vienna Genesis (whose date is uncertain) may have combined the two traditions which were then current.
to him, implying his active role in the committing of the sin.

Nor does the Vienna Genesis appear similar to the Byzantine Octateuchs in illustration of the Creation story. The same differences that were seen between the Cotton Genesis and the Vienna manuscript hold true for the comparison between the Vienna and the Byzantine works. These last two works coincide on two points, however: 1) the representation of the Word of God by a hand in an arc of light and 2) the presentation of an angel at the gate of Paradise blocking the reentry of the human pair. Nevertheless, these similarities cannot outweigh the many aspects of the two which are dissimilar.

Rather, resemblances which may be revealing can be seen between the Octateuch recension and the Cotton recension. Confining ourselves to the scenes of the Fall and the Expulsion first, we can see many similarities if we mentally remove the Christ figure from the mosaics (or conversely, replace the hand by the Christ in the Byzantine). The scenes of Eve's temptation and then her seduction of Adam are represented by three scenes in the Octateuchs and two at San Marco. However, the latter could result from either the combining of two scenes or the omission of one. It has already been noted that we cannot satisfactorily reconstruct the original Cotton Genesis and, therefore, cannot make absolute statements concerning numbers of scenes. And even though, the Eve of the first scene is reversed from the manuscript to the mosaic, her persuasion by the snake is represented in both. And even the position of Eve's
arms seems comparable.

In comparing the later scenes of the cycle, it is necessary to provide both iconographically and compositionally for the replacement of the hand by the Christ figure. Also there seems to be a reversal of the order and iconographic significance of some of the pictures. For example, the scene of Adam and Eve hiding as the Lord approaches (Plate XIII) at San Marco is very close to the Octateuch scene of the Lord's Reproach (Plate XVIIIb). In both Adam and Eve stand toward the side, under or behind a tree. In the Octateuch a hand emitting rays emerges from an arc of light at the left. At San Marco the figure of Christ enters from the left also. The most significant difference between the two is the presence of the snake in the Octateuch scene and its absence in the mosaic, which makes the subject more likely to be that of the Repremand than Hiding. For the reproach by God in the Bible involved the snake as well as the humans.

Just the opposite is true of two other similar scenes. The Octateuch scene which shows Adam and Eve seated on the rocks listening to the Lord (Plate XIIa) and which comes in sequence just before the scene just discussed, the Reproach, bears a striking resemblance to another picture which appears to be the Reproach of the Lord in the San Marco cycle (Plate XVIII). In both illustrations Adam and Eve are seated one on either side of the composition. In both the central area is reserved for the deity who appears in his accustomed form in each. The snake who belonged to the standing picture in the
Octateuchs, as discussed above, now enters the seated picture at San Marco. In short, the compositions and subjects have been reversed.

The San Marco Expulsion itself, if it can be thought of as related in some way to the Octateuchs, seems to be a combination of two scenes. Christ has taken over the role of both the hand which points toward the door in the Byzantine example and the angel who gives the pair the added push as they go. Outside is the barren earth where Adam and Eve appear again. The fact that the hand of Eve in the Expulsion mosaic moves into the scene of the chapter four episode (Plate XVb) indicates that both scenes were within a single frame in the prototype of the mosaic just as they are in the existing Octateuchs (Plate XVIa).

To briefly survey other examples from earlier scenes: both have Adam with outstretched hand naming animals who appear in rows before him (Plates XIXa, XIxb). In both Eve is created from an Adam who sleeps with legs crossed and one arm propped against his head while the second arm dangles (Plates XXa, XXb). Although the actual detail of the creation of Eve is not analogous from one to the other, this can probably be explained by the changes necessitated by replacement of a symbolic God with an anthropomorphic one.

