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Locating the Devil “Her” in MS Junius 11

ASA SIMON MITTMAN  California State University, Chico  |  SUSAN M. KIM  Illinois State University

Abstract

This article focuses on the images and texts on page 3 of Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Junius 11, in which Lucifer foments rebellion, falls, and, as Satan, is bound to the mouth of hell. The bottom third of the page contains an image of falling angels, Satan, and the hellmouth. Above that image and to the left is written “HER SE,” Old English for “here that” or “here the.” We contend that this fragmentary textual note exaggerates both the linguistic function of other here x did y formulae in the manuscript and the interaction between these formulae and the visual images. Such exaggeration in the textual note at the very space and moment between the representation of rebellion and that of the completed transformation of Lucifer into Satan locates that metamorphosis in the act of reading-viewing itself. We consider the composition of the image and its inscriptions and set them into the context of Richard Drew’s Falling Man. Viewing the fall of Satan as part of a sequence of images and texts, we argue for the collaborative role of the viewer in sequential art and contend that Satan, as he appears in this depiction, is not safely distant from the reader-viewer but rather becoming through the active engagement of the viewer and reader in the creation of the world of image and language.

Lucifer foments rebellion, falls, and is transformed in a sequence of illustrations on page 3 of Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Junius 11 (Fig. 1). The topmost register shows Lucifer in the center, crowned and adored (Fig. 2), and the second scene depicts the incipient rebellion, in which rebel angels offer Lucifer palm fronds of victory. The third register presents an image of a powerful cross-nimbed Jesus wielding three spears with his right arm; the spear tips point downward to the scenes below (Fig. 3). Although the fourth and fifth scenes are included in a single register on the lower third of the page, it appears as though the fourth depicts the actual fall of Lucifer, while the final scene is of Satan bound hand and foot to the gaping mouth of hell (Fig. 4).
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2. While the narrative perhaps calls for this to be God the Father, it is common for Anglo-Saxon illuminators to present such figures of God in the guise of Jesus. This incarnation is clearly signaled here by the cross-nimbus, brown hair and beard, and the inscription that reads “Se Hælend,” the Savior. As Damian Fleming has recently discussed, the term Hælend in Old English texts ubiquitously refers to Jesus. As he observes, in contrast to the thousands of instances of the word Hælend in the corpus, occurrences of the name “Jesus” are strikingly few. Fleming, “Jesus, that is Hælend: Hebrew Names and the Vernacular Savior in Anglo-Saxon England,” Journal of English and Germanic Philology 112, no. 1 (2013): 26–47. Fleming asserts (45) that explicit treatments by Bede and Ælfric exploit the etymological resonance of the Old English Hælend with the meaning of the Hebrew name Jesus, and thus allow Old English readers access to “instant exegesis” much less available in Latin. Fleming’s careful argument for such transparency in the Old English provides resonance for our discussion, later in this essay, of the ongoing and legible presence of past meaning in the language of the text and hence the ongoing state of Satan’s fall.
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Figure 1. Fall of the Rebel Angels, page 3, possibly Christ Church, Canterbury, ca. 950–1000, Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Junius 11 (photo: Bodleian Libraries, University of Oxford).
The textual notes supply what seem to be explanations of the actions that the images depict. Above the top register is written, "Hu se engyl ongon ofermod wesan" (How the angel began to be proud); on the right, between the second and third register, is "Her se hælend gesc[op] helle heom to wite" (Here the Savior created hell as a punishment for them). Similar notes, again with the formula here x did y, occur in a number of other images early in this manuscript. On page 7, for example, we read, "Her he todalde dæg wið nihte" (Here he divided day from night); and on page 9, "Her godes englas astigan of heouen into paradisum" (Here God's angels ascended from heaven into paradise), "Her drihten gescop adames wif euam" (Here the lord formed Adam's wife Eve), and "Her drihten gewearp sclep on adam and genam him an rib of Þa sidan and gescop his wif of Þam ribbe" (Here the lord cast sleep on Adam and drew a rib from his side and created his wife from that rib). The repeated formula here x did y emphasizes the apparent locative function of the textual notes. These textual notes locate the sequences of images both spatially and temporally within the narrative and spatially and temporally on the page. Thus, for example, the textual notes situate the images with respect to the larger narrative of the Genesis poems of the manuscript.3 In doing so, they

3. Herbert R. Broderick identifies the problem for the illustrator, in that the depictions on this page are "unusual, calling for images of the rise and fall of Lucifer and other motifs not to be found in normal cycles of biblical illustration" and, while noting Barbara Raw's argument (Raw, "The Probable Derivation of Most of the Illustrations in Junius 11 from an Illustrated Old Saxon Genesis," Anglo-Saxon England 5 [1976]: 133–48, at 48; and eadem, "The Story of the Fall of Man and of the Angels in the MS Junius 11 and the Relationship of the Manuscript Illustrations to the Text" [MA thesis, University of London, 1953]) that the images on page 3 closely follow details found in Genesis B, suggests that the ninth-century Utrecht Psalter is their "principal iconographic and compositional source." Broderick, "Observations on the Method of Illustration in MS Junius 11 and the Relationship of the Drawings to the Text," Scriptorum 37, no. 2 (1983): 161–77, at 162, 165.
also provide direction to the reader-viewer, as they point out whether an image's narrative sequence should be read top to bottom and left to right, or bottom to top and right to left. As Catherine Karkov observes, “In the majority of the Junius 11 illustrations the direction of the visual narrative is clear and mirrors the content of the poem. In the images depicting the two Falls of the rebel angels . . . we read primarily from top to bottom, our eyes repeating the motion of the falling angels.”4 The notes here seem to provide the viewer with a guide for locating the images within the poetic narrative and so offer instruction for interpretation of the images. As they do so, these narratives and images also point out for reader-viewers how they might locate themselves with respect to both the text and the images, both in terms of how they interpret and also in physical terms, determining whether their eyes will move with the images away from or toward their own bodies.5

5. Benjamin C. Withers, The Illustrated Old English Hexateuch, Cotton Claudius B.iv: The Frontier of Seeing and Reading in Anglo-Saxon England (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2007), esp. 286–93, at 286: “Rather than merely allegorize or mythologize the experience of the manuscript as a kind of landscape, it is possible to trace the ways that the landscape of the book naturalizes itself as it creates or reinforces the status of the reader and the way he conceives of his own position as a reading subject.”

If we accept such an apparent function for the topmost and right-hand textual notes on page 3 (“Hu se engyl ongon ofermod wesan” and “Her se hælend gesce[op] helle heom to wite”), it is all the more remarkable that in the space that divides the third register of the sequence on page 3 (before the fall) from the fourth and fifth (during and after the fall), there is another textual note. This one is not in the blank space near the image but, rather, within the architectural frame separating the image sequences. This note differs from the others not only by its placement in the frame but also by its unusually large, clear, red, mostly majuscule letters (Figs. 1, 3–4). It reads simply “Her se,” “Here the” or “Here that.”6 Elsewhere, the here x did y formulae focus on those moments of division of one state or one being from another and

---

6. We note that the text of this caption is written in a mix of scripts, with the h in Anglo-Saxon minuscule, the E in an uncial, and the rest in rustic or square capitals. Such combinations are also found in some other openings in the manuscript, although the body text is written in Anglo-Saxon minuscule, square phase. Jane Roberts, Guide to Scripts Used in English Writings up to 1500 (London: British Library, 2005), 68–71.
the creation of the new from that difference—the separation of water from earth, of day from night, of Eve from Adam. But it is here, of all places, at the dividing line between before and after, heaven and hell, angel and devil, that one might most wish for explication and guidance: here Lucifer becomes Satan; here hell opens its mouth; here is a different world and a being different from what had existed before. Certainly the very presence of the text suggests at least an impulse toward such guidance.

