

Martin Büchsel / Herbert L. Kessler / Rebecca Müller (eds.)

The Atrium of San Marco in Venice

The Genesis and Medieval Reality of the Genesis Mosaics

Das Atrium von San Marco in Venedig

Die Genese der Genesismosaiken und ihre mittelalterliche Wirklichkeit



# Neue Frankfurter Forschungen zur Kunst

Herausgegeben vom Kunstgeschichtlichen Institut  
der Goethe-Universität Frankfurt am Main

Band 15

Martin Büchsel / Herbert L. Kessler /  
Rebecca Müller (eds.)

# The Atrium of San Marco in Venice

The Genesis and Medieval Reality  
of the Genesis Mosaics

# Das Atrium von San Marco in Venedig

Die Genese der Genesismosaiken und  
ihre mittelalterliche Wirklichkeit

Gebr. Mann Verlag • Berlin

Gedruckt mit Unterstützung von:

Fritz Thyssen Stiftung

Stiftung zur Förderung der internationalen wissenschaftlichen Beziehungen  
der Goethe-Universität

Richard Stury Stiftung

Benvenuto Cellini-Gesellschaft e.V. Frankfurt am Main

Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie;  
detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet über <http://dnb.d-nb.de> abrufbar.

© 2014 by Gebr. Mann Verlag • Berlin  
[www.gebrmannverlag.de](http://www.gebrmannverlag.de)

Alle Rechte, insbesondere das Recht der Vervielfältigung und Verbreitung sowie der  
Übersetzung vorbehalten. Kein Teil des Werkes darf in irgendeiner Form durch Fotokopie,  
Mikrofilm, CD-ROM usw. ohne schriftliche Genehmigung des Verlages reproduziert  
oder unter Verwendung elektronischer Systeme verarbeitet, vervielfältigt oder verbreitet werden.  
Bezüglich Fotokopien verweisen wir ausdrücklich auf §§ 53, 54 UrhG.

Gedruckt auf säurefreiem Papier, das die US-ANSI-NORM über Haltbarkeit erfüllt.

Umschlaggestaltung unter Verwendung von Taf. 8 (Foto: Beat Brenk, mit freundlicher Erlaubnis  
der Procuratoria di San Marco): M&S Hawemann • Berlin

Layoutkonzeption: M&S Hawemann • Berlin

Satz: Gebr. Mann Verlag • Berlin

Druck und Verarbeitung: druckhaus köthen • Köthen

Printed in Germany • ISBN 978-3-7861-2713-0

## Inhalt / Table of Contents

Vorwort.....	7
Introduction <i>Herbert L. Kessler</i> .....	9
I Der Ort der Bilder. Funktionen des Atriums – The Place of the Pictures. The Atrium’s Function	
Die Vorhalle von San Marco vor den Genesismosaiken – Aspekte der Bau-, Ausstattungs- und Nutzungsgeschichte <i>Rudolf Dellermann</i> .....	21
Zur Funktion des Atriums von San Marco in Venedig <i>Beat Brenk</i> .....	49

## II Theologie und Bildgenese. Die Cotton Genesis und ihre mittelalterlichen Adaptionen – Theology and the Origins of the Pictures. The Cotton Genesis and its Medieval Modifications

Thirteenth-Century Venetian Revisions of the Cotton Genesis Cycle <i>Herbert L. Kessler</i> .....	75
Theologie und Bildgenese. Modelle der Transformation antiker und frühchristlicher Vorlagen <i>Martin Büchsel</i> .....	95
Adams Seele <i>Alexander Brungs</i> .....	131
Die Inschriften der Genesismosaiken <i>Karin Krause</i> .....	143
Farbtafeln.....	177

## III Theologie und Narration vor San Marco – Theology and Narration before San Marco

Northern Light: Late Anglo-Saxon Genesis Illustration and the Mosaics of San Marco <i>Herbert R. Broderick</i> .....	211
Fragwürdige Bilder. Die Genesismosaiken in Monreale <i>Kathrin Müller</i> .....	231
Pictorial Narratives of the Holy Land and the Myth of Venice in the Atrium of San Marco <i>Thomas Dale</i> .....	247
The Political Content of the Atrium Mosaics <i>Henry Maguire</i> .....	271
Abbildungsnachweis.....	280