The Creation of Adam provides a discordant note. The Creation at San Marco (Plate XXIa) and in the Hortus Deliciarum (XXIb) show Adam being produced by being modelled from the earth in the manner of clay sculpture. Weitzmann sees this composition as coming from the
pagan conception of man's creation in this way by Prometheus. This version differs from the Carolingian in which Adam is lying supine as Christ bends over him. And this latter form parallels the Byzantine work; Adam is again lying supine, arms stiffly at his sides (Plate XXIIa). A ray of light touches his head in the same way that Christ touches the head of the recumbent Adam in the Moutier-Grandval Bible (Plate XXIIb) and in the Millstatt Genesis (Plate XXIII). One is, then, an anthropomorphic version of the other.

In the second scene in the Byzantine manuscript, Adam begins to rise (Plate XXIVa). And in the third, Adam is seated by what appears to be a double of himself lying stretched on the ground (Plate XXIVb). This may correspond to the Giving of a Soul to Adam which in the San Marco mosaic involves Christ and a standing Adam into whom a small winged figure enters (Plate XXV). In both cycles the next scene is that of Adam in Paradise.

Looking back over the two series of the Creation of Adam, we find that both cycles are complete in themselves. It seems most probable that we are dealing with two different versions of the same episode. And we can see several examples of each version among the copies.

While the ideas suggested here are far from conclusive, the evidence points to a relationship between the Byzantine Octateuchs.

---

93 Weitzmann, Roll and Codex, pp.176-177.
and the *Cotton Genesis* family. It might even be possible to trace
them back to a single ultimate prototype. But the more reasonable
conclusion based on the evidence is to suggest that a manuscript
similar to the prototype of the Octateuchs was used as a model for
the development of a Christianized version of the Creation story.
The development of this type of illustration is not surprising.
Even in the fourth century, St. Augustine was already suggesting
that the "whole Trinity was revealed to us in the creation." 94 It
is a possibility that the Christianized prototype may go back that
far. But there is no evidence either way.

Considering the paucity of material which has come down to us, we
do not seem to be in a position to make any definite assertions as to
the number of different versions of Genesis picture cycles produced
during the Early Christian period. Therefore, it is not impossible
that two recensions of the Christianized Genesis cycle were developed,
one from which the *Cotton Genesis* and later the *Hortus Deliciarum*
and the San Marco mosaics came and another on which the Carolingian
Bibles and the *Millstatt Genesis* are based.

As to which recension is the older, the recension with the
supine Adam is probably more ancient. The reason for suggesting
this is that the other version looks as if it were developed
specifically for an anthropomorphic representation of the deity.
For the model for the composition was, as Weitzmann points out, a

94 Aurelius Augustinus (St.), The City of God, ed., Marcus Dods,
pagan illustration of Prometheus creating the human race. The
descent of Christ has taken over the position of Prometheus in the
scene of the Shaping of Adam at San Marco; he is literally creating
Adam out of the dust. On the other hand, the Christ in the Moutier-
Grandelval Bible merely touches the head of Adam. He is a more passive
agent, the human form of the hand of the Octateuchs with its shaft
of light.
IV

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, it would appear from the comparison of the Adam and Eve story in the Vienna Genesis with the Cotton Genesis recension and the Octateuch that the Vienna Genesis belongs to an entirely different class of Genesis recensions from the other two, and further, that the Cotton and Byzantine cycles are actually members of the same recension which has survived in two forms: a Christianized, in which the actions of God are taken over by the Christ figure; and the Byzantine which retains the image of the Hand as Logos.

The differences between the Cotton-Byzantine cycle and the Vienna Genesis are based on a variety of factors, particularly iconography and composition. Iconographically, for instance, the use of the flaming wheel in the Vienna manuscript has no counterpart in the Cotton-Byzantine recension. And compositionally, we note a difference in the conception of the pair, Adam and Eve, between the Vienna Genesis and the Cotton-Byzantine group. The figures of the former still emerge
as a pair, an emotional unit, as it were, while the latter depicts
the figures in greater isolation, i.e. the separation of the couple-
one on either side of the composition— in many of the miniatures.
The isolation of the figures tends to give the Cotton-Octateuch
pictures a more medieval feeling, that of a tradition which is
moving away from the Antique and toward the Middle Ages.