Of course, one could claim that the scribe was interrupted and that the textual note is simply unfinished. But we argue that this textual note, "Her se," provokes not only because it is so bafflingly fragmentary but also because, as it stands, it exaggerates both the linguistic function of the formulae and the interaction between these formulae and the visual images. We maintain that such exaggeration in the textual note at the very space and moment between the representation of rebellion and the representation of the completed transformation of Lucifer into Satan locates that transformation in the act of reading/viewing itself: Satan is not bound but becoming in that act.

A number of scholars have remarked not on the fragmentary textual note dividing the visual episodes on this page but on the curious inconsistencies in the depiction of Lucifer in the fourth and fifth scenes and in the related illustration on page 16 (Fig. 5). Jeffrey Burton Russell, in his now-foundational study of the devil, for example, notes (following Thomas Ohlgren) that in the “illustrations of the Old English Caedmonian poems, the angels falling from heaven...
Figure 5. Fall of the Rebel Angels, page 16, possibly Christ Church, Canterbury, ca. 950–1000, Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Junius 11 (photo: Bodleian Libraries, University of Oxford). See the electronic edition of Gesta for a color version of this image.
into the mouth of hell become little, black, wizened imps with tiny wings and tails—except for Lucifer, who remains proudly humanoid though with flaming hair and a tail. Russell observes that Lucifer’s transformation in this image is strangely retarded in the fall; he “remains . . . humanoid.” It is worth emphasizing, however, that the “humanoid” form is already a degeneration, that the phrase “proudly humanoid” with respect to Lucifer/Satan is perhaps already oxymoronic. Lucifer has been stripped of his wings, of his smooth hair, of his slender and delicate fingers, of his flowing robes, of his crown and diadem and scepter—and, most important, of his radiance, his light, thereby necessitating his change in name from Lucifer, “Light-Bringing,” to Satan, “Adversary.”

His skin is now darkened and streaked, burned like that of the Ethiopians in the roughly contemporary Tiberius B. v Wonders of the East (Fig. 6). He has been stained with his sin, marked by his transgression. He is clearly a figure to be scorned and rejected.

Karkov asserts: “The change in the depiction of Lucifer from an upright angel in the upper register, to an inverted figure as he falls, and finally to the bound and horizontal Satan at the bottom, conveys the notion of a fall from grace as effectively as does the overall composition of the page.” We posit, however, that the tumbling, twisting figure of Lucifer, suspended in mid-fall, most evokes the postlapsarian human (Fig. 4). In comparison with his image in the top register he is greatly reduced in scale—even if stretched out to a standing position the figure would only reach to the abdomen of the grand image of Lucifer above (Fig. 2)—as are those who fall with him. Bent like a bow as the figure is wrenched about, it is not half the height of the already reduced figure in the second register (Fig. 3). Above and below, before his fall and during it, Lucifer dwarfs his cohort, perhaps suggesting his pride, in contrast to the figure of Christ in between, which is barely, if at all, larger than the figures in his angelic phalanx. More significant than size, however, is the basic fact that Lucifer is falling. This winged figure ought to be able to float, to fly, to soar, and indeed the upper figure barely seems to rest his feet on the plinth (Fig. 2). Although the falling figure still has wings, they are clearly of no use to him. If any of these figures most suggests the state of humanity, it is this one, neither angelic nor demonic, poised between heaven and hell.

Comparison with what is likely the closest analogue highlights the focus on suspended transformation in the illumination on page 3. The Fall of the Rebel Angels that opens the Old English Hexateuch (London, BL, Cotton Clavell B. iv, fol. 2r) likewise contains an image of Jesus (or God the

9. Such description is embedded in classical and Renaissance ideas about the human body, often reinforced unconsciously in art historical discourse but ill suited to the early Middle Ages. For discussion, see Mittman and Kim, Inconceivable Beasts, esp. chaps. 4–5, 85–136.
10. In contrast, the image of Satan in a mandorla in the scene of the Fall of the Rebel Angels in London, British Library (hereafter BL), Cotton Claudius B. iv, fol. 2r (discussed below), stresses his former status. Benjamin C. Withers, “Satan’s Mandorla: Translation, Transformation, and Interpretation in Late Anglo-Saxon England,” in Hourihane, Insular and Anglo-Saxon Art and Thought, 247–69, at 265, writes, “the mandorla identifies the falling figure with light, recalling Lucifer’s name and Ælfric’s description of ‘the great brightness of his glorious appearance.’”
11. Karkov, Text and Picture, 40. See also 162, where Karkov discusses a passage in Christ and Satan (lines 129–35) that focuses on “bodily torments,” which make for a “direct appeal . . . to the body of the reader/viewer.”

The Devil “Her” in MS Junius 11

Figure 6. “Sigelwara” (Ethiopians, the two figures at right), fol. 83v, possibly Christ Church, Canterbury, ca. 1050, London, British Library, MS Cotton Tiberius B. v (photo: © British Library Board).
Father 13) at the top and Satan at the bottom, but while Satan's followers are in the process of falling, overall the image is much more static (Fig. 7). 14 Jesus is presented in timeless majesty, his right hand raised in a gesture of blessing, surrounded by a mandorla held aloft by adoring angels. Below, Satan is firmly locked in his own mandorla—an "Anglo-Saxon iconographic innovation" and one of only two known medieval examples 15—which seems to function as a weight anchoring him very firmly in the lower left corner of the image, wedged in tightly by the coiling serpent of a hellmouth that presses in from the right. There is no continuous narration and therefore no corresponding image of Lucifer, no sense of transformation. Christ is presented as eternally majestic and Satan as forever damned. 16 There is a crisp line delineating the flowing lavender waves of heaven from the ruddy backdrop behind the damned (which now appears striped owing to the green sea on the verso bleeding through). There is no space for the human viewer in this image, only for those who will never fall and those who are already damned.

In comparison, the figure of Lucifer/Satan, chained in hell in the lowermost register on page 3 of Junius 11, compels 16 (Fig. 4). It is not only larger in size than any of the other figures, Christ included, but it is also a focal point: the mouth of hell dominates, but it is Lucifer/Satan who provides the closest point of human identification within the image. One might similarly argue that the figure of Lucifer/Satan also functions as a point of identification within the two poetic Genesis narratives, Genesis A and the interpolated Genesis B, contained in this manuscript. As Russell writes, "Ironically the most appropriate traditional figure was Lucifer, the proud, the noble, standing alone in hopeless battle against an im- placable foe, unyielding to the end. Teutonic heroism best explains the compelling power of the [Old English] Lucifer—and that of Milton. " 17 This is the heroism of the Battle of Maldon, the Anglo-Saxon brand of heroism characterized by a deep-seated appreciation of heroes who persevere despite the knowledge that they cannot win. Indeed, as Peter Dendle writes, the "grovelling adversary" of another of the biblical narratives of Junius 11, Christ and Satan, and in the related versions of that poem, "is cut from a very different cloth than the epic hero of Genesis B," whom we also confront in Junius 11. 18 Admittedly, this type is less common than the tortured Satan of what Charles Abbetmeyer labeled the "plaints of Lucifer," the depictions of Satan in texts like the saints’ lives in verse that focus in those scenes on the abjection of Satan.

13. In this case, the image is doing double duty as both the Fall of the Rebel Angels and the Separation of Light from Darkness. Benjamin C. Withers, "A Secret and Feverish Genesis: The Prefaces of the Old English Hexateuch," Art Bulletin 81, no. 1 (1999): 53–71. So, too, we would argue, this figure might simultaneously present God the Father and Jesus.


