Florida State University Libraries

2012

Historicizing Multimodality: Medieval Meaning-Making in the Old English Illustrated Hexateuch

Logan Bearden

THE FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

HISTORICIZING MULTIMODALITY: MEDIEVAL MEANING-MAKING IN THE OLD

ENGLISH ILLUSTRATED HEXATEUCH

By

LOGAN BEARDEN

A Thesis submitted to the
Department of English
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts

Degree Awarded:
Summer Semester, 2012

The members of the committee approve the thesis of Logan Bearden defended June 11, 2012.

Kristie S. Fleckenstein
Professor Directing Thesis

Elaine Treharne
Committee Member

Michael Neal
Committee Member

Kathleen Blake Yancey
Committee Member

The Graduate School has verified and approved the above-named committee members, and certifies that the thesis has been approved in accordance with university requirements.

To my mother, who shows me how to love; to my father, who shows me how to laugh; and to Conner, Gunner, and Jayce, who give me reason to do both.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT

This project seeks to complicate the ahistorical and binary-oriented treatment of multimodality in contemporary scholarship. I pose the questions: how does multimodality function within the Old English Illustrated Hexateuch, an illuminated manuscript from the eleventh century, and what enlarged picture of literacy might we gain from such an examination?

The answer my analysis uncovers is twofold: 1) in the Hexateuch, we see that modes cannot be separated; and 2) the blurring of the semiotic boundaries between modes also blurs the boundary between the Hexateuch and its audience, constituting an embodied literacy.

From this analysis, I offer that we nuance our understanding of multimodality from a recent phenomenon to the interplay of interpenetrating literacy tools that are always already working together in any composition. In so doing, we open ourselves up to a more capacious and historical understanding of multimodality and of literacy.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

The "Position Statement on Multimodal Literacies" issued by the National Council of
Teachers of English states:

> The use of multimodal literacies has expanded the ways we acquire information and
> understand concepts. Ever since the days of illustrated books and maps texts have
> included visual elements for the purpose of imparting information. The contemporary
> difference is the ease with which we can combine words, images, sound, color,
> animation, video, and styles of print in projects so that they are part of our everyday lives
> and, at least by our youngest generation, often taken for granted.

Writing almost a thousand years before the publication of this statement, Gregory the Great
claimed "it is one thing to worship a picture; another to learn through the story of a picture what
is to be worshipped. For the thing that writing conveys, that is what a picture shows to the
illiterate...in [the picture] itself those who are unacquainted with letters [are able to]
read" (Geddes). These are two very different statements which discuss the same thing: the
historical and dialectical interplay of the visual combined with the word. The intersection of
these the modes of textual transmission and its implication for literacy, which has received so
much attention in the field of Rhetoric and Composition recently, is the focus of this study. In
this environment, I pose the question: how do these modes function together within different
historical contexts?

Gunther Kress and the New London Group label this intersection "multimodality."[1] In his book on the subject, Kress asks the question: "What has produced the explosive interest in multimodality over the last decade or so?" (*Multimodality* 5). The answer, he offers, lies in the changing of world communication, the rise in digital technologies, and the globalization that results from the dialectical interplay between the two (5). Globalization, the networking of the world via digital connections, does not just change the nature of communication; he also contends that "stemming from [globalization] – and generated by it – are far-reaching changes in the domain of meaning: in representation and 'semiotic production'; in dissemination and distribution of messages and meanings; in mediation and communication; all have changed profoundly" (6). According to Kress, the meaning making process has been fundamentally changed because of the increasing availability of digital technologies and globalization. In this pattern of thought, however, multimodality is predominantly limited to the digital age, to digital technologies, and to digital composers; it is a recent phenomenon with a historical footnote.

He is not alone in this belief; other composition scholars have examined the impact of technology on literacy, placing an overwhelming emphasis on the computer and its technologies, implicitly limiting the definition of technology to the digital and the theory of image-word interaction to present phenomena. These scholars argue that the very nature of literacy has been changed because of the increasing prevalence of digital technologies and the way in which those technologies facilitate the use of multiple modes. I do not devalue the importance of this research; composition and communication are definitely dominated by the computer and its digital affordances in the current moment. This limited focus on just the literacy technologies of the present, however, elides the inherent visuality of Western literacy, hides the historical inextricability of image and word, and restricts multimodality to the past thirty years. My project

––––––––––––––––––

[1] Multimodality is, of course, not limited to the intersection of these two modes. Sound, color, and gesture are just a few of the other possible modes outlined by these scholars. However, I focus specifically on the discursive written text and the visual in this project, because of the concrete ways these manifest themselves within the specific text I have chosen to analyze here. Sound and gesture are definitely a part of the multimodal meaning-making process of the Hexateuch, but they are ephemeral. It would be extremely difficult to access the specifics of their impact on the reading experience.

reveals the limitations of such perspective. Multimodality, I argue, has always been and will always be a part of literacy. Confining the study of multimodality to recent years leaves us with an ahistorical perspective of the interactions of image and word and a limited understanding of their role in literacy. This, I believe, is why Kress claims "we do not yet have a theory which allows us to understand and account for the world of communication as it is now" (7). By failing to account for the imbricated nature of current digital technologies (how they have been informed by literacies of print and manuscript culture), current scholarship only examines the most recent iterations of (multimodal) literacy; by limiting our understanding to twenty-first century multimodality, we limit our theories of multimodality itself and of literacy. This project seeks to illuminate the historical nature of multimodality. Though it is definitely more easily accessed as a result of global digitization because it is more widely circulated than in previous historical moments, it is *not* a recent phenomenon; it has been a facet of literacy as long as there has been written word and visual image, or, to return to the NCTE position statement, "since the days of illustrated books and maps." In essence, this study is an examination of the intersections of image and word and how they arise from the inherent materiality and visuality of literacy in technologies predating the digital. I argue that to gain a fuller, more robust and historical understanding of multimodality as an essential facet of literacy *today*, we must examine it within different historical moments.

My intention is to place multimodality in (a) historical context in order to better understand its relationship to literacy and thus of literacy itself. I begin this introductory chapter with a discussion of the materiality of literacy and the way in which this complicates our understanding of multimodality (as the intersection image and word). Then, I examine the implications of the visuality of literacy and literacy as an *embodied* practice in part because of that visuality. This culminates in an understanding of the written word as inherently multimodal, which, if accepted, will allow us to discern aspects of literacy, regardless of the historical period, that are currently invisible. These terms and theories will constitute a framework with which I will be able to answer the questions that are driving this study, which is: how might we supplement current theories of multimodality to account for the literacy emerging from scribal technologies, and what enlarged picture of literacy do we gain?

Literacy

The goal of this project is to historicize multimodality. To define "historicize," I borrow from Christine Haas, who in *Writing Technology* claims that historicizing is "the reciprocal process of placing literacy technologies into historical contexts" (205). It is not merely my goal to understand how multimodality was utilized within the medieval manuscript. In addition, I hope to develop a more nuanced understanding of modality (its materiality, its impact on literacy, etc.) to understand how it functions within different historical and technological contexts, complicating its current perception and our understanding of its position in literacy, which Haas suggests is the ability to construct and share meaning by means of available material resources. However, because of the multifaceted nature of multimodality and the sheer number of possible modal interactions, I restrict my study to only two: image and word. I choose these for two reasons: 1) because literacy, as I will argue, requires an understanding of image *and* word as transactive, not merely interactive (Rosenblatt);[2] and 2) because Western culture, as W. J. T. Mitchell argues, the visual is becoming increasingly prevalent in the wake of digital technologies (*The Pictorial Turn*).

Haas uses her book not just to theorize the implications of technology on writing, but also to make the argument that literacy is material, that materiality is "the central fact of literacy" (3). For instance, Christian Vandendorpe claims that the written book "can be touched, held in the hands, and felt as a real presence" (129). The physicality of texts, their existence as tangible things, inevitably textures the reader-viewer's performance of that literacy. As Haas explains, "writing technologies are *physical objects*, creating and existing in space and time, whose materiality structures and constrains the human activities associated with them" (225, emphasis added). Texts and compositions are the material intersections of the abstract/ideological and the physical resources available for composing. Thus, the way those composers understand texts and processes of composing depends on their understanding of the physical tools. Those physical

---

[2] According to Louise Rosenblatt, a transactive relationship between image and word would suggest that the two not only interact, but that their potentials for meaning are only realized through reciprocity; the two are mutually constitutive. In this project, I will be working with this symbiotic understanding of the two modes, because it rejects the notion that the two can be easily separated. See *The Reader, the Text, the Poem*.

tools are "what makes writing possible…[and] acts of reading and writing cannot be prior to technology but are always and inescapably technological" (205). Literacy is dependent on, is composed of, and is determined by the material.

It is critical to understand that literate practices emerge from the dialectical relationship between available technologies and the users who manipulate those technologies.[3] Haas claims "when writers exchange one set of material tools for another – or, more accurately, when they add another set of literacy tools to their repertoires – aspects of writing are foregrounded that may not have been noticed before, including the writer's physical relationship to texts and tools of text production" (24). This concept of literacy is both material and historically imbricated: literacy is the culmination of past practices and the *physical* artifacts which informed those practices. I find this to be remarkably similar to the ways in which illuminated manuscripts are theorized by medieval scholars.

In a chapter concerning the art of the manuscript in *Working with Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts*, Catherine Karkov makes an argument for the importance of studying Anglo-Saxon manuscripts as a site of multimodal meaning-making (as opposed to those produced in other geographical areas) because Anglo-Saxon manuscripts depict a "unity of word and image that does not appear to have been quite as highly developed…elsewhere in the medieval world" (215).[4] This unity implies a sophisticated understanding of the interactions between image and word, a literacy positioned at the intersection of the two, making it a historical moment ripe for multimodal analysis. Even more important than this is an assertion that Karkov makes in "Text and Image in the Red Book of Darley." She claims that the unification of word and image draws the reader in, "asks him to picture himself as text, the flesh made word" (148). The fusion of image and word creates an embodied literacy in which the reader projects himself or herself into the text, reducing the ideological distance between text and audience, which in turn, invites the audience

---

[3] This is, in part, why I have selected a text from the eleventh century, which marks a period of transition in both scribal technologies and literacy practices; I will discuss this further in a subsequent section.

[4] While she does not use the term "multimodal" in her scholarship, the interplay of image and word that she describes is, according to Kress, multimodality.

to live the text that they have experienced. Multimodality, then, is not only a twenty-first-century experience; it is part of an embodied literacy in the Middle Ages. In the following section, I work towards this more refined understanding of multimodality, one that will allow for a concept of multimodal texts prior to the digital age, specifically within the eleventh century.

Multimodality

Gunther Kress, the New London Group, and other contemporary scholars have extensively published and theorized on the nature of multimodality, the technologies that produce it, and its effects on literacy. I focus on Kress's theories in particular, because he offers the most thorough and robust scholarship on the term and theory, and that scholarship is canonical within the field. What I find most important is that he focuses on the socially contextualized nature of multimodality. He offers a book-length exploration of multimodality and its social-semiotic functions within a culture, in which he defines *mode* as "a socially shaped and culturally given semiotic resource for making meaning. Image, writing, layout, music gesture, speech, moving image, soundtrack and 3D objects are examples of modes used in representation and communication" (*Multimodality* 79). Each of these individual modes performs a very specific semiotic task that no other mode can. For instance, Kress states that "writing *names* and image *shows*" (1). According to him, these clear divisions are necessary for effective signification and communication; one mode simply cannot bear the weight of *all* semiotic functions within a society, because "each has distinct potentials [and limitations] for meaning" (1). Multimodality, then, is the intersection of those semiotic resources; it is the combination (in a Gestaltian sense) of two or more modes. Those intersections and combinations offer different ways of "engaging with the world…of representing the world" (96). Modes and the resultant multimodality are the frameworks by which we perceive, understand, and re-create our world; they are a facet of literacy.