The conclusions that have come from this study can necessarily
be applied only to the story of Creation. We cannot make any
statements concerning the rest of the manuscript without further
investigation of the works concerned from the same point of view;
that is, by iconographical comparison of the parts of the Bible
which appear in all three groups, the Vienna Genesis, the Cotton
recension, and the Octateuchs, in order to determine whether the
relationships shown here are carried through the rest of the illustra-
tions of the manuscripts and in order to define the actual relation-
ships if they are not consistant with the results of this study.

The question of another relationship between the three groups,
different from the one seen here has already arisen. Morey has
pointed out a similarity between the miniature of the Flood in the
Vienna Genesis and the Flood mosaic at San Marco. It may then be
that the similarities shift back and forth, i.e. at one point we see
a marked agreement between the Octateuchs and the Cotton Genesis, at
another between the Cotton and the Vienna.

Supposing for a moment that this is the case, numerous questions

arise: for instance, what possibility is there that the artists did not copy from a single model but were open to influence from other picture cycles which may have fallen into their hands? Could it be than, as Buberl says, that there were several copies of a single manuscript produced by an artist or rather a group of artists?96 The pictures might have been in circulation either because they actually moved about or because their owners permitted them to be copied. Would it be inconceivable to suppose that professional artists who illustrated these books, particularly in cities of the size and cosmopolitan atmosphere of Alexandria, could not have known several versions and at times interpolated one into the other?

Before any answers to these questions can be attempted, further comparative studies concentrating on the nature of the relationship between the two recensions, the Vienna and the Cotton-Byzantine must be made.

Although the individual manuscripts have been studied as have their relationship to the illumination of the Middle Ages, little probing in depth appears to have been done as to the relation between the various Genesis recensions in and among themselves and into the possibility of cross influences among the artist of the different Genesis cycles. Therefore, a study similar to this one seems to be the next step indicated.

96 Buberl, op.cit., p. 55.
APPENDIX I

GENESIS, CHAPTERS TWO AND THREE FROM THE HEBREW PENTATEUCH

1. And the heaven and the earth were finished and all the host of them. 2. And on the seventh day God finished his work which he had made; and he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made. 3. And God blessed the seventh day, and hallowed it; because that in it he had rested from all his work which God had created and made.

4. These are the generations of the heaven and of the earth when they were created, in the day that the Lord God made earth and heaven. 5. And no plant of the field was yet in the earth, and no herb of the field had yet sprung up; for the Lord God had not caused it to rain upon the earth, and there was not a man to till the ground; 6. but there went up a mist from the earth, and watered the whole face of the ground. 7. And the Lord God formed man out of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul. 8. And the Lord God planted a garden eastward, in Eden; and there he put the man who he had formed. 9. And out of the ground made the Lord God to grow every tree that is pleasant to the sight, and good for food; the tree of life also in the midst of the garden, and the tree of knowledge of
good and evil. 10. And a river went out of Eden to water the garden; and from thence it was parted, and became four heads . . . 15. And the Lord God took the man, and put him into the garden of Eden to dress it and to keep it. 16. And the Lord God commanded the man, saying, Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat; 17. but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it; for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.