16. Ibid., 269, does suggest that this figure is “perhaps a little of both,” not still Lucifer nor yet entirely Satan, as he “hasn't quite landed in Hell.” His location here is decidedly potent and complex, although his figure is unambiguously that of Satan—wingless, wild-haired, hook-nosed, and tailed.


18. Peter Dendle, Satan Unbound: The Devil in Old English Narrative Literature (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001), 41.
and the miseries of hell. But this Satan is not less potent, and, indeed, it has therefore garnered greater critical attention.19

Yet the temptation of the reader-viewer at least to appreciate the courage of Satan is, of course, a mortal danger. This returns us to that puzzling inscription, the “Her se.” Dendle’s study of Satan in Old English narrative is articulated through the contradictory representations of the figure’s location—“the devil’s simultaneous binding [in hell] and liberty” to roam earth.20 This paradox of location seems to have been largely unresolved throughout the Middle Ages, with commentators advocating for both positions. Following scriptural passages, Augustine held a unifying notion that the devil was imprisoned in the air, which, in comparison to the glory of heaven, was a hellish torment.21

This notion was also supported in Anglo-Saxon England in the Passio Margaretae, Juliana, and Byrhtferth’s Enchiridion, and it seems to have influenced several of the herbal remedies of the Leechbook.22 The location of Satan and his minions is central to the resonance of the image on page 3, since these figures might be interpreted as either far away, in an indeterminate and unknowable hell, or right here, on the present earth that humans occupy. If the devil’s location is at issue on page 3, in image and inscription, the suggestion of his placement in the air provides a location that is at once everywhere and no where, in no definable, boundaried space. Yet it is precisely at the time of the fall that location is most vital. The scenes divided by the fragmentary inscription on page 3 depict the moment when Lucifer/Satan and his followers are cast from the known, absolute location of heaven into the murk of their present location, “here.”

The figures we see on the page are first and foremost on the page in the hands of the reader—medieval or modern. They are sitting on the surface of the vellum. This makes them proximate to us, in our space, although what they signify may be elsewhere. Indeed, as Robert Finnegan argues, at least one of the other images in Junius 11 is explicitly about our location in relation to the events depicted within the illustrations.23 In this case, a faintly penned figure floating in the ether, above and to the right of the topmost blessing figure of Christ, just outside the circle that surrounds him, was added by the manuscript’s second artist to an image composed by the first (Figs. 8–9).24 This figure appears to exist outside God’s creation, left out in the cold, at least for the moment. For Finnegan, this image may represent a fallen angel but is more likely a human being, a figure for the viewer’s own unseen seeing of the story of God’s creation—that is, the generally unrecorded presence of the viewer outside, but adjacent to, all of the images in the manuscript.25 Karkov presses this further:

[T]he little figure sketched in the margins of page 7 provides the ultimate metaphor for the position of the artists, poets, scribes and readers in relation to the manuscript and its narratives. We stand outside the biblical acts described and depicted, yet within Creation; we observe and are observed, judge and are judged at the same time.26

Even though Finnegan concludes with the provocative identification of this figure as a human reader, he also explores the possibility that the figure is not just any fallen angel but Satan himself, suggesting that the devil, present nowhere and

19. Ibid., 40–41, quoting Charles Dietrich August Frederick Abbetmeyer, Old English Poetical Motives Derived from the Doctrine of Sin (Minneapolis: Wilson, 1903).


22. “The demon in a Passio Margaretae copied in Anglo-Saxon England reveals to Margaret, ‘Our lives are not on the earth, but we travel with the winds,’ and the demon in Juliana is referred to as lyft-lacende, ‘flying through the air.’ Ælfric calls the devil se fleogendra sceocca (‘the flying demon’). . . . Byrhtferth closes his Enchiridion with the admonition that eall bis lyft is full hellicra deofla, ‘all this air is full of hellish devils.’ Only with Peter Lombard and Thomas Aquinas would the idea that Satan is already chained in hell become the prevalent opinion.” Ibid., 72.


25. “It is not inappropriate, then, though it is startling, to have a figure representing those members of humankind for whom the manuscript was composed and illustrated doing analogously from within the confines of the manuscript what the manuscript’s contemporary audience was doing outside the manuscript: watching what goes on—literally by looking at the illustrations, metaphorically by listening to the poems being read, or, perhaps, actually reading them. . . . Moreover, if we accept as probable my identification of the figure as the work of the second artist, then we may argue that he has made a critical and artistic point: his figure secretly scrutinizes.” Ibid., 31.

Russell’s reading of the position of the figure of Satan enables us to consider both of Finnegan’s proposals. For Russell, “The Devil is par excellence the alien, the other, the stranger, measurelessly removed from the reality, love, being, and glory of God. . . . His chief hope is to make us also strangers to God, and original sin is the token of his success.”28 The “man in ‘nowhere’” seems to embody this notion, suggesting Satan’s success, a concept befitting an image cycle that presents the Fall of the Rebel Angels and the Imprisonment of Satan five times and spreads the subsequent Fall of Man across no fewer than a dozen images, many of them taking up one-half or a full folio.29 In the worldview constructed by the manuscript, the devil is always falling, always losing, always being thrust from the face of God. But so, “her,” are we. Anglo-Saxons saw their insular location at the edge of the inhabitable earth as troublingly peripheral, to such an extent that identity, genealogy, and geography became profoundly intertwined.30 This is perhaps most clearly evinced in English mappae mundi, such as that in Oxford, St. John’s College, MS 17, of about 1110,31

29. For the Fall of the Rebel Angels and Imprisonment of Satan, see Junius 11, pages 3, 16–17, 20, 36. For the Fall of Man, see pages 13, 20, 24, 28, 31, 34, 36, 39, 41, 44–46.
in which the island of Britannia appears literally beyond the pale, in the left (north) margin of the world (Fig. 10). In the image of the fall, then, we cannot pass over the inscription’s “her” without thinking of the Fall of Man and without being reminded that, as Augustine and others averred, the fallen angels were not safely remote in distant hell; they were “her,” all around us.

Returning to the image of the fall on page 3 (Fig. 1), we see in the lower registers of the leaf a focus on separation of the devil and his host from God and heaven. Lucifer is being blown off the throne he set up “in the northern borders of heaven,”32 and the violence of this assault—delivered directly by Jesus and not by his customary strongman, Michael33—blasts apart the architectural throne as well. Comparison with a slightly later image from the Tiberius Psalter (ca. 1050) shows the clear difference in these figures (Fig. 11).34 Where Michael is beardless, carries a shield, wears a diadem, and has an elaborate but not cross-embellished nimbus, Jesus is bearded, carries a scroll, wears no diadem, and—for purposes of identification, most importantly—has a cross-nimbus. On page 3, which has a more consistent use of “colour symbolism” than elsewhere in the manuscript,35 attention is drawn to the roughly centered figure of Jesus through the use of color: he is the only figure of the many on the folio who is clothed entirely in red, although others are in red and brown (Fig. 1).36

Below, in the fourth register, Lucifer, entirely in brown ink and therefore contrasting with the image of Christ, is shown in Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Junius 11” (PhD diss., Columbia University, 1978), 94 (also cited by Withers, “Satan’s Mandorla,” 254), does not find the color symbolism to be especially consistent.