Modes, framing, and multimodality combine to form a lens with which scholars can examine a culture at a specific point in time (through the intersections of image and word produced by that culture). Kress pays specific attention to this aspect of multimodality: its ability to frame communication and utterance. For Kress, "there is no *meaning without framing*" (10). Varying combinations of different modes can impact the way in which a consumer receives or

understands texts. What a user or composer takes away from the text, or makes *with* the text, is dependent of those combinations and framings. Thus, "a culture will therefore provide its distinct semiotic resources for *framing*…:what sorts of things are framed, how they are framed, [and] what kind of frames there are" (10). Frames are more than just a principle of multimodal communication; they have the capacity to reveal what is valued within a society, how it is valued, and why that might be. Modes, then, "are the result of a social and historical shaping of materials chosen by a society for representation" (11). They are the technologies by which we make meaning; they frame textual messages at the same time as they are framed by the context from which they arise; they are material, physical choices made by producers from the available cultural resources. Those choices will and do have ideological significance for the consumers of those texts because the selection is a rhetorical act. From this perspective "the cultural technologies of representation, production, and dissemination and the affordances and facilities that they offer within the frame of what is socially possible at one time," what can be said and who can say it (19). This dialectical relationship between mode and context as it affects the nature of multimodality and consequently literacy is the focal point of this project, because, while Kress recognizes historicity, he does not include it often in his theories, a common tendency of multimodal scholarship.

Essentially, Kress uses his book to make two arguments: 1) there has been a "shift in the dominance of the mode of *writing* to the mode of *image*" (6, emphasis original); and 2) this shift is a result of the digital age and digital technologies, in which there is "*production* and *participation* for those who had previously been seen as audience" (21, emphasis original). Kress uses the example of textbooks, particularly science textbooks, to illustrate how increasingly visual they have become over the past thirty years (46). This increasing use of image and imagery in composition and communication reveals a more democratic form of making meaning to Kress. Visuals, as part of a multimodal transaction of meaning, Kress argues, allow users to make meaning *with* the texts they encounter; digital technologies and their increasing availability allow them to access more texts and create their own more easily. These shifts, these changes in literacy and communication, reveal a fundamental change in the social structures, a redistribution/decentralization of power (20). His pattern of logic reads like this: Multimodality

is (more) interactive and democratic. Digital is inherently multimodal. Thus, digital environments are inherently more interactive than other environments, such as the physical, material page. He uses the example of the webpage, writing that "unlike the traditional page, designed with a given *order/arrangement* for the reader's *engagement*, this site – a 'home*page*', which has 'visitors' rather than *readers* – is given an *ordering* by the reader's interest, their (*ordering-as-) design*" (39, emphasis original). According to Kress, the multimodal design of the webpage invites readers/users/consumers to make their own meaning *with* the text instead of having that meaning prescribed for them by the layout of the page. All of this culminates in Kress's claim that "given the changing environments for meaning and knowledge-making – multimodal representation, participative production and 'sites of appearance' – knowledge making takes new routes in content, form and social engagement" (26). This harkens back to the New London Group's call to redefine the understanding of Literacy (one absolute) to multiliteracies (multifaceted, changing, fluid) (Jacobs). For Kress, it seems multimodality and multiliteracies are twenty-first century phenomena that are not yet fully understood.

Several composition/communication scholars have taken up this call to better understand multimodality. Mary Hocks, for example, extends Kress's theories in "Understanding Visual Rhetoric in Digital Writing Environments." She contends that "because modern technologies construct meaning as simultaneously verbal, visual, and interactive hybrids, digital rhetoric *simply assumes* the use of visual rhetoric as well as other modalities" (631, emphasis original). Hocks makes it clear that she believes digital composing environments inherently lend themselves to multimodality more so than other environments. She terms this hybridity, "the ways in which online documents combine and construct visual verbal designs" (632). Similarly, in her 2004 CCCC Chair Address, Kathleen Blake Yancey argues that it is the task of the field of Rhetoric and Composition to theorize these technologies because composition students are composing with those technologies and in those environments more frequently (and more adroitly) than they compose with just words on the page. Jody Shipka makes the same argument, seeking to develop a framework with which composition scholars can both understand and teach the "three dimensional layering of words and visuals" that is produced in digital contexts (278). According to all of these scholars, the visual plays a key element within a *new* kind of literacy.

However, while Diana George explores something similar in her article, "From Analysis to Design," she argues that "there remains much confusion over what is meant by visual communication, visual rhetoric, or, more simply the visual and where or whether it belongs in a compositions course" (19). It is clear that there is still a great uncertainty regarding the visual and its place within both literacy and composition. This, I believe, is the result of an incomplete perception of the established relationship between visuality and literacy, which in turn, limits our understanding of multimodality. To refine this perception, in the next section, I incorporate visuality into literacy.

Multimodality as Literacy

W. J. T. Mitchell's argument about the existence of a "pictorial turn," an increase in the amount of visuals within society, is predicated on the belief that the increase in the amount of images is the result of the increasing availability and prevalence of new technologies that allow for easier (re)production of images. And, indeed, it is noticeable that "visual culture is everywhere: all around us are screens on computers, game consoles, iPods, handheld devices and televisions" (Mirzoeff 2). In the current moment, multimodality, as an expression of the overwhelming presence of visual culture, is more of a vernacular, secular enterprise than it has ever been because of the availability and the ease with which digital technologies can be accessed. However, this perspective of a pictorial turn and of limiting multimodality to only digital (con)texts ignores the fact that literacy is also inherently visual (and not just presently). Walter Ong states that "writing, and most particularly the alphabet, shifts the balance of the sense away from the aural to the visual," suggesting the importance of the visual in the semiotics of the word. Similarly, in a discussion of Magritte's famous painting, "Ceci N'est Pas Une Pipe," Michel Foucault discusses this very point. He claims that written language is a form of calligram – that line breaks, paragraphs, spacing, and punctuation are all *visual* cues intended to *frame* the way in which a reader consumes, perceives, or understands a text (9). Similarly, Stephen Bernhardt sees written language the same way, arguing for an inherent visual literacy within written language, because "the physical fact of the text, with its spatial appearance on the page, requires a visual apprehension: a text can be seen, must be seen" ("Seeing the Text" 66). In this perception of text-as-image, "phoneticism and *being* are fused, and the binary of image and word

transforms into a dialectical interplay between two different modes" (Mitchell 38, emphasis original). The visuality of written language, its ability to be seen, its need to be seen, becomes a (multimodal) gesture that frames the way in which it is read. Thus, *seeing* has a fundamental impact on literacy. John Berger, in *Ways of Seeing*, argues that "seeing comes before words. The child looks and recognizes before it can speak…It is seeing which establishes our place in the surrounding world; we explain that world with words, but words can never undo the fact that we are surrounded by [the visual]" (33). Similarly, Christina Haas asserts that "language enables, encourages, and perhaps even requires certain ways of seeing" (167). In this perception of literacy, language and visuality, image and word are inextricably fused. All literacy (as it is manifested in the written word), then, is "multimodal," not just the literacy associated with the Digital Age, and there is a rich history of multimodal literacy that has yet to be accounted for in scholarship. In the field of Rhetoric and Composition, overwhelming attention has been given to the digital, which implicitly limits multimodality as a twenty-first century experience only, which limits our understanding on multimodality and of literacy as well. My proposed solution to this is twofold, which I outline in the next two sections: 1) to reconceptualize multimodality as an integral component of an embodied literacy; and 2) to historicize that revised understanding of multimodality through an application of it to an historical context before the current moment, specifically an illuminated manuscript from the eleventh century.

Embodied Multimodality

Kristie S. Fleckenstein's key term in her discussion of embodied literacies is imageword. Fusing these two modes into one term reveals the "inextricability of language and imagery in any literate act. Image and word are always melded in meaning" (*Embodied Literacies* 4). The two modes are interdependent and interpenetrating, and Fleckenstein argues that our perception of literacy must be as well. In "Words Made Flesh," she calls for a polymorphic perception of literacy, which "emphasizes the reality that meaning shapes itself in response to different media, different modes, and contexts of representation" (615). The processes by which we make meaning, by which we compose, are multimodal, because literacy operates at these sites of semiotic transgression where image and word are always imageword. This nuanced understanding of literacy "focuses our attention on the *nexus* of semiotic systems," unlike current

perceptions of multimodality which focus on the semiotic boundaries between modes (616). She terms texts that especially focus on these intersections and interdependencies "slippery texts," "texts that keep us positioned on the edges that blur, the edges where literacy evolves" (*Embodied Literacies* 105). This semiotic "slipperiness" allows imageword to cross the "porous boundaries of bodies, cultures, places, and times" (7). This is how literacy becomes embodied -- the multimodal interactions of image and word cross the boundary between text and reader, soliciting a response; in essence, imageword reveals as it reinscribes.

Mark Amsler explores this same phenomenon, yet uses a different term, "affective literacy," which he defines as the "ways we develop emotional, somatic, activity-based relationships with texts as part of our reading experiences" (83). As an example, he turns to medieval reading practices, arguing that acts of literacy during the Middle Ages were "produced within a semiotic network of textualities, acts, and bodies" (83). For Amsler as well, the boundary between texts and bodies is fluid, permeable, penetrable. Discussing the medieval prayer rituals of anchoresses, he describes the very physical way women of the church responded to their Books of Hours, such as physical gestures they were supposed to perform or words they were intended to repeat out loud. The best example he provides of this fluid physiotextual boundary is of the Amiens illuminated Book of Hours in which the image of Jesus has been smeared from user(s) kissing the image. The image has moved from the material page to the physical body to the discourse of the mind and soul, reifying the existing social structure illuminated within the manuscript itself (96). In this framework, the ingestion and digestion, both physical and discursive (in a Foucauldian sense), of the greater ideological discourse occurs as the result of the multimodal/ multitextual intersection of image (the representation of Jesus) and the word (Word, written discourse intended to frame the way that image was ingested). Combining Fleckenstein and Amsler allows for this more capacious understanding of multimodality, one that is not predicated on the separation of mode and which allows for the historical application of its concepts to grapple with the nature of embodiment within multimodal literacy.

Eleventh-Century Multimodality

I choose the Cotton Ms. Claudius B. iv version of the Old English Hexateuch – the first six chapters of the Bible composed sometime during the latter half of the eleventh century – as the focus of this project. Over four hundred illuminations accompany this handwritten text, making it an excellent source with which to examine the intersections of image and word, and, according to Benjamin C. Withers and Rebecca Barnhouse, "the complexities of its textual history and illustrations…invite approaches that merge different disciplines in complementary ways" (7). This, in addition to its composition within the transitional period of the eleventh century and its religious ethos, makes it an excellent example of medieval multimodality. However, this text was not produced in the digital age; it was compiled and circulated before the advent of print. It exemplifies a moment in the history of multimodality nine hundred years before most multimodal theorization. I choose an eleventh-century manifestation of multimodality for three reasons: 1) the way in which that multimodality reveals the social context of the text, 2) the way in which scribal technologies lend themselves to multimodal composition, 3) the way in which the combination of the two represents a paradigmatic shift in the nature of literacy during this time period, revealing the stakes of multimodal analysis within that context.

First, I choose eleventh-century multimodality because of the socially contextualized nature of illuminations. Illuminations, "embellished, richly colored and decorated" images added to manuscript texts, first appeared in the West in the fourth century (Beal 192; Parkes and Watson 87). In *Text and Picture in Anglo-Saxon England*, Catherine Karkov defines the difference between illustrations and illuminations (and thus the rhetorical choice to label drawings associated with a text as illuminations):[5] illustrations are literal interpretations of the text they accompany, while illuminations function as translation, text and image working together to "create a new and unique version of the text itself" (17). Consequently, these "decorations" served a dual purpose. The first purpose was practical: miniatures (small illuminations) depicted scenes relating to the text itself, serving as interpretive and mnemonic tools of memorization for

_____

[5] I utilize the term *illuminate* (as opposed to *illustrate*) throughout this project intentionally, because as Craig Stroupe states of hypermedia texts, "images therefore constitute an alternative, parallel text, which doesn't simply follow the verbal text, but rises and falls independently" ("Visualizing English" 624).

the scholar-scribes, typically monks, who perused the manuscript (Beal 254; Karkov, "Manuscript Art" 205). Amelia Grounds reveals the second purpose, suggesting that illuminations provided alternative ways of engaging with a text (120). From this perspective, manuscripts (as the multimodal intersection of the visual and the verbal) were/are a site of both interpretation and instruction; they were/are a conduit of ideological transfer resulting from their multimodal nature. The imageword relationship framed the way in which the manuscript could be perceived as a result of the available semiotic resources that produced it and the social system from which it arose, embodying the dominant discourse and inviting those who came in contact with it to do the same. The function of illuminations, however, is not limited to the cultural context in which they are produced; they can also be particularly vibrant areas of research for contemporary scholars, because, as Kress illustrates, the manuscript (as the intersection of two modes) can reveal what it is culturally possible to be uttered within a certain context, reifying that same system. Similarly, Karkov argues that illuminated manuscripts provide those who study them a full cultural and contextual understanding or interpretation of the particular text. The combination of the modes, the way they frame and reveal how individuals understood both themselves and literacy, provides that context. Michael Camille, in "Gothic Signs and Surplus," defines this aspect as intervisuality: "a process in which images are not the stable referents in some ideal iconographic dictionary, but are perceived by their audiences to work across and within different, even competing, value systems" (151).