18. And the Lord God said, It is not good that the man should be alone; I will make him an help meet for him. 19. And out of the ground the Lord God formed every beast of the fields, and every fowl of the air; and brought them unto the man to see what he would call them; and whatsoever the man called every living creature, that was the name thereof. 20. And the man gave names to all the cattle, and to the fowl of the air, and to every beast of the field; but for Adam there was not found a help meet for him. 21. And the Lord God caused a deep sleep to fall upon the man, and he slept; and he took one of his ribs and closed up the flesh instead thereof; 22. and the rib, which the Lord God had taken from the man, made he a woman, and brought her unto the man. 23. And the man said, This is now bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh; she shall be called Woman, because she was taken out of Man. 24. Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife; and they shall be one flesh. 25. And they were both naked, the man and his wife and were not ashamed.
3:1. Now the serpent was more subtil (sic) than any beast of the field which the Lord God had made. And he said unto the woman, Yea, hath God said, Ye shall not eat of any tree of the garden? 2. And the woman said unto the serpent, Of the fruit of the trees of the garden we may eat; 3. but of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden, God hath said, Ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die. 4. And the serpent said unto the woman, Ye shall not surely die; 5. for God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as God, knowing good and evil. 6. And when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was a delight to the eyes, and that the tree was to be desired to make one wise, she took of the fruit thereof, and did eat; and she gave also unto her husband with her, and he did eat. 7. And the eyes of both of them were opened, and they knew that they were naked; and they sewed fig leaves together and made themselves girdles. 8. And they heard the voice of the Lord God walking in the garden in the cool of the day; and the man and his wife hid themselves from the presence of the Lord God amongst the trees of the garden. 9. And the Lord God called unto the man, and said unto him, Where art thou? And he said, I heard thy voice in the garden, and I was afraid, because I was naked; and I hid myself. 10. And he said, Who told thee that thou wast naked? Hast thou eaten of the tree whereof I commanded thee that thou shouldst not eat? 12. And the man said, The woman whom thou gavest to be with me, she gave me of the tree, and I did eat. 13. And the
Lord God said unto the woman, What is this thou hast done? And the woman said, The serpent beguiled me, and I did eat. 14. And the Lord God said unto the serpent, Because thou hast done this, cursed art thou from among all cattle, and from among every beast of the field; upon thy belly shalt thou go, and dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life; 15. and I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel.

16. Unto the woman he said, I will greatly multiply thy sorrow and thy conception; in sorrow thou shalt bring forth children; and thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee. 17. And unto Adam he said, Because thou hast hearkened unto the voice of thy wife, and hast eaten of the tree, of which I commanded thee, saying, Thou shalt not eat of it; cursed is the ground for thy sake; in toil shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life; 18. thorns also and thistles shall it bring forth to thee; and thou shalt eat the herb of the field; 19. in the sweat of thy face shall thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground; for out of it wast thou taken; for dust thou art, and dust shalt thou return. 20. And the man called his wife's name Eve; because she was the mother of all living. 21. And the Lord God made for Adam and his wife coats of skins and clothed them.

22. And the Lord God said, Behold, the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil; and now, lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live for ever;
23. therefore the Lord God sent him forth from the garden of Eden, to till the ground from whence he was taken. 24. So he drove out the man; and he placed at the east of the garden of Eden the Cherubim, and the flame of a sword which turned every which way, to keep the way of the tree of life.
APPENDIX II

GENESIS, CHAPTERS TWO AND THREE FROM THE GREEK SEPTUAGINT

Thus were finished the heaven and earth and all the arrangement of them. (2)And God finished on the sixth day these His works which He made; and on the seventh day He desisted from all these works of His which He made. (3)And God blessed the seventh day and hallowed it; because on it He rested from all these works of His which God had taken occasion to make.

This is the genealogy of heaven and earth. (4)When they were made,—(5)on the day when the Lord God had made the heaven and the earth, and all the verdure of the field, before it was on the earth, and every herb of the field, before it sprang up (for God had not rained on the earth, (6) nor was there a man to till it; but a fountain ascended out of the earth and watered the whole face of the ground), (7)then God formed the man, dust from the earth, and breathed upon his face a breath of life, and the man became a living soul. (8)And God planted a garden in Eden towards the east and placed there a man whom he had made. (9)And God caused to spring up there also out of the ground every tree beautiful to the sight and good for food, and the Tree of Life in the middle of the garden, and tree for the purpose of knowing what was to be known of good and evil.
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(10) Now a river issueth out of Eden to water the garden: thence it was divided into four heads . . . (15) And the Lord God took the man whom He had made, and placed him in this garden of pleasure to work it and to watch. (16) And the Lord God gave a charge to Adam saying, "Of every tree which is in the garden for food, thou mightest have eaten; (17) but from this tree, that you may know good and evil, you must not eat of it. On the day you eat of it, by death you shall die."