36. The coloration of this figure seems particularly freighted because the part of the image below it is almost entirely in black ink. Withers, “Satan’s Mandorla,” 254, argues that the gradual shift from more red at the top of the image to more black at the bottom “suggest[s] Lucifer’s fall from light to darkness as described in the poem.” Withers here follows Karkov, Text and Picture, 34, who in turn follows Thomas Ohlgren, “The Illustrations of the Caedmonian Genesis as a Guide to the Interpretation of the Text” (PhD diss., University of Michigan, 1969), 96–99.

The Devil “Her” in MS Junius 11
suspended in the air here and in subsequent images in the manuscript. He is falling off the bolster pillow at which he so blithely gestured above. To his right floats the shingle-covered gable roof of the throne, and to his left, next to the pillow, sails another fragment. As the throne is blasted apart, so too the rectilinear architectural order that characterized heaven gives way to the organic chaos of hell. As Benjamin Withers writes, "[t]he harmony in Heaven juxtaposes the chaos in hell and the beauty of the blessed angels in the heavenly city stands out against the grotesque forms of the damned residents of Satan's dominion, below."37 The flash of ink on the central panel of the bolster pillow, ostensibly indicating folds in the fabric, resembles a hand pointing an accusatory finger at the falling figure of Lucifer.

As the figure tumbles downward, however, in the space between his outstretched hands in each incarnation in this continuous narration—still Lucifer above but simultaneously Satan below—the essential transformation occurs, a transformation that is never depicted. In this gap, in this unarticulated gutter between the two portions of this simultaneous visual narration, the change is effected. The frozen state of this process allows Satan, already bound in hell, to look up mournfully at his former state, his former glory, emphasizing the trauma of the fall that is likewise stressed by the tormented, wrecked bodies of the angels falling with him. The text of the poem itself, on page 16, maintains a parallel and similarly reiterated gap: the poem's narrative explains that God,

\[
\text{acwæð hine ða fram his hyldo} \quad \text{and hine on helle wearp},
\]

\[
on ða deopen dala, \quad \text{þær he to deofle weard,}
\]

\[
\text{se feond mid his geferum eallum.} \quad \text{Feolon ða ufon of heofon}
\]

\[
\text{Þurhlonge swa ðreo niht and dagas,} \quad \text{Þa englas of heofonum on helle,}
\]

\[
\text{and heo ealle forscceop drihten to deoflum (lines 304–9)}
\]

Figure 11. St. Michael and the Dragon, fol. 16r, Tiberius Psalter, possibly Winchester, ca. 1050, London, British Library, MS Cotton Tiberius C. vi (photo: © British Library Board).

[banished him [i.e., Lucifer] from his favor and cast him into hell, in the deep pits, when he became as a devil, the fiend with all his companions. They fell then from heaven headlong thus for three nights and days, the angels from heaven into hell, and the lord changed them all to devils.]38

God casts Lucifer into hell, and Lucifer becomes "as" a devil with all his companions, and then again, the angels fall for three days and are changed into devils. The insistence is on the fact of the transformation, but equally forceful is the obfuscation of when and where that transformation takes place.

One might add to the discussion of the "her" of our caption three more factors. The first is that the narrative of the text reiterates both its insistence and its obfuscation. The second is that the illustration itself is likely a depiction not of the text of Genesis A that surrounds it but, rather, of the representation of the fall as it is described in Genesis B, which follows about ten pages later and which it cites in two of its captions.


38. The Old English text here and below is from George Philip Krapp, ed., The Junius Manuscript (New York: Columbia University Press, 1931). Translation is our own.
The Devil "Her se" in MS Junius 11

The third is that the very captions we have cited as signposts, locational indicators directing the reader through the visual narratives, are in more than one place—here on page 3 and also on page 6 (Fig. 12)—likely misplaced, indicating an action in the visual narrative that does not occur beside the caption. Indeed, the "misplaced" caption on page 6 is very like our fragmentary "Her se" caption in that it indicates (or misindicates) the location of a cosmologically essential point of separation: "[Here he (God)] separated water and earth."Given that most of the captions appear to be in the main hand, the "odd" misplacement of two of these early captions prompts questions like the following, from Bernard Muir: "If the scribe had originally chosen the illustrations or was at least aware of what was available for copying when he left spaces for them . . . why did he not know where to place the captions when he came back later to add them?" Dendle has argued with respect to the representation of the demonic in the Solomon and Saturn texts that "[m]ore interesting than the actual beliefs about what demons do . . . is the treatment of the demonic as a textual matter in these works." Dendle suggests that representations of evil occur in company with "disorienting shifts from one interpretive level to another. Thus allegory becomes realistic description, which then melts into lyrical exaltation, without appropriate cues to indicate the corresponding change of generic expectations." The literal disorientation in our text/image, in its representation of the original transformation of the angelic into embodied, locatable, legible evil, is intensified by the interaction of text and image, both on the internal level of caption and image and on the external level of the placement of the illustration in the narrative as a whole. The frisson of this page, then, is rooted in the overall layout of all of its components and in its position within the larger program of the manuscript. One might thus extend Dendle's argument in this case to one about the disorienting potential of the demonic image as it slides between textual and visual representations.


40. In what remains of this textual note there is no "Her se."


Figure 12. Creation of Light and Separation of Light from Darkness, page 6, possibly Christ Church, Canterbury, ca. 950–1000, Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Junius 11 (photo: Bodleian Libraries, University of Oxford). See the electronic edition of Gesta for a color version of this image.

One other fragmentary inscription on page 3 merits attention. Within the lowest register of the image itself, less than an inch from the partial "Her se" and directly below the leg of one of the falling angels, the illuminator has written "inferae" in the same ink used to draw the figures of the damned (Fig. 4). If we take the text to be in Latin, as others have, this word should perhaps be reconstructed as “infer[n]ae,” although there is no suspension mark to indicate the truncation. We might expect the inscription to read “inferni,” clearly indicating the location of hell or, alternatively, “the damned.” While it may be that the text is intended as a locative form,
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stressing the setting, the thrusting downward of the damned here in hell, positing a possible locative does not clarify quite as it ought because the inscription is notably not in hell. Rather, it is in the air, floating in the space between heaven and the mouth of hell below. Muir reads it as “inferne (below, underneath),” but underneath what? Underneath heaven, perhaps, or earth, each of which would have implications for the location of hell. Other images, like that on page 16, will make clear that the mouth of hell is the gateway into a locked and barred realm, not its nadir but its actual entrance (Fig. 5). In this case, again, there is a troubling pointing to the space between heaven and hell as the home of the damned. Indeed, if we return to the word as it clearly appears on the page, “inferae,” considering both this context and the fact that captions elsewhere in the manuscript are in Old English, we note that in Old English, and within the text of Genesis itself, the neuter noun inferae clearly means “gate” or “entrance” (Fig. 4).

However bafflingly text and image mislocate, obscure, or refuse to represent or to name the site of Lucifer’s transformation, image and text on page 3 do work in tandem in other senses. On page 9 (Fig. 13), the only page more heavily captioned than page 3, the captions help guide the viewer upward from the colored cross-nimbus of Jesus (in place of the Creator)—the visual focal point of the image—through the illustration, from the right side of the page to a higher position on the left side and then, finally, to the upper frame of the illustration and the caption “Here God’s angels ascended from heaven into paradise” (Here God’s angels ascended from heaven into paradise). In contrast, page 3 (Fig. 14) draws the viewer and reader from left to right and down the page to the mouth of hell. That is, following the path of the images and captions on page 9 leads the reader-viewer from the bottom of the page, the portion closest to his own body, to an idealized point distant from it, following the path of the images and caption—however “misplaced”—but on page 3, doing so leads reader-viewers both to the mouth of hell and to the point most proximal to our own bodies as we read.