Second, I choose eleventh-century multimodality as the focus of this study because of affordances of scribal technologies in the meaning making process. This is revealed in the reproductive nature of the time period: it is not uncommon for the same text to appear in multiple manuscript forms with different illuminations. Part of medieval scribal culture before the advent of the printing press was the copying/reproduction of important texts (Clemens and Graham 22). Thus, the illuminations of different manuscripts can provide insight into the ways in which a text was (re)interpreted and valued culturally by different scribes and/or audiences in different locations and/or time periods; they can be a tool with which contemporary scholars can "gain an understanding of the changing concerns of those who produced them" (Karkov 249). In addition to this, the kinds of texts that were illuminated illustrate what ideologies or perspectives were

valued by the educated elite simply based on the kinds of texts (and the amount of those texts) that were reproduced (Karkov 251).

The advent of these scribal technologies of illumination and their increasing prevalence in the Middle Ages caused a shift in the perceptions of and attitudes toward texts; in other words, a shift in literacy. While it is impossible to completely define eleventh-century literacy (especially because of the amount of regional vernacular dialects extant during the time period), there is a noticeable shift in Anglo-Saxon literacy from the dominantly oral culture of late antiquity to a "literate" culture "increasingly oriented towards the scribe, the written word, the literary text, and the document" (Stock, *Implications of Literacy* 18). This shift repositioned the function of texts within society. This leads me into my third reason for choosing the eleventh century: according to Brian Stock, the Middle Ages, and specifically the eleventh century, is the "starting point in the period in which Europe [became] a society of texts" ("History, Literature, and Medieval Textuality" 9). Prior to this, medieval culture had been primarily oral, constructing knowledge and truth through verbal communication. However, with the increasing prevalence of scribal technologies, the written word became a vessel of identification, a means of establishing unity and community. Stock suggests "through the text…individuals who previously had little else in common were united around common goals" ("Medieval Literacy" 18). Thus, the manuscript became a shared premise from which communities could be constructed. However, very few individuals in England in the eleventh century could actually make direct meaning with the texts, with the words on the page; the rest could only communicate orally, making this kind of textual literacy inherently social yet dependent on a literate "translator" who could convey the "meaning" of the text to the preliterate masses (*Implications* 13). As a result of this, the self was no longer a discrete entity; it was self-in-relation-to-texts (4). Authority shifted from the individual to the text or one's ability to adhere to the text.

This historical moment, this paradigmatic shift in literacy, is also significant for two very different reasons. First, Stock argues, the moment embodies "the rise of a more literate mentality, changes in reading and devotional practices, and the shift from auditory to visual memory" ("The Self and Literary Experience" 842). In a culture centered on the text, the meaning of written

words (as they were interpreted by a literate authority) was fundamentally more important than the oral (because the oral was intangible, bodiless). Thus, for those who could not interpret the written words, visual representations of those words were necessary to help educate/inform the public. Scribal technologies such as illuminations became a fundamental part of literacy. In this model, literacy "is now [mostly] exteriorized…loyalty and obedience are given to a more or less standardized set of rules which lie outside the sphere of influence of the person, the family, or the community" (*Implications* 18). Interpretation is exterior to the preliterate individual; it is prescribed/mediated by both the interpreter and the visuals provided to help make the text more accessible. Also, the concept of text and, thus, literacy, was even more specific and exclusive than words inscribed on a page; according to Stock, "[it] began to refer more and more exclusively to the Bible" (210). Eleventh-century literacy, then, was dominated by a religious ethos, and, because that literacy was multimodal, it was dominate by religious imagery. Thus, if the focus of this study is a text exemplifying eleventh-century, multimodal literacy, that text should be a religious, vernacular text.

Methodology

My method of analysis is an exploration of the presence of multimodality in the Hexateuch and the way in which that presence invites the reader-viewers to ingest the biblical text, to live it, and to *embody* it. In essence, I apply current theories of multimodality to the Hexateuch in order to reveal their limitations and affordances, supplementing the limitations with concepts of embodied literacy, which will allow for a more capacious and more historical definition and understanding of the position of multimodality within literacy. In this section, I outline Kress's framework (his way of perceiving and analyzing multimodal texts) and how I intend to supplement that absence in the following chapters.

The first limitation of Kress's framework is that it presupposes that modes can operate in isolation from one another. Kress terms multimodal compositions as "ensembles" of meaning – different modes making meaning *with* one another (*Multimodality* 159). In his analyses of these ensemble texts, he breaks down compositions into their separate modes, examining the ways in which each mode frames the other(s). Each mode, in this framework, is capable of having its own discrete meaning; their interactions are interactive rather than transactive. The second is that

Kress claims that "*arrangements* are made as *ensembles* in a world of *movement*: I, as a maker of meaning, *move* in the world, literally, in different ways; and the world around me is in *motion*, in constant *movement*" (159, emphasis original). This particular concept invites those interested in multimodality to explore the ways in which a composition can *move* its audience, can help them to embody the ideologies manifested within, but it is one that Kress never explores sufficiently. To supplement these limitations, I utilize Amsler's and Fleckenstein's discussions, which illustrate the fluid boundary between image and word and between text and body and the way in which that "slipperiness" results from the multimodal nature of a composition. By joining Kress's analytical framework with embodied literacy, I am able to read the ways in which the manuscript text invites the audience to move, to behave in accordance with the social system laid out by the Hexateuch, through the transgression of semiotic boundaries that. In this way, I am able to analyze not only the meaning of the Hexateuch, but the way in which multimodal compositions construct a material, embodied practice.

In the following chapters, I dissect the Hexateuch into handwritten text and illuminations. However, as my analysis will show, the two analyses cannot be kept discrete; the words on the page also convey their meaning visually, just as the images are deeply steeped in language; the two modes work together to illuminate one another. Due to the length of the Hexateuch and the sheer number of illuminations that accompany the text, I limit my study to the Book of Genesis. I choose this particular book because, as Kress argues, the multimodal interactions constructed by a given community reveal the social practices of that particular community and the way that community perceives itself; nowhere could this be more evident than in the story of the beginning of humankind's relationship with God, which is so integral to social structures in the Middle Ages, and in the way that story is depicted both visually and textually. I organize my analysis into two waves. The first wave, the second chapter of this project, will trace the semiotic capabilities of the written word as they are revealed in the Hexateuch. In my analysis, I challenge Kress's perception of "text" as only able to make meaning through logic, order, linearity, and sequence, even though that heuristic can indeed provide interesting interpretations focusing on the concept of Covenant. The concept of Covenant as a part of the biblical, for instance, is definitely developed through the sequence of words on the page. The sentences emphasize a

social dynamic centered on the Almighty. However, the Covenants, as they are addressed in the Hexateuch, are more than just words on the page. They are also Word, a social dynamic that is carried within the reader-viewer-listeners in their daily lives. The Hexateuch constructs this through the material intersections of image and word because written text is inherently visual; all words are imagewords. Thus, the way the text looks on the page, the way it visually emphasizes, complicates, and enriches the meaning that is made by the order of the words, the way it is also imageword, will also be a part of this analysis. In this way, I will illustrate that, by limiting our understanding of the mode of "writing" to the order of words leaves, we are with an incomplete understanding of the Hexateuch because that is an incomplete understanding of multimodality.

The second wave, the third chapter, will explore the implications of images: the way they visually construct the narrative of Genesis and the concept of Covenant as a way for the reader-viewer to live after they have experienced the text. For Kress, images make meaning within the frame of the image and the frame of the multimodal composition as a whole. For him, images make meaning in a fundamentally different way than written texts because images provide all their semiotic material at once. The logic of the image is spatial, and it is contained within the frame. However, in my analysis, I trace the ways in which the frames surrounding the images in the Hexateuch (and frames in general) are frequently transgressed. Through those transgressions, the image slips across the frame (and the language into the text). Thus, my analysis uses Fleckenstein's concept of slippery texts to display how the Hexateuch solicits embodied responses through the use of images that "slip out" toward the Anglo-Saxon reader viewers through the semiotically porous boundary of the frame. Because the images exist in this state, the audience is held accountable for the visual covenant that is reflected therein. I do all of this to word toward a revised understanding of images and frames and their position within an embodied multimodal literacy.

Conclusion

Gunther Kress claims that a revolution has taken/is taking place in the semiotic realm. This project, however, provides a counter-claim to that statement. Literacy has always been inherently multimodal. The nature of literacy has not changed fundamentally, only the degree to which

users can access the technologies of that literacy. To return to Haas, the computers and the technologies with which we now so readily compose are "built on top of, and are inherently dependent on, other, earlier technologies, including print. The technologies we write with are not new: They are built on layers and layers of other technologies" (219). Yancey claims something similar: "new composition includes the literacy of print: it adds onto it and brings the notions of practice and activity and circulation and media and screen and networking to our conceptions of practice" (320). Nothing is lost in the shift from one set of literacy technologies to the next. However, scholarship, particularly composition studies, as I currently see it, has not sufficiently examined the layers that have built up to digital technologies. It is necessary to return to the manuscript page, the elements of material literacy, and imageword in order to fully understand multimodality, the concept with which compositionists have become so fascinated. In a side note to her chair's address concerning the images that accompanied its delivery, Yancey claims "the images, in other words, did not simply punctuate a written text; together words and images were (and are) the materials of composition" (299). And yes, this is definitely true and easy within the/ a multimodal, global, digital age where composition is indeed in a new key, but it has always been true. Literacy is material; it is multimodal; and it is alive because of that multimodality. Kress himself admits, "the world of meaning has *always* been multimodal" (*Multimodality* 174, emphasis added). This project illustrates that by taking contemporary theories of multimodality, informing them with historical perceptions of the relationship between image and word on the manuscript page, and then applying them to the Hexateuch, thereby joining multimodality with history.

CHAPTER 2

A VISUAL-TEXTUAL ORDER

This project seeks to complicate current theories and concepts of multimodality through an examination of technologies and texts from a historical period other than the current digital-saturated moment. Gunther Kress asserts "communication is always and inevitably multimodal" ("Gains and Losses" 5). From this perspective, multimodality *should* have a long and rich history; however, it does not as it is currently theorized and discussed. This, I argue, is because Kress's scholarship also speaks of a semiotic revolution that is currently taking place in processes of meaning making. He claims in "Challenges to Thinking about Language," "it is *now* impossible to make sense of texts, even of their linguistic parts alone, without having a clear idea of what these other features might be contributing to the meaning of a text. In fact, it is *now* no longer possible to understand language and its uses without understanding the effect of all modes of communication that are copresent in any text" (337, emphasis added). Thus, he asserts that this semiotic revolution is a change in the nature of communication and literacy in which it is impossible to fully understand texts *without* (understanding) multimodality. This semiotic revolution, he writes, is most evident in the shift of cultural value from writing to image. He uses the example of science textbooks, in which he sees a "fundamental change. Where before written language was the medium of information, in many texts, there is now a new code at work which consist of both verbal and visual elements" ("Globalization" 194). Referring to a specific textbook, he describes and defines the potentials of different modes: "one representational mode, language, is used for pedagogic purpose, to direct, remind, organize the students. Another representational mode, visual images, is used to convey the central information. The images *show* what significant elements this bit of the world consists of and in what relation they

stand" ("Multimodality" 198-9, emphasis added).[6] These assertions culminate in a claim he makes in his 2010 book, which states "writing, the previously canonical mode *par excellence*, is giving way to image" (*Multimodality* 133). Thus, he proclaims that this semiotic revolution is a shift in the very nature of communication and literacy. In so doing, he achieves two things: 1) he separates the modes of language (specifically written text) and the visual into two discrete categories: the two, he believes, accomplish very different semiotic goals; and, 2) he makes a major claim about the revolution he describes: it is a paradigmatic shift in modal privilege, a phenomenon of the present moment initiated predominantly by the emergence of digital technologies. In this revolution, writing and image are separate, and writing is giving way to image. This is why I have chosen a text from the Middle Ages for this project: using a historical text composed by non-digital composing technologies allows me to investigate the long history of multimodal meaning-making and argue against the claim of a semiotic revolution.