(18) Then the Lord God said, "It is not good that the man should be alone; let us make for him a helper correspondent to himself." (19) Now God had also formed out of the earth all the beasts of the field, and all the birds of the air, and brought them to Adam to see what he would call them. And whatever Adam called every living creature, that was its name. (20) So Adam gave names to all the cattle, and to all the fowls of the air, and to all the wild beasts of the field. But for Adam there was not found a helper like himself. (21) Then God brought an ecstasy upon Adam and caused him to sleep, and took one of his ribs and filled up flesh instead thereof. (22) And God built up the rib, which He took from Adam, into a woman, and brought her to Adam. (23) And Adam said, "This is now bone of my bone, and flesh of my flesh, let her be called Woman." Because she was taken out of her man, (24) therefore a man is to leave his father and his mother and cleave to his wife, and they two shall be one flesh.

3(1) Now the two, both Adam and his wife were naked, and were not
ashamed. But the serpent was the wisest of all the beasts on the earth which the Lord God had made, and the serpent said to the woman, "Why hath God said, you must not eat of every tree in the garden?" (2) And the woman said to the serpent, "Of the fruit of the trees of the garden we may eat; (3) but of the fruit of the tree which is in the middle of the garden, God said, You shall not eat of it, nor touch it, that you may not die." (4) And the serpent said to the woman, "You will not by death die. For God knew that in the day you eat thereof, your eyes would be opened and you would be like gods knowing good and evil." (5) And the woman saw that the tree was good for food; and that it is delightful to see with the eyes; and that to exercise understanding is comely, so having taken some of the fruit thereof, she ate and gave also to her husband with her.

(7) And when they had eaten, the eyes of both of them were opened, and they perceived that they were naked. And they sewed together fig leaves and made themselves girdles. (8) And when they heard the sound of the Lord God walking in the garden in the evening both Adam and his wife hid themselves from the presence of the Lord God, among the trees of the garden.

(9) And the Lord God called Adam and said to him, "Adam, where art thou?" (10) And he said unto Him, "I heard the sound of thee walking in the garden and I was afraid, because I am naked, and I hid myself." (11) And God said to him, "Who told thee that thou art naked, if so be thou hast not eaten of the tree of which alone I commanded thee not to eat of this?" (12) And Adam said, "The
woman whom Thou gavest to be with me, she gave me of the tree and I did eat." (13)And the Lord God said to the woman, "Why hast thou done this?" And the woman said, "The serpent seduced me and I ate." (14)And the Lord God said to the serpent, "Because thou hast done this, thou art cursed from all the cattle and from all the beasts which are upon the earth. Upon thy breast and belly thou shalt go and shall eat earth all the days of thy life. (15)And I will put enmity between thee and the woman and between thy seed and her seed. He will wound thy head, and thou wilt wound his heel." (16)And to the woman He said, "I will greatly multiply thy sorrows and thy anguish. With sorrows thou shalt bear children and to thy husband shall be thy recourse, and he shall rule over thee." (17)And to Adam He said, "Because thou hast hearkened to the voice of thy wife, and eaten of the tree of which alone I commanded thee not to eat, the ground is cursed by thy labors. With sorrows thou shalt eat of it all the days of thy life. (18)Thorns and thistles it shall cause to spring up for thee and thou shalt eat the herbs of the field. (19)By the sweat of thy face thou shalt eat thy bread until thou return into the earth out of which thou wast taken; for earth thou art and to earth thou shalt return."

(20)And Adam called the name of his wife Life (Eve), because she was to be the mother of all the living. (21)And the Lord God made for Adam and his wife garments of skin and clothed them. (22) And God said, "Behold Adam was made like one of us to know
good and evil. And now perhaps he may stretch forth his hand and take of the Tree of Life and eat, so shall he live forever."
(23) So the Lord God sent him out of the garden of pleasure to till the ground out of which he was taken. (24) And when He put Adam out He caused him to dwell over against the garden of pleasure and stationed the Cherubims (sic) and the whirling flame of fire to keep the way to the Tree of Life.
PLATE XVIII
4. Fol. 3v: Creation of Adam
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