The overall shape of the image strongly emphasizes this movement. Herbert Broderick notes that the frames of Junius

44. The Dictionary of the Old English Corpus cites, for example, Genesis B 8.1.4.1: “Da ða he adraed fæswes of þeorþawnges myrððe, ða gesette God æt ôm infære engla hyrdædene & fyre swurd to gehealdenne ðone weg to ôm lifes treowæ” (When he was driven away from the joy of heaven, then God set at the gate a watch of angels and a flaming sword for protecting the path to the tree of life). Antonette diPaolo Healey, ed., Dictionary of Old English Web Corpus (Toronto: Dictionary of Old English, University of Toronto, 2009), http://www.doe.utoronto.ca/pages/pub/web-corpus.html.

11 function “as a narrative and expressive force.” The image is wider at the top than the bottom, with the frame along the right edge of the folio gradually moving inward with each register; the architectural members are shifted slightly to the left at each division. Along the edge of the lowest register, the column is worn away as it descends, likely the result of abrasion caused by the turning of this leaf for a millennium, but in its

of hell is well fortified, surrounded by high crenellated walls, but at the bottom of the image, the lone turret—containing a devil with a fleshhook—is open. No line delineates its base, and therefore the viewer’s visual access to it and to the flames that rise from its window is unimpeded. Above, in the void between heaven and hell, one figure stands out, recalling Russell’s assertion that the devil remains “proudly humanoid.” At the right edge of the image, and therefore as far to the left side (viewer’s right) of this judging Christ as possible, a falling angel, stripped bare, displays a full (and possibly erect) complement of male genitalia, an attribute found not on angels but on men. The additions of genitals to demons here and on page 17 are markers of the degradation of “angel to devil, bodilessness to embodied form,” specifically to male human form. As Dendle writes of the image of Satan on this folio, “other than the tail and the grotesque feet, he here appears basically human.” These devils and demons are increasingly like their viewers.

There is one figure here yet more human, however. Again suspended between heaven and hell, at the very entrance to the mouth of hell, is a figure without wings. All the rest of the falling angels/demons are clearly depicted as winged, but this one, located in a position like that of the figure of Lucifer on page 3 and perhaps representing him as well, is not. In this moment, then, between heaven and hell, Satan has no wings, no diadem, no angelic robes. Naked as he is, we see all of him, and he appears entirely human. We read in the text directly above this image that “They fell then from heaven headlong thus for three nights and days, the angels from heaven into hell, and the lord changed them all to devils” (lines 304–9). Yet, looking from text to image, the transformation, the degradation of the angelic bodies into “devils,” brings them not farther from but closer to us as human reader-viewers. As they fall toward the base of the page, and therefore toward the reader, their fall is into a state like ours. They are falling, then, “her.”

The rhythmic use of “her” in these inscriptions makes obvious reference to place but also to place-in-time, to chronology. In the context of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, “her” is clearly used to mark place-in-time: the entries for the vast majority of years begin with “her.” For example:

30 AN.xxx. Her wæs Crist gefullod, 7 Petrus 7 Andreas gehwerfede 7 Iacobus 7 Iohannes 7 þa .xii. apostolas.
33 AN.xxxiii. Hær wæs Crist ahangen, from fruman middangeardes ymb v. þusend wintra 7 .cc. 7 .xxvi.

47. Dendle, _Satan Unbound_, caption to fig. 2.

---

Figure 14. *Fall of the Rebel Angels, path diagrammed, page 3, possibly Christ Church, Canterbury, ca. 950–1000, Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Junius 11* (photo: Bodleian Libraries, University of Oxford). See the electronic edition of Gesta for a color version of this image.
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[30 Year 30. Here was Christ baptized, and Peter and
Andreas converted and James and John and the
12 apostles.
33 Year 33. Here was Christ crucified, around five thou-
sand and 200 and 26 years from the creation of earth.
34 Year 34. Here was St. Paul converted, and St. Stephen
stoned.
35 Year 35. Here the blessed apostle Peter established an
episcopal see in the city of Antioch.
39 Here Gaius took hold of the empire.]

Chronology is, of course, of the essence in these images from
Junius 11, as this is the first moment in the Christian narrative
in which good and evil are divided. In our continued repeating
of “here this happened,” we might simultaneously read, “at
this time, this happened.”

As we include place and place-in-time in the semantic do-
main of her, in the moment of our perception of the images
on page 3, her, the angels are falling—they are falling now.
Karkov writes:

The repetition of the Fall of the angels . . . has the ef-
fect of reinforcing the ever-present threat of hell and
damnation in the minds and eyes of the manuscript’s
readers. If, as Augustine believed, eternity has no past
or future, but only an “eternal present” (totum esse prae-
sens), then these events are always taking place and the
sequential repetition, or layering, of image and story
may be one way of documenting this phenomenon.

The fall, then, happening in an eternal present, was seen to
be happening as Anglo-Saxon readers read and viewed, and
would presumably still be happening as we read and as we
view. As on page 3 (Fig. 1), the devil on page 16 (Fig. 5) is
shown hovering in the gap between heaven and hell, the gap
that is, inevitably, the space we inhabit; so, too, the balking
of the caption “Her se” at once denies and points toward the
location of his transformation as itself a process of interpretat-
on of reading and viewing. If the illustration and the poem
elicit identification with the devil in spite of themselves, it is
perhaps because they so clearly invite us to speak into that gap
and thus to locate ourselves—as we view and read them—not
in the particulars of space and time but in the process of con-
structing meaning from them.

We have thus far primarily focused on the images and on
the function of the textual notes in and around them. This is
fitting, because the manuscript is heavily illustrated. In the
first ninety pages there are eighteen full-page (or nearly full-
page) illustrations, as well as twenty-nine approximately one-
half page in size. Images therefore account for more than
one-third of the space of the text blocks at the beginning of
the manuscript, and they clearly are fundamental to its de-
sign. Further, as Muir notes,

We remain conscious, however, of the fact that from the
start of the poem, Genesis A presents its narrative as a mat-
er of words, by obligation to God: “Us is riht micel ðæt we
rodera weard, / wereda wuldorcining, / wordum herigen, / modum lufien!” (It is a great duty for us that we should praise
the keeper of the heavens, the glorious king of hosts, in words,
should love him in our hearts; our emphasis). Genesis A is not
a series of illustrations with a few bits of explanatory text but,
rather, a substantial text containing illustrations. The textual
guideposts within the spaces of the illustrations further un-
derscore the authority of text as it seems to direct interpreta-
tion of the illustrations.

But the very language of these guideposts also problemat-
izes any such privileging of text. The inscriptions are not

50. John Lowden notes that “the nature of Evil, and the character
of Satan . . . were of particular concern” to the designer of Junius 11,
though of course it “was in no sense a covert or underground work.”
Lowden, “Concerning the Cotton Genesis and Other Illustrated
51. The illuminations of the unfinished manuscript cease at this
point, although spaces were left for them. If completed, there would
have been approximately 140 illustrations. There are also several
pages now missing. Karkov, Text and Picture, 203–6, provides an
appendix with proposed subjects for the blank spaces.

49. Karkov, Text and Picture, 67, with internal quotation from
Augustine, Confessions 11.13, Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum
Latinorum 33, ed. P. Knöll (Vienna: Tempsky, 1896), 289.
excerpted passages from the text proper, for example, guiding readers back into text. Rather, the repetition of the deictic adverbial “here” in the formulae also emphasizes the fact that text—like all signs—functions by pointing, and by pointing away from its own materiality. “Here” is never the “here” of the text; it never actually means “here, in this spot, where the text itself exists.” In most instances in which the formula occurs, “here” in its most immediate sense is not even within the purely textual world but in the world represented in the image.