In addition, due to the rapid rise of this "revolution," in his chapter on multimodality in *Multiliteracies*, Kress claims that "present theories of language are inadequate because they are founded on an understanding of one (multi)mode – language – alone, and because that understanding misconstrues the fundamental characteristics of human semiosis anywhere and at all times" ("Multimodality" 183). This is predicated on his belief that all communication is and always has been multimodal, and, by only focusing on language in the study of literacy, we are left with an incomplete perception of semiotics. In the following chapter of the same collection *Multiliteracies*, Bill Cope and Mary Kalantzis make their consensus with Kress very clear: "in our recent modernity we have privileged *linguistic* meanings, particularly *written* or *literate* linguistic meanings, over other modes of meaning" ("Designing Social Futures" 217, emphasis added). However, these claims can only be true if writing and image are defined as discrete

---

[6] This is in opposition to Craig Stroupe's differentiation between illustration and illumination in "Visualizing English." For Stroupe, illumination is a dialogic process in which the images do not simply supplement or provide an example of the text, but are intertwined with the meaning of the text. Of this particular example (Kress and the textbook), Stroupe would contend that the images and words "rise and fall independently of one another," yet work together dialogically (624). I would, however, extend Stroupe's distinction even further. All images and words illuminate one another because the two cannot be separated semiotically. Differentiating between illustration and illumination, while it emphasizes that images and words can have very different relationships with one another, implies a hierarchy between the two.

semiotic entities that *can* but do not necessarily act together. In their description of the privileged position of writing, they implicitly privilege it as well: if it can be separated from the visual, then it can, of course, occupy a different position of cultural value. From this perspective, then, the current theories of multimodality are problematic for two interrelated reasons: 1) they impose neat semiotic boundaries on modes, limiting the capabilities of each in their attempt to define and categorize; and 2) they contend a revolution has occurred or is occurring, which abbreviates and limits the history of multimodality, thus abbreviating and limiting the explanatory depth of multimodality..

Based on my analysis of the handwritten text in the Old English Hexateuch, it is my contention that modes cannot be kept discrete; multimodality, then, is not the combination of distinct, discrete modes into a greater whole; modes, I will argue, cannot be easily separated. Literacy is always and has always been steeped in the visual, in the body, in the senses, and in the materials of meaning making. I follow Lester Faigley's perception of literacy, which is succinctly summarized in his claim that "literacy has always been a material, multimedia construct but we only now are becoming aware of this multidimensionality and materiality because computer technologies have made it possible for many people to produce and publish multimedia [texts]." Cope and Kalantzis do allude to this possible understanding of literacy in a summary of Kress's claims about the interactions of modes, stating "Kress has argued that multimodality and synaesthesia are in our natures because our senses never operate independently of each other. Yet the culture of literacy suppresses our human potential by favouring one, restricted form of meaning-making, that is the written word" (223). But, even in this claim, they presuppose that the written can be separated from the visual, that modes can be independent of one another. In fact, I see their assertions begin to break down in their writings: "multimodal representation, moreover, does not have to be entirely digital, or even digital at all. And the relationships of readers, viewers or audiences to representations of meaning can be transformed in ways analogous to multimedia without any of the technology" (224). Thus, they reiterate my claim that the revolution of which Kress writes is one of accessibility, availability, and visibility, and not a revolution in the *kind* of literacy. These theories concerning multimodality and revolution in semiotics rely heavily on modal distinctions. Kress asserts that

"writing names and image shows" (*Multimodality* 1). I argue those boundaries are not so clear. Words are spatial just as much as they are sequential, Anne Wysocki argues in response to Kress and Theo van Leeuwen's *Reading Images*, because "when we speak of the tops and bottoms of pages and of the left and the right and the placement of textual elements -- we tie into other spatial understandings of our embodied worlds" ("awaywithwords" 57). The revolution has not occurred – it cannot occur – because image and word cannot be separated; written language itself is an image, is, as Kristie S. Fleckenstein defines, imageword, "a double dialectic, a double vision of literacy as image and word…emphasizing the inextricability of language and imagery in any literate act" (*Embodied Litera*cies 4). From this perspective, Fleckenstein argues that imageword can slip "across the porous boundaries of bodies, cultures, places, and times," situating literacy, as Mark Amsler does, at the intersection of composition and body (7).[7] This understanding of literacy, Mary Carruthers asserts, constitutes an *orthopraxis*, a way of living in response to texts, a way that is shaped through the intersections of image and word, text and the body of the reader (1).

The Hexateuch, I argue, solicits an embodied response to its narrative (and written text), defining and inviting a way of living even after the text is no longer there. Kress gives these kinds of embodied meanings a small amount of treatment in his scholarship. For instance, he suggests in "Multimodality" from *Multiliteracies* that "mode and materiality, through their close relation with the body's means of taking in information, and its possibilities of engagement with the world more generally, have wide repercussions for the issue of subjectivity" (187). His claims, then, are issues of access to the materials with which a culture chooses to compose, rather than the way in which modes can invite somatic responses from an audience. He makes the most nuanced claim in his book, stating "all signs, whether those I make in my actions, or remake in my inner transformative and/or transductive (re)actions, are always embodied, for maker and remake alike" (*Multimodality* 77). However, the example he provides here is of chess pieces: their materiality, how they feel, how much they weigh. He then adds, "that sensory, affective and aesthetic dimension is too often ignored and treated as ancillary. In reality, it is indissolubly part of semiosis," without providing a contemporary example of multimodal texts/

---

[7] I define "affective literacy" more explicitly in Chapter 1. See (pp. 12-14).

compositions that invite bodily responses, either through their composition or reception (77). He only introduces this concept in both pieces to rearticulate his assertion that written text has been culturally privileged as a dominant mode (and that one mode isolates the sense of sight from the others). The claim is insightful: he provides a valuable framework with which we can explore the cultural implications of modal choice and use. However, he does not fully address the ways in which language, for example, can invite somatic responses beyond listening or perception with the eyes. For Kress, materiality is only a factor in the (re)production or consumption of texts; for my purposes, the materiality of the object invites a way of doing, believing, or acting that lingers when the material object of the text is no longer present.

I do not devalue the claims that Kress and others make: digital technologies, especially within the past twenty or thirty years, have definitely facilitated the combination of image and text and the composition of multimodal texts. And, indeed, writing has always held a position of privilege within the academy, a position that is currently and increasingly challenged. However, these technologies only make those multimodal compositions more visible; they do not necessarily signify a new kind of literacy. This project questions those theories of multimodality, which are predicated on this "revolution" in literacy, the neat separation of image and word, and a limited understanding of materiality.

These current theories, I contend, do not allow for full interpretation of texts or a complete understanding of literate acts. I choose to illustrate this specifically with the Old English Hexateuch, an illuminated manuscript from the Middle Ages composed one thousand years before this "semiotic revolution," in which writing is deeply visual and the images are born of words. The composers who made the Hexateuch were making rhetorical choices through the selection of these modes and making those choices as adroitly as Kress claims composers using digital technologies are. While this is not the primary argument of this chapter, those choices reveal the existence of a kind of literacy in the Middle Ages in which reading and writing were inherently multimodal, and that, as Mary Olson argues, "in certain ways, then, Anglo-Saxons would have seen the boundaries between words and pictures to be less marked than our [current] culture does" (31). To prove this, I divide the next two chapters into two distinct analyses: first the textual and then the visual. However, the lines between these analyses will inevitably blur,

because, as I argue, the two modes cannot be separated. In this kind of application, I (re)examine the limitations and affordances of those current theories of multimodality. By keeping the modes discrete, by suggesting that a revolution a paradigmatic shift in the cultural value of writing and image has occurred and is occurring, we are left with an incomplete understanding of the Old English Hexateuch as a whole; by keeping the modes discrete we are left with an incomplete understanding of multimodality and its affective-material dimension.

Covenant: Text, word, and Word

In this section, I explore the implications of textual covenants in the Old English Hexateuch. Covenants, I argue, as they are textually developed in the Old English manuscript, grow out of the order and sequence of the words on the page. However, the handwritten, biblical text of the Hexateuch reinforces Anglo-Saxon social order as it simultaneously draws the reader/viewer/ audience into that social order, reinscribing as it reveals, constructing the written text as a kind of lived experience, as literate practices that extend beyond the reading-viewing of the text. That dynamic, I contend, results from the interplay of image *and* word, which invites the reader-viewer into a way of living the text. That materiality of the object, as a crucial part of the literacy experience, extends into the everyday, lived reality of the individual and their social conduct with others.

In my analysis, I trace the three major covenants present in Genesis-- the Adamic, the Noachic, and the Abrahamic-- because of the way in which these reveal how the handwritten text constructs social order: each involves the implementation of the Word of God (drawn from those words on the page) into lived cultural practices, providing a textual example that invites the audience of the Hexateuch to behave/live in the way defined therein, even for audience members who could not necessarily make meaning with the written words on the page, because as Brian Stock asserts "for [that] vast group, marginal to literacy, the graphic world represented only complex set of signs, frequently tied to relations of authority" (*Implications* 13-14). However, the stakes of these graphic symbols were high for Anglo-Saxons, because, as Benjamin C. Withers asserts, "on a spiritual level, texts permitted access to the rights and rituals that weighed so heavily in the outcome in the final, Last Judgment, where one is chosen or not chosen, either inside or outside Christian society" (*Frontier* 179). In the transitional moment of literacy in

which the Hexateuch was composed, Stock suggests that "men began to think of facts not as recorded by texts but as embodied by texts" (*Implications* 62). The line between text and truth was blurred during the Middle Ages. Thus, especially in religious texts like that of the Hexateuch, the written word becomes Word: a textual manifestation of cultural practices which invites the reader-audience of a text to adopt those practices themselves. Religious cultures, like the Christian one of the Middle Ages, constitute what Stock names textual communities "groups of people whose social activities are centered around text" (*Implications* 522). In these textual communities, "on many occasions actual texts were not present, but people often thought or behaved like they were" (62). In such an environment, word inevitably becomes Word, which according to Walter Ong, is "not and inert record but a living something...something going on" (12). The written text of the Hexateuch is then embodied on two levels: 1) the Word is the Word of God embodied by Genesis; and 2) the Hexateuch, as an embodiment of the Word, reveals that it was necessary and urgent for it to be performed to (and by) an audience of reader-viewer-listeners so that they could, in turn, embody the Word embodied by the book; this oral-aural component to the written text reveals its salvific purpose: it must be performed, read, seen, and heard. It is simultaneously word, Word, and image.

I begin this section with a brief description of the physical artifact of the text: its shape, size, the nature of the handwriting, and its "look" on the page. I then describe how the Hexateuch's Genesis functions as a cultural text, both history and example for the Anglo-Saxon reader-viewers. Next, I discuss my method of analysis: how/why I plan to argue the physical appearance of the graphic text -- how it unfolds on the page -- reinforces a social order *in and out of* the book within the narrative of Genesis and within Anglo-Saxon culture. In each section of my analysis, I first analyze the sentence structure and sequential order of each covenant I use, explaining how the very sentence structure, which Kress defines as one of the main affordances of written text, defines and prescribes a social order and set of lived practices (which Kress does not account for) for the audience of the Hexateuch, even for those Anglo-Saxon reader-viewers who could not actually "read" the words. In so doing, I acknowledge the affordances of Kress's theories, while revealing and revising their limitations.

The Old English Translation

The text of the Old English Hexateuch is a translation undertaken by Aelfric and a team of anonymous translators, traditionally dated to the last decade of the tenth century, forty to fifty years before the compilation of the Hexateuch.[8] Genesis (up until Gen.24:22) is attributed to Aelfric (*Aspects and Approaches* 3). The Old English prose translation, according to Rebecca Barnhouse, can be found in nine other manuscripts other than Cotton Claudius B.iv version, which is the focus of this study and which I abbreviate as the Hexateuch (*Text and Image* 39-40). The text is derived from the Latin Vulgate version of the Bible, and Barnhouse claims that "the Old English text in [the Hexateuch] follows the Latin of the Vulgate very closely in some places; in other paces the Old English and Latin differ significantly" (43). At the points of difference between the two translations, we see that the Old English version is a selected paraphrase, an edited revision. In a chapter titled "Shaping the Hexateuch," Barnhouse claims of those editions and additions that "in particular, episodes that show patriarchs in a negative light are edited, as are passages that mention practices not sanctioned by the church. The changes of this latter sort, considered together, reveal patterns that suggest some of them were made to control the reading and interpretation of the biblical text" (92). It is clear that the translators, artists, and compilers wanted to exercise some level of control over the way in which the Hexateuch could be interpreted. However, those intentions were for the benefit of the audience of reader-viewer-listeners, because Withers claims "Aelfric and the anonymous translators turn God's words into something more palatable and understandable for the audience of Anglo-Saxon Christians, thereby reducing the amount of chiding either God or the translators expect on account of what may sound like foolishness in the text" (*Frontier* 108).