## Vorwort

Der vorliegende Band ist das Ergebnis eines 2012 von den Herausgebern im Forschungskolleg Humanwissenschaften in Bad Homburg organisierten Kolloquiums. Anlass und Ausgangspunkt war die jüngst von Herbert L. Kessler und Martin Büchsel erneut aufgegriffene Kontroverse zum Verhältnis der frühchristlichen Illuminationen der Cotton-Genesis zu den Genesismosaiken des Atriums von San Marco und zur Bedeutung der augustinischen Schöpfungstheologie für beide Zyklen. Damit ging es um die grundlegenden Fragen, mit welchen visuellen Vorstellungen ein theologisches Konzept verbunden ist oder welche visuellen Vorstellungen ein theologisches Konzept provozieren kann. Die Mosaiken von San Marco standen aber nicht nur als Kopie der Cotton-Genesis zur Diskussion, sondern als mittelalterliche Bilderzählung in einem architektonischen, in einem funktionalen Zusammenhang. Gerade das Spezifische des Konzepts von San Marco im künstlerischen, historischen und politischen Kontext Venedigs sollte herausgearbeitet werden.

Ziel des Kolloquiums war es nicht, die unterschiedlichen Standpunkte zu nivellieren. Vielmehr erwiesen sich die Unterschiede in den Positionen als besonders stimulierend für den konstruktiven Austausch aller Teilnehmenden. Die Kontroverse macht im vorliegenden Band die Problemfelder zukünftiger Forschung deutlich. Hier werden Fragen sichtbar, die die Grenzen der diskutierten Gegenstände überschreiten.

Die Herausgeber sind zu vielfältigem Dank verpflichtet. Das Kolloquium und die Drucklegung wurden durch die maßgebliche Förderung der Fritz Thyssen Stiftung möglich gemacht. Dass wir die Beiträge in dieser Form publizieren können, verdanken wir darüber

hinaus der Stiftung zur Förderung der internationalen wissenschaftlichen Beziehungen der Goethe-Universität, der Richard Stury Stiftung sowie dem Förderverein des Kunstgeschichtlichen Instituts, der Benvenuto Cellini-Gesellschaft. Für finanzielle Unterstützung des Kolloquiums danken wir der Vereinigung von Freunden und Förderern der Goethe-Universität und wiederum der Benvenuto Cellini-Gesellschaft. Das Forschungskolleg Humanwissenschaften und hier die tätige Hilfe von Andreas Reichhardt ermöglichten ein konzentriertes Arbeiten in besonderer Atmosphäre. Wir danken Tobias Frese und Peter Scholz für ihre anregenden Tagungsbeiträge, die beide nicht für die Publikation zur Verfügung standen. Beat Brenk stellte freundlicherweise für den Band seine nach der jüngsten Restaurierung der Genesis-Kuppel von San Marco angefertigten Aufnahmen zur Verfügung. Irene Favaretto und Ettore Vio, Procuratoria di San Marco, sind wir für die Erlaubnis sehr verbunden, diese hier publizieren zu können. Dumbarton Oaks und Branislav L. Slantchev ermöglichten uns entgegenkommenderweise den Abdruck ihrer Aufnahmen. Melanie Scheidler hat uns in den Korrekturarbeiten unterstützt.

Als Vortragende konnte auch Sahoko Tsuji gewonnen werden. Sahoko Tsuji verstarb am 24. Dezember 2011. Midori Tsuzumi übernahm es, sie zu vertreten; dafür möchten wir Midori Tsuzumi unseren besonderen Dank aussprechen.

Frankfurt/Adams, im Februar 2014

Martin Büchsel  
Herbert L. Kessler  
Rebecca Müller

# Introduction

*Herbert L. Kessler*

## Cotton Genesis

For more than a century, scholars have treated the mosaics in the atrium of San Marco primarily as a reflection of the miniatures in the Cotton Genesis (London, British Library, MS Otho B VI),<sup>1</sup> a fifth-century Greek manuscript largely destroyed in an eighteenth-century fire and, hence, as one of a handful of remaining Late Antique illustrated manuscripts, demanding reconstruction. Even Otto Demus's magisterial 1984 study of the Venetian decorations, while taking up issues of dating, style, and preservation, and also providing an iconographic overview that is rich in observations, included a chapter on the relationship mosaics' relationship to their presumed manuscript model, while more or less ignoring the Latin inscriptions, the mise-en-scene, and other aspects that do not depend on the iconographic source.<sup>2</sup>