Of course, we do not have to establish primacy of one form over another; it is the interaction between text and image (or image and text) that generates the force of many medieval illuminated manuscripts, as Withers argued recently for the Old English Hexateuch and as we have contended with respect to the Vitellius Wonders of the East. If we keep this interaction in mind as we consider the “her” x did y formulae, we can argue that these formulae may prompt recognition of an increasingly pragmatic “her,” which in these cases is perhaps not so clearly or simply the deictic adverbial. It may also have been pragmaticalized as a discourse marker. We use it as such in modern-day English: “Here’s the thing” or “Here’s the problem.” In these phrases, “here” does not serve so simply as an adverbial. It is not in fact locating “the problem” or “the thing” like all signs—functions by pointing, and by pointing away from itself but also toward the unfolding textual world it marks. Hence, as it occurs in documents like the Old English charters, in such formulations as “her” is geswutelod in þisum gewrite (Here is stated/made manifest in this document) or simply “her swutelap” (Here is stated/made manifest), a pragmaticalized “her” marks not location in place or time but, rather, marking its location in discourse. It points not only away from itself but also toward the unfolding textual world it marks. Hence, as it occurs in documents like the Old English charters, in such formulations as “her” is geswutelod in þisum gewrite (Here is stated/made manifest in this document) or simply “her swutelap” (Here is stated/made manifest), a pragmaticalized “her” marks not location in place or time but, rather, marking its location in discourse. If we consider the “her” formulae as serving this function in Junius 11, we can also pose the idea that this manuscript presents the possibility that discursive practices in manuscripts from the early Middle Ages might involve as well as theorize the interaction of image and text in addition to the concomitant processes of seeing and reading.

On the one hand, the textual formulae segment the illustrations, as on page 3, where the text passages divide the whole of the image into distinct and contained narrative episodes. Segmentation, as Ælfric (ca. 955–ca. 1020), in the tradition of grammatica, argues, is fundamental to language. Sound is either segmented, articulata, and meaningful or confusa, mixed, and nonlinguistic, like the barking of dogs. Segmenting the image allows for its apprehension not as an inarticulable whole but in parts, as a sequence in space and time, like language. On the other hand, reading the image in this way also emphasizes the problem we have been discussing: that the image sequence does not allow for the clear demarcation of one state from another, of one meaningful segment from another. In this sense, such a reading also returns us to the problem that language is not purely sequential; it is never simply a movement from point A to point B, generating a meaning of C. On the contrary, the exaggerated textualuality suggested by the fragment on page 3, with its pragmaticalized “her,” generates emphasis of exactly this problem of sequence and movement. The words of the fragment themselves are not simply words. They are words that are undergoing the processes of pragmaticalization and grammaticalization in Old English, words that, in this context, exaggerate that reference may be internal to language rather than lexical or pointing to the nonlinguistic world. Yet the processes of pragmaticalization and grammaticalization evident in both “her” and “se” also involve the complication that even as language shifts away from the referential, even as it points increasingly toward itself rather than to a world it represents, it also retains that which it has developed away from. That is, attention to the words of the formulae, to “her” and “se,” underscores both movement and retention in the process of language, a dynamic of movement and retention not dissimilar to what we have traced in the images.

The “Her se” of our fragmentary text repeats the opening of the preceding text, “Her se hælend gesce[op] helle heom” (Here the savior created hell as a punishment for the nonlinguistic world). Yet the processes of pragmaticalization and grammaticalization evident in both “her” and “se” also involve the complication that even as language shifts away from the referential, even as it points increasingly toward itself rather than to a world it represents, it also retains that which it has developed away from. That is, attention to the words of the formulae, to “her” and “se,” underscores both movement and retention in the process of language, a dynamic of movement and retention not dissimilar to what we have traced in the images.

The Devil “Her” in MS Junius 11
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55. Julius Zupitza, ed., Ælfrics Grammatik und Glossar (Berlin: Weidmann, 1880), 4: “Secondum Donatum omnis vox aut articulata est aut confusa. Articulata est, quae litteris comprehendi potest; confusa, quae scribi non potest” (According to Donatus all sound is either segmented [articulata] or joined together [confusa]. Segmented is that which can be understood in letters; joined together, that which cannot be written); and in the Old English that follows the Latin: “Ælc stemn is oððe andgytfullic oððe gemenged. Andgytfullic stemn is, þe mid andgyte bíd geclypod, swawsa ys arma virumque cano ic herige þa wæpnu and ðone wer. gemenged stemn is, þe bíd butan andgyte, swylyc swa is hrydera gehlow and horsa hænung, hunda gebeorc, treowa braslung ET CETERA” (Each sound is either meaningful or mixed. A meaningful sound is that which is called out with meaning, just as is arma virumque cano, I praise weapons and the man. Mixed sound is that which is without meaning, such as is the lowing of oxen and the neighing of horses, the bark of dogs, the rustling of trees, et cetera).
them). It thus anticipates potential completion following the syntactic pattern of that text: here the subject verb object, with the "se" clearly marking definiteness, meaning "the," and not functioning as the distal demonstrative pronoun, not meaning (as it can in other contexts) "that." But because in this strange textual moment, "Her se blank," the "se" is not followed by a noun (or any other words, for that matter), even as the context of the preceding text invites us to imagine a completed line, the text as it stands also suggests the reading "Here: that one," that is, "he, that man, that Satan." Even the potential for such a reading underscores a tension that, we argue, is present throughout the manuscript.

The development of the definite article is in part a grammaticalization of the demonstrative "se." It is a form of the evolution of a grammatical meaning from more clearly lexical material, although here the demonstrative as a pronoun is already grammatical.56 Grammaticalized forms are, in an interesting sense, here transformed. They no longer refer to the world outside language but to the world of grammar, of language. As Joan Bybee has argued, however, grammaticalized forms are also never fully separated from their earlier lexical meanings.57 So, for example, as K. Aaron Smith has proposed compellingly, the current English progressive developed from the locative construction "on + Present Active Participle." "The King is on hunting" evolved into "The King is a-hunting" and then the progressive, "The King is hunting."58 Yet the progressive retains the locative, as is clear in a question like "Where is the king?" and the possible answer, "He's hunting." This answer is not about the king's ongoing action at that moment. It means something like "The king is in the forest." It is a possible answer only because the grammaticalized progressive retains the earlier locative meaning.59

The persistence of the lexical in the grammaticalized is particularly significant here because we are reminded of it by the fragment of the formula, whether we try to complete the "Her se" or to read it as meaningful as it stands, at just the moment when the image we are directed toward might present a definitive break, a movement to a decisively different state—the change from the rebellious angel to the bound Satan. The very representation of the decisive break, the pointing away from the representation to an elsewhere of signification is also a pointing to the representation itself, to the world of image and language, not of things, a world that requires difference but also always retains exactly what it has evolved away from.

As we have argued, there is a strong correspondence between the grammatical movements described here, the pragmatically and grammaticalization of our "her" and "se," and the subject to which they are closest. This image of the fall of Satan, the image that is "here," or nearly so, is a bifurcated one, a simultaneous narration presenting at once Lucifer above and Satan below. What it does not present, however, is the actual moment of transformation itself. Between Lucifer and Satan, in the tense space between their outstretched hands—delicate and long-fingered above, grasping and taloned below—we might be presented with a body suspended temporally as well as spatially between these figures.