Its existence in the Anglo-Saxon vernacular exemplifies a shift in the cultural value of English and a clear need for a vernacular version of the Bible. Additionally, the text was obviously valuable and important. Withers also claims that the Hexateuch was

---

[8] For a full investigation of the possible translators and the process of translating a usable Old English prose version of the Bible from the Latin Vulgate, see Richard Marsden "Translation by Committee? The 'Anonymous' Text of the Old English Hexateuch."

an expensive investment not only in material terms of the resources that went into its making, but also ideologically in terms of the value its makers placed on English language and culture. Though its translated text was relatively new, the stories it contained represented stability for a society in flux. The extensive and expensive project of translation, compilation and codification promoted cultural stability by positioning churchmen as middlemen in transactions both temporal and eternal. (*Frontier* 174)

Thus, the material object would have been especially important to the monastery to which it belonged and to the audience that would have access to it because of the social function of the biblical text, which Withers suggests is that "the example of the Old Testament results in a social and political history that unites personal salvation, corporate identity, and the righteousness of the nation as a whole" ("Secret" 59). The Hexateuch and its existence in the vernacular makes the religion, spirituality, and society established therein accessible to a wider audience who would not have had access to Latin learning. The handwritten text as a social-semiotic mode of communication, then, is a point of entry for reader-viewers into medieval spirituality through the materiality of the Hexateuch.

The Old English written text, as it appears on the page, is "written in one column on thick, dark parchment measure approximately 267 x 167mm" (Barnhouse 9). Of the visual layout of the text, Withers claims "by writing a single column of long lines, the compiler of Claudius B.iv [the Hexateuch] follows a format that is standard for writing *in Old English*. Though conventional, this format should not be taken for granted. It in effect 'visualizes the vernacular,' signaling an attitude towards the translated text, immediately calling attention to the difference of Old English from Latin" (*Frontier* 284, emphasis original). The layout, Withers argues, is a direct result of this particular moment in Anglo-Saxon history, in which "eleventh century England, confronted with the challenges of a rapidly expanding technology of writing in the vernacular, began to test the dominance of Latin long before the use of the Old French and Anglo-Norman languages became prevalent" (*Frontier* 13). The written layout of the words on the page visually signifies that the Hexateuch is fundamentally different than Latin versions of the Bible and cultural systems that only valued Latin learning, revealing the re-valuing and

repositioning of English during this transitional period of literacy: the shift from oral to manuscript culture positioning written text, especially biblical, as the foundation of culture, society, and social relationships.[9] However, I also contend that this reveals the way in which the inherent visuality of the written text impacts its meaning; the neat and clear boundaries that Kress imposes upon modes break down in the Hexateuch, something that I will explore in this textual analysis.

Barnhouse also pays particular attention to the visuality of the written text itself. She describes the "large initials and non-biblical rubrics separate the beginnings of new stories at ff. 12v (Noah), 21r (Abraham), and 53r (Joseph), while only small colored initials, not separated from the text, begin Genesis and Exodus" (*Text and Image* 17). These initials reveal that these stories were particularly important in the function of the book as both moral exemplar and history. The stories of these patriarchs are emphasized, almost more than the Bible as a complete text. For instance, Barnhouse states that "Genesis begins with only a colored initial, a three-line high green O, six lines up from the bottom of fol. iv. The rest of the folio is filled with Aelfric's Preface to Genesis, and no fanfare announces the start of the Bible itself" (18) Elsewhere, Barnhouse makes it clear that these intentional aims "reveal the concern the translators had for their audience's spiritual well-being. We see the translators taking on a paternal role, interpreting, simplifying, and summarizing some material, omitting or editing other passages, with the intent of saving readers from error or helping them towards salvation" ("Shaping"108). However, that framing is not just textual; it is also inherently *visual*. Indeed, the stories regarding these characters in Genesis would have been important because they provided a model of appropriate Christian behaviors and spirituality, and, for an audience that might not have been able to make meaning with the words on the page, they would have had needed to be visually emphasized in addition to their performance in order to lend authority to the text. In contrast to the beginning of Genesis, the "story of Noah begins at the top of 12v with an eight-line high red N" (18). Noah's

---

9 These two different modes of communication and literacy should not be thought of as discrete, however. The Hexateuch was composed in a culture of transition: print and orality are both at work in the text because the text was written with its performance in mind For a fuller exploration of this moment in the history of literacy, see Mark Chinca and Christopher Young: "Orality and Literacy in the Middle Ages: A Conjunction and its Consequences"

story also begins at the top of the folio. The order of the text (and the way in which these different narratives occur on the page) reveals a clear hierarchy in terms of different stories within the narrative: the patriarch (and the covenant described through that example) is given favor over the beginning of the biblical text overall. This is because Aelfric makes it clear in his homiletic Preface to Genesis, included at the beginning of the Hexateuch, that "readers and viewers of [the Hexateuch] would be expected to seek to understand how these stories of the past were relevant to their own lives and future salvation" (Withers, *Frontier* 7). The purpose of the translation in the Hexateuch, then, is to provide a model of Christianity as the foundation of Anglo-Saxon social dynamic, which, I argue, is accomplished through the covenants described therein, not just in the content of those covenants or the written text, but the inherent visuality of the textual manuscript itself; the manuscript *means* at the intersection of image and word, which, I will illustrate, current theories of multimodality undercut.

For the graphic representation of language, Kress supposes that "the question asked by writing is 'what were the salient events and in what temporal order did they occur?'" ("Gains and Losses" 14). Order, time, and sequence are the fundamentals of making meaning with the written word. In fact, he asserts "order is firmly coded...within the lines of language, the order of syntax" (7). However, from just this perspective, his model does not allow one to analyze the ways in which the visuality of the page also makes meaning for/with the reader. Similarly, Ong claims that "script, particularly the written alphabet provides a heightened experience of order" (136). He also asserts that

> arrangement in space seemingly provides maximal symbols of order and control, probably because the concepts of order and control are themselves kinesthetically and visually grounded, formed chiefly out of sensory experience involved with space. When the alphabet commits the verbal and conceptual world, themselves already ordered superbly in their own right, to the quiescent and obedient order of space, it imputes to language and to thought an additional consistency. (45)

The arrangement of the words, the sequence in which they occur, provides a heightened sense of order to the overall experience of the text; those are the affordances of written language: the order it provides and the logical unfolding of information. However, Ong also introduces

concepts of the visual into the verbal, revealing that by just analyzing the order, timing, and sequence of individual sentences and the overall order of the story, we are left with an incomplete perception and understanding of any text; written words are themselves images, and Ong allows for that and for those kinds of interpretations, revealing an uneasy absence in Kress's theories concerning graphic text.

Thus, the written word, as it appears in the Hexateuch's Genesis, enforces order on two different levels. The first is that the very structure of lines of the page enforces a linear, spatial reading of the narrative and genealogies of Genesis, forming the textual foundation of covenant. The second is that the order invites the audience to adhere to the will of God as it is depicted in the text through lived cultural practices, which Kress's theories do not describe or theorize. It constructs a social dynamic centered on the Word of God *spoken to* the patriarchs (and the audience) and established through covenants in their written form, illuminating the conflation of word (graphic representations of meaning) and Word (authority of God). While current frameworks allow us to see the ways in which the unfolding of the text on the page allows those covenants to grow out of their order and syntax (and to impose a spiritual order and syntax), it does not allow us to examine the visual qualities of the written text, which are just as crucial to the interpretation of the text. In the following analysis, I highlight the limitations and affordances of this restricted understanding of the mode of "text."

Living the Unfolding Text

The covenants, verbal (and textual) agreements between the Almighty and the patriarchs, establish and reinforce the authority of God's Word and the Hexateuch as an embodied iteration of that Word; they define a set of lived practices ordained by God. According to Kress's theories, those covenants, as they are embodied in the Anglo-Saxon Hexateuch, grow out of the written words on the page: the order, time, sequence. Salvation and blessing, the promises of the covenants, are only afforded to those who obey the sentence, which is, essentially, the will of the Almighty placed on the manuscript page. Thus, the text provides both a history and an example of model Anglo-Saxon cultural practices. However, I contend that model is constructed at the intersection of image and word, that the visuality of the words on the page is just as important to the meaning that is made as is the logic and sequence of the text. In the following analysis, I

begin with the visuality of the text to establish its importance in that semiotic process before moving to the meaning made by the sequence of the text, calling into question the current dichotomous understanding of the relationship between image and word.

Adamic

The social dynamic and set of lived cultural practices delineated by the Adamic covenant do not simply grow out of the order of the words on the page; they also develop from the way that the particular verses describing Adam's interaction with the Almighty look, because looking would occur prior to the perception of order, which is only made clear through the act of reading. The covenant, which comes first in the chronological narrative and the order of the written text of the Hexateuch, constitutes the foundation of the authority and infallibility of God and of His Word. These verses occur shortly after the beginning of new paragraphs in the narrative of Genesis, paragraphs that have been visually distinguished from the rest of the text by rubricated initials. The first paragraph begins with a two-line high blue G that begins the text of folio 6r, Genesis 2:15, textually near God's prohibition of Adam eating of the tree of knowledge. The second rubrication, a two-line high red-brown G occurs on 7v in the middle of the page and recounts God preparing clothes for Adam and Eve before their expulsion after failing to adhere to God's Word.

However, while both of these letters represent the same linguistic sound referent (G beginning the word for God - the active agent of each sentence), they are drawn in two very different ways. The G beginning the paragraph connected to God's prohibition is angular and Roman in style, while the G beginning the paragraph containing the punishment of Adam's sin is curved and menacing, like the tail of a serpent; it is, in fact, the same color as the great serpent portrayed on folio 2r, which depicts the Fall of the Rebel Angels.[10] These two very different Gs represent depictions of God: the first benevolent yet prohibitive, the second angry and punitive. My point is that these rubrications are letters as they are simultaneously images: the artist-scribes of the Hexateuch used these two different Gs to visually reflect and reinscribe the narrative taking place, which constructs the appropriate relationship between God and humankind:

---

[10] Folios in medieval manuscripts are labeled according to the recto and verso side of the leaf. Recto and verso mean "front" and "back," respectively.

obedience to His Word. The social dynamic is constructed and reinforced by the visuality of these particular letters. The cause and effect relationship between sin and punishment is reinforced by the Gs: God has authority and will in the blue G; living outside of either of those, invokes the God of the red G. These letters are neither fully visual, nor fully textual. Kress's understanding of written text, which I will outline in the following paragraphs, only allows for the order, logic, and sequence of the words on the page, not for the interesting intersections between image and word, like these. The way the words *look on the page* affect the meaning of the text for the Anglo-Saxon audience that was either reading the text or having the text read to them just as much as the order of the words themselves.[11]

The textual narrative of Genesis makes it clear that in the Garden of Eden before the Fall, God has only one prohibition for Adam (and Eve) and that His authority derives from that prohibition:

> soðlice of þam treowe ingehydes godes & yfeles ne et þu ; on swa hwylcum dæge
> swa þu etst of þam treowe, þu scealt deade sweltan /
>
> truly of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil you [will/do] not eat; on that
> very day that you eat of the tree, you shall die. (Crawford 87)[12]

This text delineates a covenant for both Adam and the Anglo-Saxon reader-viewers who would have experienced the Hexateuch. Following Kress's understanding of the way written text makes meaning, in the sequential order of the sentence, the tree of knowledge comes first. God defines the temptation, knowledge, and thereby He simultaneously acknowledges that man (Adam) would want to indulge in it. After the temptation, God states the prohibition. In most contemporary translations of the Bible, the prohibition "ne et þu" is translated as "you will," or "you shall not eat," implying a hypothetical or future situation in which man will have to deny himself the temptation. However, the Old English does not conjugate the verb in the future tense.