Consigned to Kurt Weitzmann, the chapter in Demus's book titled »Genesis Mosaics of San Marco and the Cotton Genesis Miniatures«, expanded observations made in 1889 by Johan Jakob Tikkanen,<sup>3</sup> and sharpened them through the application of Weitzmann's own approach to medieval pictorial imagery.<sup>4</sup> Although he rejected the term »Weitzmann method«, Weitzmann had systematically laid out this approach in his 1947 book *Illustrations in Roll and Codex: a Study of the Origin and Method of Text Illustration*.<sup>5</sup> The method was explicitly philological, devised to recover an *Urtext*, or rather an *Urzählus*, by analyzing various derivatives from a hypothetical model, using the fidelity to a textual narrative as the main criterion for adjudicating the authenticity among versions of a pictorial »recension«. The Cotton Genesis played a prin-

cial role in Weitzmann's approach because, unlike the other surviving manuscripts, it seemed to be the center of a vast family, as Tikkanen had already assumed and other scholars accepted. Moreover, with the exception of the fifth/sixth-century Ashburnham Pentateuch (Paris, BnF. Nouv. acq. Latin 2334), which had served in the twelfth-century as a model for frescoes in the church of St. Julian at Tours,<sup>6</sup> the Cotton Genesis's relationship to the mosaics of San Marco confirmed a secondary tenet of Weitzmann's broad heuristic hypothesis, namely, that illuminated manuscripts were a primary source of much monumental art during the Middle Ages.<sup>7</sup> In other words, the atrium mosaics interested Tikkanen and Weitzmann largely, not in their own right, but for what they told of the (mostly lost) Greek manuscript. Accordingly, Weitzmann understood the classical vocabulary, for example, the Prometheus story underlying the scenes of the Creation of Adam in the first atrium dome, as a reflection of the ancient source and not as a contemporary innovation; he ascribed the mosaics' extra-biblical details wholesale to the manuscript model; and he dislodged the narrative from the complicated architectural space and myriad Latin inscriptions to see the Greek manuscript underlying it.

While Weitzmann was writing his chapter for Demus' book, he and I were finishing a study of the Cotton fragments themselves that we had begun in 1979. I had been a student of Weitzmann's in Princeton during the early 1960s and subscribed fully to his methods. My own dissertation on four illustrated ninth-century Bibles, seemed to confirm the utility of his method;<sup>8</sup> and, examining the charred fragments of the manuscript in the British Library over the course of three years, I discovered new details that seemed absolutely to support the tight connection Weitzmann had established between manuscript and murals. As a student during the sixties, however, I was also deeply impressed by the then new science of codicology being advanced by Léon M. J. Delaissé and other scholars. As I worked with the fragments and with such secondary evidence as the watercolor copies made by George Virtue, I realized that much of the lost manuscript could still be reconstructed physically, including the original dimensions and even the structure of the gatherings of folios. Codicology seemed only to support the conclusion that the Cotton Genesis itself and not a hypothetical *Zwischenglied* had been the very source available in thirteenth-century Venice. For instance, it established the absence of the folio illustrating God Commanding Noah and his Family Leaving the Ark and hence offered a plausible explanation for why the counterpart episode in San Marco was anomalously problematic.<sup>9</sup> So convinced was I of the relationship between manuscript and mosaics, I even fantasized finding leaves missing among the fragments before the fire – including some containing the most important scenes known from San Marco – in a British antiquary shop, excised and dispersed (I imagined) during the two and a half centuries the Late Antique codex was in England.