The text of the poem, curiously, also balks at this central moment in the narrative. The poets of Genesis A and B were not without the ability to describe or show interest in representing transformation. Over the course of more than thirty lines, the text describes in striking visual language the process of the emergence of the earth out of "black perpetual-night, vast and wide,"60 covering "dark waves," into a "bright-shining creation" (whiteboerhtes gescaft; line 131a). The presence of this passage demonstrates the possibility of suggestive language being used to describe a physical transformation. But even as the text reiterates that transformation of the angels into devils takes place, it elides the process itself as it locates that transformation in space: God casts Lucifer into hell, "where he became a devil" (þær he to deofle wearð; line 305); and the angels fall to hell, where "the lord made them all into devils" (heo ealle forsceop / drihten to deoflum; lines 308–9).

This tells us where the change occurs, and the place of these lines in the narrative suggests when, but it tells us nothing about what the transformation itself looks like. Indeed, much closer to the key moment we read about the alteration of the

56. Many thanks to K. Aaron Smith, Illinois State University, for supplying this example and for guiding us through the concepts of pragmaticization and grammaticalization.


59. Ibid., 223: “The role of locativity as a source for progressive meaning is further suggested by the fact that it is still often an appropriate answer to questions about location.” Smith cites the example “Where’s Lou? He’s taking a bath,” from Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca, Evolution of Grammar, 133, and adds an example in which location is less implicit, “Where is John? He’s reading.” Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca note (133), “If we look at the meaning elements that go into the formation of the progressive periphrasis, it would appear that the original function of the progressive is to give the location of an agent as in the midst of an activity. In fact, this function seems to persist, even in well-developed progressives such as the English one.”

60. “garsecg þeahite / sweart synnihste, side and wide, / wonne wagas” (ocean covered over black perpetual-night, vast and wide, dark waves; lines 117b–19a).
space around the fallen angels. The poem reads "hyr wuruld was gehwyrfted," that is, "their world was changed" (line 318) or, more forcefully, was turned, rolled, tossed about—vertiginous, even. This textual imagery seems very close to that of the illumination, where we have a sort of world turning upside down. Lucifer is clearly tumbling through space, although momentarily frozen, and then turned supine, chained as Satan to the mouth of hell, while all around him his followers tumble through the air as they fall.

These figures are not graceful in this moment, not majestic as angels (which, of course, in the previous moment, they were). Instead, they fall like humans, clumsily twisting and jackknifing through space. This image is a thousand years old, a line drawing with bits of ink wash in a style that has been characterized (erroneously, we believe) as crude, "resulting from lack of skill, lack of training, or lack of patience." One of the countless difficulties—and opportunities—in the study of Anglo-Saxon arts and literatures is approaching both the differences and the continuities in the medieval and modern experiences and understandings of viewing and reading. Broderick, for example, takes particular exception to Karkov's 2001 book on Junius 11, writing that "Karkov takes a 'postmodern' critical stance that incorporates the contemporary twenty-first-century reader-viewer as a co-creator in the construction of meaning in the work as a whole." Because it lacks provable accuracy, Broderick finds such a stance problematic. In contrast, in his effort to make the most cautious and minimal statements about the images of Junius 11, Broderick claims, "The fact that the poetic texts of Junius 11 were based in large part on various books of the Bible is the primary reason that the manuscript was destined to have illustrations at all, since those illustrations could be modeled on pre-existing biblical images." Here we pose two arguments. The first and most practical is that there were many models of a nonbiblical nature available to the illustrator, such as the cycle of images that accompany the Wonders of the East; the second is that artists can make new images. However, those images may be indebted to earlier models, and, indeed, Broderick himself asserts that the illuminators here "needed to innovate and create images, such as the Fall of Lucifer and the Rebel Angels," because there were no biblical precedents, although, as he notes, these illustrations of "unorthodox" subjects may simply be based on "other sources." We submit that the effort to restrict interpretation only to that which is provable, rather than the result of what Broderick calls "free association," may produce interpretations just as subjective, just as deeply rooted in modern paradigms, as those of scholars more willing to acknowledge explicit grounding in modern theory. That is, we argue that the tracing of sources is an approach, based on a theory, and is a modern one at that.

We acknowledge that modern viewing and reading experiences inform and even shape our reception of medieval works. As Madeline Caviness articulates, all modern historians of medieval art are "by definition . . . modern." In a wonderful response to Erwin Panofsky's seminal essay on Jan van Eyck's Arnolfini Wedding Portrait, Linda Seidel wrote (almost three decades ago), "Panofsky's study centers on the male member of the pair and on religious aspects of nuptial ritual; in my eyes, the woman's social standing and the domestic aspects of the marriage ceremony demand equal attention." The key phrase here is "in my eyes." This is not an incidental word choice, not merely another way of saying "I believe." It is, instead, a way to convey that from Seidel's position, as she sees it, through her own eyes, the painting is fundamentally different from the one Panofsky saw, and both are inevitably, and by necessity, different from the painting van Eyck and his patrons saw. The difference is not a question of accuracy or its lack, but of honesty, or its lack. Yes, when we look at Junius 11, we look as the modern viewers we are. If we imagine that there is only one correct reading of any image, that held by "the medieval viewer," we reduce and constrain the object in question, all imagined viewers, and our own role as viewers and interpreters. In 1989 Louise O. Fradenburg addressed these concerns with respect to reading in an essay in the inaugural issue of the now-venerable forum Exemplaria. She writes of "[t]otalization of the Middle Ages" as a process of absolute Othering, in which there is an idealized medieval reader who is, in fact, the product of "extremely modern historical and semiological 'fantasies' and fantasists." She continues:

Totalization of the Middle Ages ( . . . appealed to whenever the court of last resort is what the "Middle Ages" could have imagined or thought or believed or, for that matter, done) is in fact authorized by the very notion

---

63. Ibid., 396.
64. Ibid., 397.
of a categorical or absolute medieval alterity—if everything in the Middle Ages is Other to modernity, then an absolute boundary is in place; such totalizing, moreover, enables the splitting off from the Middle Ages of anything “anomalous” or Other to its supposed Otherness.67

Caviness presents an alternative method of negotiating the space between past and present as a form of “triangulation”:

I have two quite different angles from which I approach the object of study, giving a kind of stereoscopic vision. I have come to think of this model as an asymmetric triangle, where the medieval representations form an apex, projected between two widely separated viewing positions—one of the postmodern feminist critic, the other of the “historian” whom I hold by definition to be modern. The historical viewpoint privileges commentaries by the makers and audience of the object in its original temporal and spatial frames, and may encompass interpretations over time; this is the conventional art historical route, the shorter of the two, yet it can no longer be viewed as the only one, connecting the ancient object directly with its modern viewer, the way it was held to be before the New Historicism. I still think of it as the short lever with which to pry open the object, but contextual study has a tendency to confirm the unity of culture at a given moment, rather than to reveal its fissures. . . . The theoretical side of the triangle is the long lever, capable of exerting greater pressure precisely because it is the least direct. It draws upon concepts that had not been entertained at the time the work was created, and it owes its power to its predisposition not to look for unity within medieval culture.68

Broderick asserts that by “combining codicological, recensional ‘source study’; and, where appropriate, ‘typological’ analysis,” we can “obtain the fullest and most accurate picture of ‘what is going on.””69 The “relative objectivity” that Broderick sees as “an elusive, but not entirely impossible goal” is, however, not the only goal we might strive toward in our analysis of works of art. It is not our intention here to attempt to provide the fullest or most accurate picture of “what is going on” in a thousand-year-old artifact whose designers, illuminators, authors, scribes, patrons, and audiences all remain utterly obscure. If we are constrained by a quest for some form of objective accuracy, we will have to choose other objects for our attention. If, instead, we want to spend time with these fascinating, beautifully imperfect, and incomplete objects, we can also embrace our subjectivity and do our best to articulate why, after a millennium, we still care.