---

[11] That meaning is, of course, contingent upon the fact that the reader-viewer-listeners of the Hexateuch could see the text as they were having it read to them, which Withers suggests was most likely the case in a group of four or five surrounding the manuscript. See his book, *The Illustrated Old English Hexateuch, Cotton Claudius B.iv.: the frontier of seeing and reading in Anglo-Saxon England*.

[12] I draw these Old English quotations from Crawford's edited edition of the Hexateuch, which provides a printed version of the handwritten Old English text. The translations of the Old English are my own.

Thus, "ne et þu" literally means "you do not eat," in the present tense or as an imperative command. The latter possibility conveys a heightened sense of immediacy: the temptation is always already present and Adam (as God's creation) should always already be resisting it. The sequence of the words positions that threat in the lived experiences of the Anglo-Saxons as both descendants of Adam and reader-viewers of the text, implicating them within the narrative.

The second part of this passage (and thus the covenant that grows out of it) reveals the punishment for disobeying God's will and command, implying a cause and effect relationship between sin and punishment. God reinforces the temptation in a dependent clause which begins "on swa hwylcum dæge / on that very day." However, after the clause, the Old English reads "þu scealt deade sweltan," which I have idiomatically translated (as do most other contemporary versions of the text) as "you shall die." A literal translation of the Old English reads "you shall dead die." Death and dying are emphasized in the doubling on the adjective "deade" and the conjugation of the infinitive "swealtan." This defines the punishment of giving into temptation for both Adam within Genesis and for the reader-viewer of Hexateuch, which would be to die twice: first a physical death (immortality is implied *within* the Garden) and a spiritual death (a Fall from grace and blessing). The Old English sentence leads Adam (and Eve) and the reader-viewer-listeners of the Hexateuch for whom the text would be performed through the sequential dynamic of temptation and its punishment: the threat of death invites the audience to live within the confines of God's Word and prohibition, structuring a social order in both. The textual sequencing doubles the threat of death for both Adam and the audience of the Hexateuch, reflecting and reinforcing a social dynamic predicated on the authority of God's Word.

Thus, God's authority in the Adamic Covenant derives from prohibition - the act of denying Adam the temptation of knowledge and commanding Adam to deny himself -- and it is encompassed by the boundary of the sentence. By denying themselves that knowledge, Adam and Eve live within the confines of God's will. Remaining within that boundary/frame constructed by the sentence is necessary to remain within Eden, which is emblematic and symbolic of God's blessing and favor. The inevitable death resulting from the consumption of the fruit would be a direct result of living outside of the Word. Because, as mentioned previously, the Hexateuch was meant to serve as both history and example, God's covenant embodied by the

discursive features of Old English text above functions as a warning to the Anglo-Saxon audience against living outside of the Word--literally outside of the "sentence," structuring a social order based on the authority of God and His Word, thereby reinscribing the authority of the church as a vessel of his authority. The reader-viewer of the audience is simultaneously held accountable by the order of this sentence, and thus, the social order (covenant) that derives from it.

The order of the sentence not only reveals the threat of punishment, but also the actual punishment itself. Adam and Eve do give into temptation and are expelled from the Garden, exemplifying the cause and effect relationship established by the sequentiality of the text. Their expulsion manifests the infallibility of God's Word, even though he does not directly kill them. In Genesis 3:22, God makes it very clear why man's infraction is so severe:

> & cwæð : Nu Adam can yfel & god, swa swa ure sum, þe læs he astrece his hand
> & nime eac swylce of lifes treowe & ete & libbe on ecynsee /
> and said: 'Now Adam knows evil and good, just like (some of) us, that lest he
> stretch [out] his hand and also take of the tree of life and eat and live on
> eternally.' (Crawford 90)

In the dependent clause of the sentence "swa swa ure sum," God likens Adam to "us," which Aelfric claims in the Preface is a direct reference to the Trinity.[13] That dependent clause from the perspective of Aelfric injects Christianity into the sentence, into Genesis, and into the Hexateuch as a whole inherently revising the Old Testament. After that dependent clause, the conjunctions (and) reveal a flow of logic: Adam stretches out his hand, takes of the tree, then lives on eternally. Each event in the sequence is predicated upon the previous one, and all are the result of Adam knowing good and evil "swa swa ure sum/ just like (some of) us." In the sequence of Genesis, this sentence comes after the prohibition which first defined the Adamic covenant. This seemingly follows the narrative, but the sequence of these sentences redefines the temptation: Adam would naturally want to eat of the tree because in so doing he would achieve God-like (Trinity-like) knowledge, defying not only God, but the Trinity as well in the process. Here,

---

[13] For a full treatment on Aelfric's Preface and its pedagogical and homiletic intentions, see, Bernard F. Huppe, "Alfred and Aelfric: A Study of Two Prefaces" or Rebecca Menzer, "The Preface as Admonition."

Kress's affordances of written language allow us to see that the covenant grows out of the words on the page; the order affects the reception of the sentences. Adam and Eve's consumption of the fruit, achieving god-like knowledge, challenges and fundamentally rejects the dynamic defined by the Adamic covenant: the infallible authority of God *through* prohibition and man's self-denial.

   To the audience of the Hexateuch, this part of the narrative of Genesis, serving as both history and parable, introduces the concept of sin and then defines it very specifically as living *outside of* the Word (disobeying God's command). Living outside of the Word results in a/the Fall (from grace, from blessing, into Hell). The failure of man both and in out of the text and his subsequent punishment reinforces the Word of God, which includes both His will (for all man) and the Word as it *appears* on the page: the two different depictions of the letter G represent two different constructions of God and humankind's relationship with him. Reading, an act of seeing *and* understanding the words, draws the reader into the Word through the intersection of the textual and the visual.

Noachic

   The Noachic covenant, read from Kress's methodology, functions similarly to the Adamic, but on a larger scale: the order/covenant grows out of the words on the page in addition to the order of the different sections. However, as it reveals a "revised" relationship with God and His Word, Kress's methodology still silences the visuality of the text and its impact on the meaning of this particular covenant. While Kress's methodology and understanding of the limitations and affordances of graphic text allows us to see and understand the way this particular covenant grows out of the written text of Genesis, it does not account for the inherent visuality of that *written* text, which also impacts the interpretation of the Hexateuch. For example, Noah's story in the narrative of Genesis is introduced on folio 12v by an eight-line high rubricated red N, the largest rubrication in Genesis. Though this is technically a part of the written text, the rubrication of the initial and the degree to which this initial is emphasized in comparison to stories concerning the other patriarchs are both *visual* indicators that this story, this patriarch (since the initial begins Noah's name), and the covenant described therein are particularly important. Even for Anglo-Saxon readers who could not make sense of the written words on the page, the N

makes the text of Noah's story *visually* different from the rest of the Hexateuch. Just as the text revises the understanding of grace, blessing, and the relationship between man and the Almighty, this rubrication revises the audience's understanding of Noah. No other patriarch is afforded this kind of visual-textual emphasis, which invites the audience to see Noah and his narrative differently, as more important than Adam's story, because, the scribes and artists of the Hexateuch visually and textually construct Noah as a hero, saving man's relationship with the Almighty through his obedience. Here the neat distinctions between modes break down. Kress's theory only allows to the look at the words: their order, the syntax, the sequence, their position chronologically. It does not allow us to *see* how the way the words look (size, style, color) helps convey meaning that evolves from the text's linearity.

In the sequence of Genesis, the story of Noah and the ark logically occurs after the story of Adam's expulsion and after a long list of patriarchs and their lineages. The translator and compilers, even though they do eliminate long lists of lineages elsewhere in the Hexateuch,[14] are sure to link Adam to Noah through the textual narrative of Genesis. Thus, Noah, as he is portrayed in the following quotation from the text, functions as a direct juxtaposition to Adam and the generations after the Fall. From this perspective, the story of Noah and the Noachic covenant textually work to revise and redefine the Adamic covenant and man's relationship with God, all of which grow out of the order of the words on the page and the juxtaposition of the two patriarchs, emphasizing that historical time unfolds in the same way as text does: in one linear direction. The Old English text reads:

> Noe waes rihtwis wer & fulfremed on his maegdum ; mid Gode he ferde /
>
> Noah was a righteous man and blameless in his generation; he walked with God.
>
> (Crawford 100)

The second clause of my idiomatic translation reads "he walked with God." However, a literal translation would read "with God he walked." In the Old English, the "walking" is dependent on and only significant because of its relationship to the Almighty. Out of this arrangement of the written words on the page grows the first premise of the Noachic covenant: a close relationship

---

[14] Rebecca Barnhouse addresses the notable absences more fully in her dissertation, "Text and Image."

with God. However, Noah is only afforded this relationship with God because he is *rihtwis* and *fulfremed* (righteous and blameless), descriptions that come before the second clause. The conjugated verb of being, *wesan*, makes Noah the active agent, the subject of the sentence. His action is the exhibition or performance of the qualities and behaviors necessary for God to select him to build the ark. Only because Noah exists in this state, only because he is fundamentally different from Adam and his failure, can he walk with God, and that difference emerges from the ordering of words in the sentence.

Noah's obedience constitutes the second part of the covenant:

> Noe soðlice dude ealle da ding, þe him God bebead /
>
> Noah truly did all these things, that God commanded him. (Crawford 101)

Again, Noah is the subject in this sentence: he performs the action. God is embedded within a dependent clause. However, the dependent clause reveals that Noah only acts because God has commanded him to do so. The dependent clause restructures and catalyzes Noah's actions. Thus, "Noe," which is technically the subject of the sentence, is not the active agent. Kress's theories allow us to see that God is inherently at the beginning and end of this sentence: Noah only acts (is only able to act) because God has instructed him. The very order of this sentence is emblematic of the Noachic Covenant, positioning obedience as the most important quality of the believer, highlighting the importance of Kress's insights concerning textual ordering. Obedience and righteousness arise from the order of the words on the page according to Kress's affordances of written, graphic text.

Also, this particular covenant, as it occurs in the sequence of Genesis, is different because of the structural order of the covenant itself: Adam was created into blessing and privilege in the Garden. Conversely, Noah is selected for his righteousness, but God only blesses Noah insofar as he is able to adhere to God's command, to his Word. The Noachic covenant, then, constitutes a revised understanding of God's blessing: one is not created into blessing (like Adam); one receives blessing through obedience and righteousness. The temporal sequencing of the textual Noachic covenant is fundamentally different that the Adamic: God instructs Noah first, then blesses his lineage; Adam had but one prohibition in the blessing of Eden and failed. Read as a both history and parable, this becomes a model for Anglo-Saxon behavior: one acts in

accordance with the Word as it is *embodied by* the Hexateuch. The authority of God's word, both in the narrative of Genesis and as a social dynamic in Anglo-Saxon society, grows out of the order of the words on the page. The textual affordances of order, linearity, and sequence reveal that the handwritten verses in the Hexateuch construct and reinforce different relationships between God and man through Adam and Noah, for both the characters in the text and the Anglo-Saxon audience who would have been invoked by and hailed into the book by reading the text and/or having it read to them. Because "affective literacy produces textuality and reading responses in the fluid space between the material language, comprehension, and imagination, between writing and the reader's reading body" (Amsler 94), the biblical narrative is not just words on the page. It is Word: a way of behaving in response to the text, even after the text is no longer present, a capacity not present in current theories of multimodality, one, furthermore, signaled by the visual nature of the textual N, the first letter of the textual sequence.

Abrahamic

The Abrahamic covenant, which marks the textual, sequential, and narratological culmination of the revised nature of man's relationship with the Almighty established by the Noachic covenant, illustrates best the embodied/affective literacy solicited by the Hexateuch, how the book invites its reader-viewer-listeners to behave in a specific way. That embodied experience results from the intersections of the order of the words on the page and how those words appear visually. However, the meaning made from that order, particularly in this covenant, is contingent on what the text states explicitly and what is both present and absent in the paraphrastic nature of the translation found within the Hexateuch. What is significant about this state of the text is that just as much meaning can be made from what a text silences and/or writes over as from the order of the words and sentences on the page, something that is absent in Kress's affordances of text, because, for him, meaning is only made from the order of what is present. Meaning in the Hexateuch is always intertextual because there are conspicuous revisions and additions that essentially re-frame the meaning of the Abrahamic covenant and its use as a model for appropriate Anglo-Saxon spirituality. I begin this section with an analysis of the implications of one particular example of this, that of circumcision and its place within the Abrahamic covenant, before moving to how that meaning is also accomplished through the visuality of the text and a

similar (yet subtly different) meaning made from the order of the text itself and how those two meaning solicit responses from the audience of reader-viewer-listeners.