In our book, Weitzmann and I treated the scenes depicted in San Marco as if they were miniatures in the Cotton Genesis, actually cutting them up and reassembling them as a linear narrative; and where the mosaics were lacking certain episodes, we consulted other members of the »recension« to reconstruct the original series of pictures. All of the *comparanda* were Western works and none included the extended hexaemeral sequence that begins the narrative in San Marco. The Carolingian Genesis frontispieces that I had studied in my Ph.D. dissertation, for instance, surely betray a source for the story of Adam and Eve that is close to the sequence



Fig. 1 Daniel Rabel, Third Day of Creation, Copy of the Cotton Genesis, Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, Ms. fr. 9530, fol. 32r.

in San Marco, as Wilhelm Koehler had argued in the 1930s;<sup>10</sup> but, despite clear similarities in the rendering of God introducing Eve to Adam on folio 3r of the London codex, there was no evidence that that model was the Cotton manuscript itself. Another (twin) manuscript related to it seemed to have been implicated in the Latin tradition. Indeed, until it was deployed for the mosaics in San Marco, the Cotton Genesis itself left no trace; and all the seemingly related works pointed to its independent and unique derivation. This very conclusion contained the seed of its own subversion: The Cotton Genesis appeared, in fact, to have had a »doppelgänger« known in the West at least from the ninth century and possibly as early as the fifth, when it seems to have been deployed by the painters of the basilicas of St. Peter's and St. Paul's outside the walls in Rome.

The Weitzmann/Kessler publication engendered reconsideration of the validity of considering the San Marco mosaics to be a literal reflection of the Cotton Genesis. Most consequential among the scholarly reactions was Martin Büchsel's extended treatment in 1991 which,

among other things, drew implications from the lacunae that Weitzmann and I had identified in the manuscript.<sup>11</sup> Büchsel argued that several of the losses, notably the folios picturing the Creation of Sea Creatures and the Creation of Terrestrial Animals, were likely aspects of the manuscript already in the thirteenth century and that, therefore, the mosaicists in Venice had had to supplement their basic source by consulting other models, among these a Byzantine Octateuch. James Carley's publication eleven years later of textual notes made in a printed Septuagint in Lambeth Palace (E41.L6) by Thomas Wakefield, the first documented owner of the Cotton Genesis, provided new evidence that the fifth-century codex was defective already in the early sixteenth century.<sup>12</sup> Indeed, Wakefield's annotations suggest that three hundred years after the Cotton Genesis was deployed as a model in the atrium of San Marco, the losses may have been quite extensive, perhaps nearly equal to those when the manuscript was reduced to ruin in 1731. In short, Büchsel and Carley raised the possibility that what the mosaicists had in hand in the thirteenth-century was a badly damaged Book of Genesis, not so different in structure from the one Weitzmann and I had reconstructed from the fragments.

The definitive evidence that that might have been the case comes near the manuscript's beginning, Genesis 1.13, which begins folio 1 of the British Library codex, was also the first passage Wakefield noted in his correlation with the printed Septuagint; and it is the same passage that Nicolas-Claude Fabri de Peiresc a century later (together with the accompanying miniature that has come down in a watercolor copy made by Daniel Rabel, Fig. 1).<sup>13</sup> The surviving folio 2, a replacement page that Ernst Grabe dated to the eighth century and Nigel Wilson thought might not even be that late, establishes as fact that parts of the opening text and accompanying pictorial series were lacking pages and pictures long before the manuscript arrived in England and, hence, powerful and incontrovertible proof that the text and pictures describing the fifth and sixth days were missing from the book at an early date. Folio 3 pictures God Introducing Eve to Adam according to Genesis 2.22–23, establishing the likelihood that, with the exception of the third and fourth days, the entire hexaemeral sequence had been destroyed by the time the manuscript reached England and the possibility that it was lost already when the Cotton Genesis was deployed for the mosaics.

Büchsel returns to the implications of such losses in his contribution to this volume, reinforcing his earlier argument with further analysis of two particular elements, the depiction of Adam receiving a soul in the form of a winged homunculus and the winged personifications that symbolize the successive days in the hexaemeral series. He notes that the two acts of creating the first man are separated from each other by the scene of God Resting on the Seventh Day and, hence, imply the independent forming of Adam's body and giving Adam a soul. Maintaining his belief that, in these elements, San Marco reflects the Cotton Genesis, he goes beyond the iconographic argument to probe the manuscript's theological and cultural context, strengthening his earlier claim that the illustrated book originated in Rome and that its representations were nourished by Augustinian exegesis. Bringing the history of theology to bear on the latter issue, Alexander Brungs confirms how very difficult it is to resolve the question of what goes back to the Late Antique manuscript and what is a thirteenth-century Venetian interpretation. Brungs does not disagree with Büchsel; but he notes that Augustine himself gave different accounts of when Adam's soul was created and, tracing the history of

the reception of Augustine's arguments, he follows the debate through the Middle Ages and into the thirteenth century. Brungs understands that Augustine's position was not the favored one in the later Middle Ages, a point confirmed by the pictorial evidence, which almost always presents the creation of Adam as a single act and often even reduces it to one element of the Creation of Animals on the sixth day or merges it with the Creation of Eve.<sup>14</sup> But he also leaves open the matter of how precisely Augustinian the imagery in San Marco is and, hence, whether it goes back to fifth-century Rome.