As we consider this potent image and its emotional charge in the present, we propose that one way to approach why and how it continues to compel is to look away from it, briefly, to a modern work—Richard Drew’s famous photograph of the falling man on September 11, 2001 (Fig. 15).70 We look to this work not to deny the historical moment of production and reception of the Junius 11 manuscript but, rather, to inform our understanding of the reception of the image and text today, in both continuity with and difference from that moment. Drew’s beautiful image, with its dramatic composition dominated by the sharp vertical lines of the north tower of the World Trade Center, manages to render the incomprehensible horror of that day aesthetic and therefore—at least momentarily, and surely illusorily—graspable. It has little in common with the Fall of the Rebel Angels. However, this photograph was only one from Drew’s roll, which also contained photographs of the man in the seconds before and after this iconic moment. As Tom Junod eloquently writes:

The Falling Man in Richard Drew’s picture fell in the manner suggested by the photograph for only a fraction of a second, and then kept falling. The photograph functioned as a study of doomed verticality, a fantasia of straight lines, with a human being slivered at the center, like a spike. In truth, however, the Falling Man fell with neither the precision of an arrow nor the grace of an Olympic diver. He fell like everyone else, like all the other jumpers—trying to hold on to the life he was leaving, which is to say that he fell desperately, inelegantly. In Drew’s famous photograph, his humanity is in accord with the lines of the buildings. In the rest of the sequence—the eleven outtakes—his humanity stands apart. He is not augmented by aesthetics; he is merely human, and his humanity, startled and in some cases horizontal, obliterates everything else in the frame.71

Here we have greater resonance. The unpublished modern photographs of a fall and the medieval illumination of the fall

---

71. Ibid.
both stress not the grandeur of their moments, not their potentially world-shifting significance, but instead the apparent humanity of those who fall. As Junod describes the other images of the Falling Man—the unpublished outtakes—they display no "acceptance of his fate. He is panicking. He is rolling through the air."72 The doomed—ultimately and permanently doomed—angels fall inelegantly, too (Fig. 4). They gyrate and contort as they plunge toward hell, and as they do, here and elsewhere in the manuscript (Fig. 5),73 they seem all too recognizably human.

Satan, too, threatens us with his near humanness, if not his humanity. However, he is the only one of those falling to appear twice, which creates a temporal estrangement from the rest of the narrative plummeting around him. There is a tension in this moment, to say the least, a seismic, cosmic tension centered on a moment of impossibility. In transforming from Lucifer to Satan, there is presumably a moment when the figure is part angel, part devil, but can this be? Such a figure would be evocative of the theoretical construct of the posthuman. As Patricia MacCormack writes, "[T]he posthuman spatially encourages an address to the multiple within a dividuated organism and the organism as part of a teeming series of relations with its inextricable environment. . . . Temporally the posthuman is past, present, and future.

72. 9/11: The Falling Man, directed by Henry Singer, 80 min. (London: Darlow Smithson Productions, 2006), at min. 50.
73. See note 29 above.

Figure 15. Richard Drew, Falling Man, September 11, 2001 (photo: © Richard Drew/AP/Corbis). See the electronic edition of Gesta for a color version of this image.
contracted into immanent entity, emergent without arrival and fled before it is complete.\textsuperscript{74} This dividuated being, this entity internally divided, is indeed "emergent without arrival and fled before" we can lay eyes on its impossible hybrid form. In its place we find both Lucifer and Satan, multiple rather than single. Unlike the falling angels all around, the dual presentation of Lucifer and Satan creates a chronological schism and renders each moment—particularly Lucifer's—as if suspended. The moments represented provide us the before and the after, without the central moment of change.

The poet likewise shies away from the presentation of the moment of transformation itself. The angels fall, again and again, in the poem, and are transformed, but at no point in the text(s) or images are they transforming. Instead, they are suspended as if frozen in their befores and their afters, most forcefully in the bodies of Lucifer and Satan:

\begin{quote}
\ldots Waldend sende
la\text{d}wendne here on langne sið,
geomre gastas; was him gylp forod,
beot forborsten, and forbiged þrym,
white gewemmaed. Heo on wrace syððan seomodon swearte \ldots (lines 67b–72a)\end{quote}

[The Leader sent the hateful host on a long journey, the grim ghosts; their pride was broken down, their boasts broken, their power brought low, their beauty defiled. Afterwards, dark, they hung suspended in misery.] (emphasis added)

This lacuna in the narrative appears repeatedly in the texts and images.\textsuperscript{75} Scott McCloud provides another way to conceptualize the suspension, the gap between Lucifer and Satan, and the "missing" scene of transformation. In his Understanding Comics, a book about the methods used in "sequential art," McCloud aims to explicate "the secrets between the panels," the processes at work in the spaces between sequential images.\textsuperscript{76} He defines sequential art visually as well as verbally, providing a series of image pairs that exemplify the temporal nature characteristic of the genre (Fig. 16). The top set of images in a column of five pairs, which becomes his icon for "sequential art," presents a man wearing a top hat on the left and one holding a top hat on the right. When we view this pair of images, we perform "closure," defined by McCloud as "observing the parts but perceiving the whole."\textsuperscript{77} In this case, closure works temporally: just as we "complete" the image in our minds by assuming that the figure of the man in each panel has a right hand, legs and feet, and a back, even though we see none of these, so too we complete the pair by filling in the temporal gap between them. Our Junius 11 image/text is clearly a piece of sequential art, which McCloud describes as "a medium where the audience is a willing and conscious collaborator and closure is the agent of change, time and motion."\textsuperscript{78} Through the principle of closure, we take

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{closure.png}
\caption{Illustrations of closure (from Scott McCloud, Understanding Comics: The Invisible Art [New York: HarperPerennial, 1994], 5; photo: courtesy Scott McCloud).}
\end{figure}

\footnotesize\textsuperscript{75} See, e.g., lines 338–46, 340b–52, and images on pages 3 and 16.
\footnotesize\textsuperscript{77} Ibid., 63.
\footnotesize\textsuperscript{78} Ibid., 65.
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two static images and convert them into *change*, *time*, and *motion*. In the series of images we see a man removing his hat, the sun setting, a woman reacting to a gunshot, a few minutes passing, and an eye closing, even though none of these events is actually presented. 79

79. This process is quite similar to the well-known Kuleshov Effect, named for Lev Kuleshov, a Russian filmmaker who experimented in the 1910s and 1920s. He showed viewers three pairs of film clips: a shot of a bowl of soup and then a close-up of the film icon Ivan Mosjoukine; an apparently dead girl in a coffin and then a close-up of Mosjoukine; and finally an alluring young woman reclining on a couch and then a close-up of Mosjoukine. Viewers assumed emotional connections, so that Mosjoukine was seen as pensive, sorrowful, and lustful, in turn, when in fact the second clip in each pair was the same clip, repeated. When viewers see scenes in a film juxtaposed through montage, they assume a temporal and causal connection between them. In essence, the Kuleshov Effect is based on the closure provided by spectators.

In this same manner, the viewer may “close” the gap between Lucifer and Satan through active and conscious participation in the image and text, through acts of viewing and reading. One figure is transformed into the other. The poet and illuminator, however, has allowed—even required—that this transformation occur not in a static image but through the act of reading and viewing. The same segmentalization via textual formulae that enables the reading of the image as a meaningful sequence also ensures that in the act of reading and viewing we ourselves supply the transformations between segments. “Her,” here, is the discursive world of images and texts that we are engaged in creating and in which, like us and with us, Satan is becoming.