This particular covenant reveals that the Hexateuch's vernacular translation of the biblical text is an edited and very selective paraphrase of the Latin Vulgate version from which it derives. For instance, one of the key tenets of the Abrahamic covenant is the circumcision of male believers:

> þis ys þaet wed, þe ge healdan sceolon betwux me & eow & þin ofsprincg, þæt
> ælc hysecild betwux eow beo emsniden /
> this is that covenant, which you shall keep between me and you and your
> offspring, that every he-child among you be circumcised. (Crawford 125)

Here, embodied/affective literacy, as "the hinge of reading which opens up and closes a gap between reader and text, between the skin of the page and the reading body" is dealt with specifically in the Hexateuch (Amsler 84). The dependent clause reinforces God's authority: Abraham *and* his lineage *shall* keep the covenant. It is again textually constructed as Abraham's responsibility, and it reminds the audience that the covenant introduced at the beginning of the sentence is to be kept even before the stipulation of the covenant is addressed. That stipulation, circumcision, is important in the sequence of premises within the Abrahamic covenant because it is the culmination of commands: the rest of God's orders have been testing Abraham's faith and leading him to this moment. Circumcision, as a part of the covenant, transforms the concept of the *body* for believers: in addition to being the physical vessel by which one lives/performs the behaviors mandated by God and His Word, through circumcision, the Word is inscribed on the body itself; it becomes the flesh made Word. The body, then, for Abraham, for believers, and specifically for the Anglo-Saxon reader-viewer-listeners, becomes something that carries the Word. And this is an infallible command, because in the text the Almighty claims:

> Se werhades man þe ne byðemsniden on þam flaesc hys fylmenes, hys sawul byð
> adylegod of hys folc, for þan þe he aidlode min wed /
> The man that is not circumcised in the flesh of his foreskin, his soul is stained [of/
> with] his people [he is an outcast], because he has broken my covenant.
> (Crawford 126)

Here, the order of the sentence begins with a dependent clause that defines a specific sin: living outside of God's Word by not being circumcised and thereby not entering into the covenant with the Almighty. The active agent in the sentence is the soul of the man defined in the dependent clause. In this way, the order of the sentence itself establishes the sin and then defines the punishment-- an existence as a social and spiritual outcast, a fate that would have resonated especially with an Anglo-Saxon audience,[15] -- before reiterating *why* there must be a punishment. Essentially, the sentence defines both a general and a specific way of living outside the Word. The inclusion of this particular framing of the text -- the words, the order, and their sequence in the overall book -- make it appear that circumcision would be especially important to medieval spirituality, Anglo-Saxon Christianity, and the new covenant (which comes through the New Testament). However, while circumcision is mentioned in this part of the Hexateuch, it is largely glossed over.[16] In fact, at the end of Genesis 17, the scribe of the Hexateuch adds:

> Nu secge we betwux þisum þaet nan Cristen man ne mot nu swa don /

> Now we say this that no Christian man must now do so. (Crawford 127)

This scribal addition/edition comes immediately after the previous quotation, in which the importance of circumcision is established. The premise and importance of circumcision to the relationship with God is thus completely negated, withdrawing circumcision from the covenant. Without circumcision, what remains in the narrative as a parable for an Anglo-Saxon audience of reader-viewer-listeners is an example of faithful dedication to God's Word and living that dedication through the vessel of the body. The absence of circumcision from the Abrahamic covenant changes the nature of the text, and by extension, the society thereby solicited from it. It is a textual interruption of Old Testament with an interjection of New Testament values; circumcision is not necessary because there is a new covenant through Jesus. Effectively, this blurs the boundaries between the Old and New Testaments. However, at the same time as those chronological/ideological boundaries are blurred, so too is the boundary between the text and the body. Though Kress does discuss the body in processes of meaning-making as mentioned

---

[15] Anglo-Saxon literature commonly deals with the themes of exile, wandering, and belonging. See Barnhouse, *Text and Image in the Old English Hexateuch*.

16 Barnhouse, "Text and Image"

previously, he does not account for the way text (or image, as will be discussed in the next chapter) can invite somatic, physical responses from an audience from the silences or writings-over that occur within the text. The Hexateuch solicits physical responses from the reader-viewer-listeners -- to move and live in accordance with the social dynamic described therein -- and it does so through the intersection of textual presence and absence concerning circumcision.

There is also an inherently visual element within this particular section of Abraham's story that, I argue, is crucial to its interpretation, elements that extend beyond the linearity of Kress's method and reveal the interactivity of image and word and the affective dimensions of that interactivity. For example, the scribe of this particular section of Genesis has underlined the line quoted above, beginning "nu secge." The underline is a visual marker of the importance of the written text not only to the scribe who wrote it, but also to the Anglo-Saxon audience who would experience the Hexateuch. This line particularly has *moved* the scribe to underline it. In doing so, the scribe is producing a "textuality and reading response in the fluid space between material language, comprehension, and imagination, between writing and the reader's reading body" (Amsler 94). Essentially, it is a visual element of the written text that is not fully an image, especially in comparison to the ornate illustrations included in the rest of the text, that implicates the body in its meaning; it is *both*. In this affective/embodied reading experience, the text hails the scribe/reader to underline the text, which reframes the text for all others who would read it. He is moved by the text, and his movement invites others to move. Essentially, the underlining visually emphasizes the text, prescribing a certain kind of performance, listening, or reading, and, without the text, the line has less meaning. I argue that the underlining *has* to be present to remind the reader of the infallibility of the Word of God, because in Anglo-Saxon society and in Christianity, the Abrahamic covenant has been revised significantly. It reminds the reader-viewer-listener of the warning in Aelfric's preface: that literal interpretation of Genesis is dangerous and wrong. The line reminds the audience to interpret the Abrahamic covenant differently, to *see* it differently than the surrounding text and to move differently because of that seeing, a kind of seeing that modal distinctions and limited understandings of the affordances of written text do not allow. The interpretation I have provided here does not presuppose clear boundaries between image and word, on this folio, in the entire Hexateuch, and in all texts,

image and word, composition and body are interrelated and interdependent, showing that and the limitations of current theories of multimodality.

A complementary reading can be gleaned from the order of the words on the page. Similar to Noah, Abraham is brought forth in the text through his lineage; the lines of text logically walk the reader-viewer through the biological and narrative path from Noah to Abraham. This linear structure directly connects the patriarchs, their narratives, and the covenants described therein. Through this sequential order, the Abrahamic covenant builds off of the Noachic, growing out of the written text, making it easier for the Anglo-Saxon audience who would have read or have been read to make the connection between the two patriarchs. The Hexateuch, as both history and parable, constructs Abraham as a part of their own legacy and a model believer. Kress's affordance of written text, specifically of the order of the text overall, also proved the aggregated nature of the Old English narrative. Abraham, like Noah, is intentionally selected by God for his piety, and the possibility of blessing is contingent upon the fact that he follows all of the commands given to him by the Almighty. The covenant, as an outgrowth of the words on the page, is unlike the other two, though, because of the significant amount of agency given to the Word itself during this part of the narrative:

> þa þis gedon waes, þa weard Godes spræc to Abram ðurh gesyde him secgende.../ when this was done , the Word of God spoke to Abram through a vision saying to him.... (Crawford 121)

On the microlevel of the narrative, this order of the words in this sentence blurs the distinction between the Almighty and His word. The selection begins with a dependent clause: Abraham must complete God's previous command before he can be instructed again. However, in this phrasing, it is not the Almighty who speaks to Abraham; it is His Word, a very significant distinction. The Word is the subject-agent in this sentence; Abraham (who has not yet been renamed) is the object. Syntactically, this constructs the Word of God as alive and present, not just in the story of Genesis, but in the Hexateuch and thus in Anglo-Saxon society. The covenant, as the embodiment of God's Word in the Hexateuch, therefore, is not just words on a page; it is Word, a living set of cultural practices that should be, must be, *embodied* by its audience. Kress's version of textuality can describe the ways in which the order of the words on the page makes

meaning with and for the reader-viewer-listener. It does not, however, extend beyond that to include how that order, that construction of Word, imbues those words on the page describing the actions of the Word with the authority of God, an authority derived from the syntax of the words on the page. Theories of multimodality have yet to align with this understanding of literacy, the ways in which the mode of text can be both textual and visual and invite an audience to react somatically to the text as a result of that intersection.

The Hexateuch, as a material object, houses a model of living, which Kress's affordances of written text should be extended to include. For instance, reflecting the linearity of written text (logic, order, and sequence), the Almighty makes the covenant generationally and biologically transferrable:

> And þu healtst min wed & þin ofsprinc aefter þe on heora maegdum /
>
> And you (shall) keep my covenant and your offspring after in their generations.
>
> (Crawford 125)

In the order of this sentence, though, Abraham's children can only keep the covenant if Abraham does first. Textually, he is used as a model for both his lineage within the text and external to it as a model for the Anglo-Saxon reader-viewers. The Anglo-Saxon readers would have believed themselves to be a part of this textual legacy, because Abraham does, in fact, follow God's commands, and, thus, the sequential text invites them to model their own behaviors and lived practices after Abraham's model: adhere to God's Word as it is presented in this book, the Hexateuch, and you will receive blessing. This covenant and the lived practices it invites are formulated by the way the text unfolds as it is either read or performed, thereby re-structuring society in and out of the Hexateuch. In either interpretation I have offered here, the body is important in the meaning-making process, especially in the embodied ways of being that the reader-viewer-listeners are expected to carry with them after experiencing the Hexateuch.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I have shown how current theories of multimodality, specifically Kress's modal distinctions and the affordances of written text, while they do allow for a formal analysis of the written text in the Hexateuch, unduly restrict a full interpretation because of certain limitations in those theories: in medieval manuscript culture, in which every (handwritten) text is

different, unique, the visuality of the text, the way it *looks* on the page, impacts the meaning of the manuscript and the way it would have been received by an audience. These theoretical and interpretive limitations, I believe, are the result of the belief that there can be clear distinctions between modes, that meaning can be made textually without incorporating the visuality of the text. Also, this framework silences the ways in which the linearity of the text can also culturally frame certain affective responses to the text. The body, in these theories, is the source of perception. However, my analysis of the text of the Hexateuch shows that this text (because the modes of visual and textual cannot be kept discrete) invites and solicits meanings made with and through the body; it delineates and reinforces the Word (through image and word, presence and absence), a way of living prescribed by God and mediated through the manuscript. Word cannot be separated from the way it is also an image, the way it can be seen (and how the seeing affects it meaning); the body cannot be separated from the meaning-making process. In this chapter, I have fleshed out more fully two weaknesses in current theories of multimodality: 1) the semiotic inextricability of image and word, because written words are images and 2) the intersections of modes solicit embodied responses from texts, even when the texts are no longer present.

In the following chapter, I continue to use (and thus show the limitations of) these theories to analyze certain images in the Hexateuch, with the goal of furthering my argument that there are no clear boundaries between image and word. Analyzing this historical text, its technologies and affordances of composing, and understanding that there are no clear semiotic boundaries between modes can show us that the revolution in communication we are seeing now, in which more and more composers are making use of digital technologies to produce multimodal compositions, is one of degree not one of kind.

CHAPTER THREE

SEMIOTIC TRANSGRESSIONS

In the previous chapter, I outlined three limitations to current understandings of multimodality which does not provide a clear rendering of the ways in which 1) the inherent visuality of written text complicates the perception of written text as being solely dependent on sequence and order; 2) imageword, as an embodiment of the inextricability of modes, draws readers into the text, holding them accountable for the text, making the text a lived experience; and 3) lived experience constitutes an embodied response to the text carried with the reader. In this chapter, I supplement perceptions of image as a semiotic mode, Gunther Kress's concept of the frame in the meaning-making process, and the permeable boundaries between text and reader through performances of an embodied, affective literacy.