In my own essay, I continue to argue along the lines of three recent articles in which I revised my earlier views,<sup>15</sup> namely, that the hexaemeral and Adam and Eve cycles, including the dual representation of the Creation of Adam as displayed in San Marco, are largely expansions and re-workings of the imagery in a defective Cotton Genesis and therefore should be considered as derivations from a second source and/or thirteenth-century innovations. While agreeing with Büchsel that the Cotton Genesis was rich in theological interpretations and borrowings from classical art, I assign more of the extra-biblical elements to the mosaics than he does. And although I also agree that the Italian tradition evident in the great basilicas of Rome, in the Carolingian Bibles, and, later, in the Salerno ivories and the mosaics of Norman Sicily is involved in the question, I see these not as evidence of what the Cotton manuscript itself must have looked like, but rather as indications that the Venetian craftsmen turned to a source close at hand when they supplemented the badly-reduced manuscript that served as their principal model.

How one evaluates these two hypotheses determines, not only how creative the San Marco mosaicists were but also, and more important, what the cultural and religious context was in which the Cotton Genesis illustrations were produced and, in turn, the thirteenth-century pictorial narrative. Thus, although Büchsel was the first to note that the Creation of Birds and Fishes and the Creation of Terrestrial Animals were interpolations and, hence, proof of the mosaicists' ability to create new pictures consistent with the classical mode, he doubts that the two scenes in San Marco picturing the Creation of Adam were part of the same revision. I believe the contrary, namely that the borrowing of the Promethean iconography took place in the thirteenth century and was as part of a process to make the imagery inherited from the Late Antique codex look ancient. Perhaps the dispute recorded in these pages opens a middle ground. The Carolingian Genesis frontispieces and the eleventh-century Millstatt Genesis (Klagenfurt, Museum Rudolfinum, Cod. VI, 19)<sup>16</sup> attest to the existence of a two-phase Creation of Adam within the Cotton Genesis »recension«; the first depicted action shows Christ modeling the first man from earth and the second pictures the Creator facing Adam and raising his hand to inspire him.<sup>17</sup> The comparisons do not resolve the issue as to whether the parallels in San Marco, and hence the Augustinian interpretation on which they were based, were also features of the Cotton manuscript of which no trace of the scenes remains or rather reflect the secondary, western source the mosaicists used to supplement the Greek model; but, lacking the Promethean features incorporated in the mosaics, they do reinforce the idea that the classicizing elements in San Marco were interpolations mapped onto earlier imagery. The question is open.

So, too, is the issue of the day personifications. Since Marie-Thérèse D'Alverny's classic 1957 publication, the winged figures in the creation series in Cotton Genesis and San Marco

have been linked to Augustine's exegesis of the creation of light; and they and their theological basis remain subjects for Büchsel and Kathrin Müller in this volume, too. While Rabel's copy of the Third Day of Creation and the surviving fragment of the Fourth Day leave no doubt that the »geflügelten Wesen« were features of the manuscript, the evolution in the depictions of the »Tagesengeln« that Büchsel tracks through an exquisite analysis of the subtle variations in San Marco may reflect the model or manifest an intelligent variation of the (defective) model initiated in the Venetian atrium itself. Büchsel understands the winged day personifications as »Reflexionsfiguren« of the creation, which represent both elements of the angels' knowledge concerning the creatures: seeing all things in God's word and seeing themselves but referring back to the word. Indeed, the question arises as to whether the personifications in the manuscript were even meant to be angels. Müller understands the Augustinian tradition the angels reflect within the medieval western tradition; and she argues, as well, that the Latin texts accompanying the mosaics complicate the images taken from the old Septuagint and relates them and their presumed theological foundation to the Genesis cycle in the Duomo of Monreale, closer in time and place to San Marco than the Cotton Genesis.

While the classical and Augustinian elements in the Cotton Genesis have attracted much interest, less attention has been paid to other extra-Scriptural details. Some of those in San Marco were surely features of the manuscript, for instance, the figure of Manasseh in the scene of Joseph's confrontation with his brothers based on a text such as the *Midrash Rabbah* (91.8) which reports that the »interpreter between Joseph and his brothers« mentioned in Gen. 42.23 was Joseph's elder son, a detail still discernable on folio 94v of the British Library fragments. Herbert Broderick reveals other such midrashic elements in members of the Cotton Genesis family; and the glossing of the Old Testament narrative continued during the thirteenth-century and indeed was intensified. Here and there, inscriptions point to the typologies as Karin Krause analyses in her contribution: *Cristus Abel Cernit* in the first bay and also Abraham. As with the classical references, which of the Christological elements were in the manuscript and which added in the mosaics is still debated, the reference to Last Judgment in the Punishment of Adam and Eve, for instance, or the throne on which Eve sits in the scene of Work after the Expulsion, both in the first dome.

One conclusion must now be drawn: For every scene in San Marco for which no counterpart survives among the fragments in London, the question needs to be asked independently as to whether it derives from the Cotton Genesis at all and, if so, to what extent. The mosaicists seem certainly to have turned to other models, one, it would seem, a western work related to the Roman basilicas. That is not insignificant because it tethers the Venetian series, not only to Byzantium, but also to the West.

## San Marco

The freeing of the San Marco mosaics from a strict adherence to the Cotton Genesis has opened the discussion to the possibility of large-scale supplementation of the fifth-century series within the atrium, required either by losses in the manuscript or a desire to extend and

inflect the existing narrative. Noting the similarities with Roman works and medieval south Italian cycles that Tikkanen had already introduced in the discussion, Büchsel and Broderick find evidence for a largely consistent transmission within the Latin tradition, what Broderick calls »iconographic affinities«. Albeit for diverse reasons, Krause, Müller, Henry Maguire, and I all favor a concerted thirteenth-century intervention, with iconological significance. How one comes down on the question has implications for aspects of the Cotton manuscript itself, most notably, about the alleged Augustinian basis of its imagery, but also is important, for interpreting San Marco, that is, for separating elements derived from the model from those inserted ad hoc in the mosaics.

There is much more to consider than iconographic sources. Recent scholarship has begun to track the relationship of the decorations to their placement within the atrium, focusing on how the stories from Genesis, even those originally arranged on leaves of the Cotton codex, were amplified and adjusted to serve a narrative arc within the space and has attempted to show the ways the unfolding relates to the atrium's functions. The space and the ceremonies it sheltered, Rudolf Dellermann reminds readers of this volume, predated the mosaics by more than a century. Indeed, the atrium was decorated and manipulated over time, before the current mosaics were installed and also afterwards; and the pictorial narrative had to be arranged to accommodate the façade's and atrium's pre-existing architectural features, with their own complicated histories as the entranceway to a building that was, at once, a martyrium, palace chapel, civic church, and parish church. Demus had, of course, made a number of proposals about the relationship of the mosaics to their placement, including the idea that the Joseph series might be connected to the tribunal function of the atrium's north wing; and he was seconded in this by Stalle Sinding-Larsen.<sup>18</sup> But it was Penny Jolly first,<sup>19</sup> and then the papers delivered at a conference organized by Henry Maguire and Robert Nelson and published in 2010 that made definitive progress on the matter.<sup>20</sup> The papers delivered in Frankfurt in 2012 and published in this volume extend this line of inquiry.

Several contributions detail the ways in which many of the modifications of the Cotton Genesis imagery introduced in San Marco are to be understood as responses to specific Venetian requisites in the thirteenth century. Thomas Dale demonstrates how, framed by depictions of the life of St. Mark, the narratives from the Books of Genesis and Exodus were devised to establish Venice as a new *terra sancta* and its inhabitants as a new Chosen People, governed by a doge who, like Joseph and Moses, watched over them. Brenk suggests that even such details as the personifications in the creation series who praise Christ are related to ruler ideology; and Krause shows that the inscriptions reinforced the political message both in their poetic forms and epigraphic aesthetics.

As Krause underscores, moreover, the decoration of the domes would have been coordinated by a professional workshop; while at the same time, the execution over the course of half a century, allowed for variation and experimentation. Brenk emphasizes the basic fact that the »Old Testament« was of interest to Christians as a prophecy of Christ; and taking up several of the particular functional hypotheses – penitential, funereal, and political – he underscores the decoration's fundamental purpose as a response to the New Testament program inside, presenting the events culled from Hebrew Scripture, *grosso modo*, as a prelude Christian sacred

history. But, within that overall structure, the original cycle of illumination was mapped onto the architecture in a fashion that betrays a clear plan, creating a dome devoted to the story of Creation and Adam and Eve in Paradise, distinct from the account of the first parents life in the world and the fate of their sons, segregating the Noah legend and Tower of Babel, and forming one dome devoted to Abraham peregrinations and three others – aligned along the north – dedicated to Joseph.

De facto, the setting organized the narratives copied from the Cotton Genesis in ways that interpreted them; and Maguire and Dale articulate broad themes underlying this organization, moreover, with the Creation dome assimilating maps, Abraham's journey embodying pilgrimage, Joseph's demonstrating good ecclesiastical administration, and Moses's proper pastoral care. The narrative's unfolding in itself engaged other subthemes pertinent to the Venetian context, particularly, as Dale reveals, references to City's relationship to Egypt and the eastern Mediterranean. Not without reason, Krause notes, EGYPTUS is boldly asserted within the Joseph narrative. And as Dale and Müller suggest, the mosaics may have sent a message to Moslems and Jews in the rendering of details. In other words, even if as John Lowden argued,<sup>21</sup> the Cotton Genesis manuscript »might have made a better instructional aid [than the Vienna Genesis], for its pictures are less complex [ . . . ] more numerous, and hence more plausibly didactic,« when transformed into mural decorations, the imagery was presented through the filters of high medieval theology, the dynamic situation within a church space, politics, and performance.

The many doors furthered the interpretation. The Porta da Mar which, until the sixteenth century, opened the atrium toward the south, established a direction for viewing the mosaics; and the depiction of the Virgin Mary »redemptrix« over what was originally the atrium's south portal cued the reading of the Genesis dome set on four cherubim as the first station of civic processions, simultaneously creating an aura of holiness and recalling humankind's fall from grace. Other doors also articulated meaning. The Cain and Abel series inside the Porta da Mar introduces the theme of judgment frequently found on the counter-façades of Italian churches; while Abraham Greeting the Angels provides an example of hospitality appropriate for the main church door it adorns. The paired depictions of the Tower of Babel are to be understood in light of the campanile visible through the entranceway and Christ's Ascension pictured in the tympanum outside; and, as Maguire stresses, the mosaic over Porta Sant'Alipio »sets the tone« of the Joseph and Moses sequences within it. Spaces, and the activities that took place in those spaces, created intersecting vectors that inflected the narratives in various ways, guided by inscriptions and cued by numerous inserted portraits and personifications.

It is an irony that the clearest instance of the copying of illustrations from a Late Antique manuscript and, for Weitzmann, a principal example, seems actually to subvert the »method« he advanced. Most scenes in San Marco that have no extant parallel among the surviving fragments of the Cotton Genesis do not, in fact, witness a vast »recension« of which the London manuscript is a prime object, but rather consist of interpolations from other sources, or ad hoc innovations. That the transfer of imagery from a manuscript made some eight centuries earlier into mural decoration would, inevitably, engender revisions beyond the fashionable details Weitzmann postulated is not surprising, especially as there is evidence of substantial losses in

the work. But the mosaicists were far more inventive than Weitzmann and I realized, not only omitting scenes missing in their source manuscript, but also turning to other models and refashioning compositions they had. Critics of Weitzmann's paradigm had long argued that the relationship of the San Marco mosaics to the Cotton Genesis was parochial and exceptional and hence could not provide the basis of a general theory of medieval art. In fact, the supplements and adjustments the essays in this volume identify do not compromise Weitzmann's philological method; rather they reconfirm its basic utility, which at its core aims at imagining lost (not partially preserved) narrative models. The new understanding of San Marco's relationship to the Cotton Genesis presented here provides a more precise way of understanding how the *Urykelus* inspired the thirteenth-century mosaicists, but did not constrain them.

In so doing, it also demonstrates how scholars of various opinions and intellectual formations can come together to discuss matters afresh, reconcile divergent opinions, continue to disagree with one another, and thus open up new questions for future research.

## Notes

- 1 K. Weitzmann/H. L. Kessler, *The Cotton Genesis*, Princeton 1986.
- 2 O. Demus, *The Mosaics of San Marco in Venice*, Chicago 1984.
- 3 Die Genesismosaik von S. Marco in Venedig und ihr Verhältniss zu den Miniaturen der Cottonbibel, nebst einer Untersuchung über den Ursprung der mittelalterlichen Genesisdarstellung besonders in der byzantinischen und italienischen Kunst, Helsingfors 1889.
- 4 Demus (cf. n. 2), vol. 2, p. 105–42.
- 5 Princeton, 1947; rev. ed. 1970.
- 6 See B. Narkiss, *El pentateuco Ashburnham. La ilustración de codices en la antigüedad tardía*. Valencia 2003.
- 7 K. Weitzmann, *The Study of Byzantine Book Illumination, Past, Present, and Future*, in: K. Weitzmann/W. C. Loerke/E. Kitzinger/H. Buchthal (eds.), *The Place of Book Illumination in Byzantine Art*, Princeton 1975, p. 1–60.
- 8 *The Illustrated Bibles from Tours*, Princeton 1977.
- 9 See Weitzmann/Kessler (cf. n. 1), p. 66.
- 10 *Die karolingischen Miniaturen*, vol. 1, Berlin 1933–35.
- 11 *Die Schöpfungsmosaiken von San Marco. Die Ikonographie der Erschaffung des Menschen in der frühchristlichen Kunst* in: *Städel Jahrbuch* 13 (1991), p. 29–80.
- 12 T. Wakefield, *Robert Wakefield and the Cotton Genesis*, in: *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society* 12 (2002), p. 246–65.
- 13 Weitzmann/Kessler (cf. n. 1), Text figure 1 and Plate I.1.
- 14 See J. Zahlten, *Creatio mundi. Darstellungen der sechs Schöpfungstage und naturwissenschaftliches Weltbild im Mittelalter*, Stuttgart 1979.
- 15 *Memory and Models: The Interplay of Patterns and Practice in the Mosaics of San Marco in Venice*, in: *Medioevo: Immagine e memoria*, Parma 2009, p. 463–75, and *The Cotton Genesis and Creation in San Marco, Venice*, in: *Cahiers archéologiques* 53 (2009–2010), p. 17–32; *Artistic Reciprocity between Venice and Salerno in the Thirteenth Century*, in: M. de Giorgi/A. Hoffmann/N. Suthor (eds.), *Synergies in Visual Culture. Bildkulturen im Dialog. Festschrift für Gerhard Wolf*, Munich 2013, p. 407–20.
- 16 A. Kracher (ed.), *Millstätter Genesis und Physiologus-Handschrift, Vollständige Facsimilieausgabe der Sammelhandschrift, Codices Selecti X*, Graz 1967.

**17** San Paolo Bible of ca. 870 (Rome, Monastero di San Paolo f.l.m.) offers a perfect example, in which the Genesis frontispiece (fol. 8v) begins with Christ forming Adam's left arm and shoulder followed by the Creator facing the first man and inspiring him; the accompanying titulus underscores the two separate actions: *Hic homo formatur pulchro sub agalmate primus. Celsithroni verbo dictu mirabile cunctis. Denique spiratur prorsusque*. See: Kessler, *Bibles* (cf. n. 8), p. 34 and Fig. 4.

**18** *St. Mark's: the Ritual of State*, in: E. Vio (ed.), *St. Mark's: the Art and Architecture of Church and State in Venice*, New York 2003.

**19** P. Jolly, *Made in God's Image? Eve and Adam in the Genesis Mosaics in San Marco, Venice*. Berkeley/Los Angeles 1997.

**20** *San Marco, Byzantium and the Myths of Venice*, Washington, D.C. 2010.

**21** J. Lowden, *Concerning the Cotton Genesis and Other Illustrated Manuscripts of Genesis in: Gesta 31* (1992), p. 40–53.