Gunther Kress would assert that, if the Old English graphic text in the Hexateuch tells what it means to be an (exemplary) Anglo-Saxon Christian at the beginning of the eleventh century, the visuals *show* what it means. Image and word have specialized functions in accordance with their limitations and affordances. In fact, he claims, "if we attempt to 'translate' [an image] into either speech or writing, we discover just how specialized this mode is" ("Multimodality" 195). However, as this project illustrates, though the two modes have different capabilities, they cannot be so easily separated and defined as Kress has done. His claim: "the two modes -- language and the visual -- simply start from different concerns, are embedded in two different ways of conceptualizing, thinking, and communicating," presupposes a binary between the two modes and between two ways of thinking (195). Kress furthers this binary in the introduction to *Multimodal Literacy*, wherein he and Jewitt suggest that all modes are partial in their ability to make meaning, and that that is why communication is always multimodal (combining their affordances to fill their limitations) (3). This, they claim, is why there needs to be a pedagogy developed for multiliteracy: to help students gain the knowledge of those limitations and affordances to make effective meaning in their worlds. While I do not discredit the goals of their research and scholarship - a pedagogy incorporating multiple understandings of literacy must be (and is being) developed in composition studies - their research explicitly perpetuates the

Figure 3.4: Rebirimus... Folia 12

assumption that modes are discrete semiotic entities. This presupposition, while it does provide contemporary scholars a vocabulary and theory to describe the specialized function of modes in texts, is flawed and perpetuates an either/or understanding of image and word. This chapter is an argument for both/and.

The images I discuss in this chapter, then, provide a counter-narrative to Kress's claim concerning the "semiotic" revolution. I contend that this revolution can only be described and addressed with binary-biased perspective of multimodality because, in part, it is ahistorical. As Paul Prior asserts, "Kress presents a semiotic history defined by periods… [and] the past that Kress evokes is a very selective past" ("Moving Multimodality" 24). However, while Prior reveals the way in which "Kress's attempt to describe modes in terms of mutually, exclusive binary affordances repeatedly leads to selective examples selectively read," he too evokes a selective past.[17] The example he provides as a counterclaim to Kress's version of multimodal history is from 1904, which still limits multimodal composing to a history of a little over a century (26). The selection of the Hexateuch as the focus of this project has been very intentional. It is my goal to place theories of multimodality with a historical context before the computer, before, even, the printing press, to situate multimodality as an integral and fundamental part of literacy.

I begin this chapter with a discussion of the narrative images found within the Hexateuch. Then, I review Kress's analytical lens both in terms of the visual and in terms of "framing," which he defines as modal interactions. In my third section, I supplement Kress's theory with additional concepts from scholars in the fields of art history and medieval studies, applying that enriched lens to the illuminations in the Hexateuch. In my analysis, I delineate four ways in which images and words in the Hexateuch are blurred as a result of transgressed semiotic boundaries; how each way reveals that semiotic transgressions solicit embodied responses, which is the overall argument of this chapter; and how each example allows us to see multimodality and literacy from a less binary-oriented and more historical perspective. In so doing, I re-examine

---

[17]Kress does, indeed, work in several texts to analyze the ways in which science textbooks have become increasingly visual over the past fifty years, seemingly confusing a change in quantity or frequency with difference of kind.

concepts of multimodality and work toward a more revised understanding of its impact on literacy, one that accounts for the interplay and interdependence of image and word.

Visual Covenant: Image, Frame, and Transgression

According to Rebecca C. Barnhouse, "Genesis is the most densely-illustrated of the six books in the Hexateuch; 229 framed color pictures are contained within its 143 pages…and many pages have two or three pictures integrated into the text" (*Text and Image* 21). In those images, there are different styles of illustration for different characters or scenes. For example, David F. Johnson suggests that "uses color outline for the majority of elements in any given miniature, but employs full-color painting to effect and emphasis of a particularly important figure or figures" (174). This suggests that there is a programmatic system of visual emphasis, a developed understanding of the meaning-making potential of images in medieval "multiliteracy."[18]

In the composition of the Hexateuch, and especially Genesis, the visual was particularly important to the purpose and function of the book. This is because, Johnson suggests, the Hexateuch was used most likely to instruct younger, inexperienced monks who were not yet fluent in Latin or noblepersons who would visit the monastery.[19] His theories suggest that the Hexateuch was intended to function pedagogically, revealing and reinscribing what it meant to be a part of a Christian social dynamic in the early eleventh century. For either of these possible audiences, monasterial or aristocratic, it is clear that the images are intended to make the story of Genesis, of the Hexateuch, and of religion accessible to those who would not have had access to Latin learning or written language. As Kress would say, the images provide points of entry for the Anglo-Saxon audience ("Gains and Losses"). Thus, they are a crucial part of medieval literacy and meaning making as it is portrayed through this manuscript.

---

[18] I use the term "multiliteracy" cautiously. While it does emphasize a plurality of meaning-making possibilities, the way it has also been used in scholarship tends to privilege an ahistorical understanding of this kind of meaning-making. As I argued in the second chapter, image and word cannot be separated, and attempting to do so (as Kress and the New London group have done) limits our definition and understanding of "literacy."

[19] In either of these scenarios, Johnson emphasizes the emplaced nature of the Hexateuch; it was composed within and for monasterial contexts and audiences.

This pedagogical function is furthered by other scholarship as well. Katherine Karkov

suggests that "the illustrations make it clear that as in the homilies of Aelfric, the biblical story

forms an moral exemplar whose message the pictures help to illuminate: God instructs mankind,

parents instruct children, the text instructs the reader" ("Anglo-Saxon" 208). The images in the

Hexateuch visually define, construct, and reinforce Anglo-Saxon Christianity through the use of

the Hexateuch as parable. Additionally, the sequential succession--the visual order-- of

genealogies reveals that the "images provided an historical picture album that visually (as well as

textually) established the relationship between biblical ancestor and audience" (Karkov 236). [20]

The images, then, formed a visual link between the characters depicted in Genesis and the

Anglo-Saxon audience. This image-history would have given the Anglo-Saxons a high stake in

the narrative of Genesis, both in terms of understanding/interpreting the text (explaining the

purpose of so many images) and in terms of their ability to embody the religious practices

described therein. That history is constructed by the blurring of the semiotic border between

image and word. This semiotic relationship, Mary Carruthers states, "allows the memory to be

organized securely for accurate recollection of a sort that permits not just reduplication of the

original material, but sorting, analyzing, and mixing as well, genuine learning, in short, rather

than simple repetition" (*Book of Memory* 19). Effectively, this blurs the boundaries between the

Hexateuch and the Anglo-Saxon reader-viewer-listeners who would have experienced the book.

Benjamin Withers suggests that "instead of the history of the Israelites, the reader surveys his

own future, cast in terms of a choice between rebellion or faithfulness, heresy or Christianity,

inclusion in society or exclusion from it" ("Secret" 67). The Hexateuch is both history and

parable, biblical and Anglo-Saxon, because it is both image and word, book and orthopraxis.

In this chapter, I analyze five particular images, selected for the way they embody the

transgression of both graphic (material and physical) frames *and* conceptual (abstract and

ideological) frames. I argue that transgressing graphic frames invites and reinforces transgression

of conceptual frames, thus encouraging the Anglo-Saxon reader-viewer-listener to live the text.

The first image I address is a depiction of Enoch's ascension into both Heaven and the written

text above him, because it blurs the semiotic boundaries between image and word, text and body.

---

[20] I discuss these genealogies briefly in the previous chapter. See pg. 37.

The second intersection concerns the sealing of the Abrahamic covenant, which is visually defined by a handshake, displaying a literacy predicated on imageword present within the Hexateuch and Anglo-Saxon England. The third is the destruction of Sodom, an image in which the frame is utilized as an integral part of the narrative of Genesis. The fourth image falls under this same category: the frame is used as a part of the Noachic narrative to emphasize the importance of the narrative for the Anglo-Saxon audience. The final image is the Fall of the Rebel Angels, a culmination of all these conceptual and graphic frame transgressions, which establish the tone and stake of the Hexateuch, mandating that it be embodied. All of these image transgressions constitute an orthopraxis, defining appropriate models of behavior, a way of living after experiencing the text.

In the next section, I address what Kress says of images, their frames, and their functions in meaning-making to draw attention to the ways in which those theories require nuancing or supplementing to account for the merging of word and image in Hexateuch.

The (Multi)Mode of Image and Framing

In his scholarship, Kress offers two concepts important to this chapter. The first is a way of "reading" images, an attempt to theorize the semiotic capabilities of the visual. The second is a theory of framing, which is the way that modes work together in semiotic ensembles (*Multimodality*). Of their position in literacy and the process of meaning making, Kress claims that images function as display and that the question for any viewer must be "what [are] the salient entities in the visual encountered and recollected world and in what way are they related" ("Gains and Losses" 14). The underlying logic of the image, then, is spatial, not temporal like written text, where order and linear sequence make meaning for the reader in addition to ideational content. Images, instead of presenting items one at a time, provide all the semiotic material at once. Thus, images offer multiple points of entry for the reader-viewer in the overall frame of the image, allowing the "user" of the image(s) to "design" their own meaning with the text (*Multimodality*).

In a chapter on multimodality in the collection, *Multiliteracies*, Kress provides a framework of visual analysis, a rubric dividing the frame of an image into four different sections, an attempt at theorizing visual grammar. According to this analytical "frame," as the reader works through

the image, she or he is only able to reach the "new" information by working through the "given," which is "taken for granted" or "assumed to be the case," going from left to right across the frame; similarly, the "ideal," which may mean "an ideal form" or a "wish" at the top of the image, grows (up and) out of the "real," which can be "here and now" or "empirically so" located at the bottom (200-1).[21] (See Figure 3.1) To summarize, he claims that "the top-bottom distinction relates to ontological judgments; the left right distinction to the social status of information" (200). Images show those who view them where the sociocultural environment in which they were composed places them; they show value judgments.

Kress reiterates this point in "Multimodality: Challenges to Thinking about Language," asserting, "image is spatial and nonsequential; writing and speech are temporal and sequential. That is a profound difference, and its consequences for representation and communication are now beginning to emerge in this semiotic revolution" (339). Here and again he makes very clear distinctions between the visual and the verbal; through the quote and through the rubric, we see that he thinks image and word work in fundamentally different semiotic ways (and, implicitly, he privileges the meanings that can be made by images). Though the two modes possess different qualities, as my analysis in this chapter will illustrate, I argue that the two are inextricable in the Hexateuch. Accepting this inextricability allows us to see that a revolution has not, cannot, occur in terms of privileging one mode over the other. By speaking of the revolution, Kress elides a major facet in the history of literacy and communication, which is not to discount his theory, but to suggest that theory be enriched by historical awareness.

In my analysis, I apply a supplemented version of Kress's theories of the visual, illuminating what those theories reveal about semiotic function of images in the Hexateuch (and other texts) and also what they elide. Additionally, I utilize his valuable discussions and theories of the frame and its position in multimodality. Frames, Kress's central metaphor for semiotics and meaning-making, have already been implicit in my project in the analysis of order and sequence done in the previous chapter, because Kress claims "sentences are frames within the mode of

---

21 While this rubric does allow for interesting interpretations, the logic of this particular analytical "frame" is problematic for analyzing *all* images, because of the way in which it presupposes a Western method of reading, in which the reader works through the image from left to right. This is something that Kress acknowledges in the chapter, but does not fully address.

writing" (*Multimodality* 150). Indeed, frames are crucial to his social-semiotic theory of multimodality and multimodal communication; his motto is "there is no meaning without framing" (*Multimodality* 10). This is because, for him, "without a frame, we cannot know what to put together with what, what to read in relation to what. If we do not know what entities there are, we cannot establish relations between them. We cannot know therefore where the boundaries to interpretations are: we cannot make meaning" (*Multimodality* 149). From this perspective, all texts are framed, and each "framed text creates, provides and occupies a discrete 'semiotic space'" (149). This is what we gain from Kress's social-semiotic theories: the contextualized nature and situatedness that constitute the social spaces of texts, communication, and modes (as the selection and combination of these) are rhetorical choices that can reveal insights about the culture in which they are utilized. However, Kress also states, "frames hold together and they separate/segment... [they] separate what is in the frame from what is outside; the viewer/listener/ reader is asked to regard what is outside the frame as different from what is inside and if connected, as differently connected" (153). His theory, while allowing for analysis of what happens inside the individual frame, among multiple frames, and within the social contexts in which the texts are produced, does not account for the transgression of frames and the blurring of semiotic spaces. I contend neither frames nor modes can be kept discrete; this, I believe, is the theoretical weakness of twenty-first century understandings of multimodal meaning making, because it cannot account for the inter-being and interdependency of image and word. The transgression of frames (and modes), as a narrative-rhetorical device is used frequently within the Hexateuch; it is crucial to its meaning making process. Ignoring it leaves us with an incomplete interpretation and reveals an incomplete perception of both multimodality and literacy. The frame, as a tool of analysis, is still useful because of the way in which it allows us to examine the cultural position of texts and orchestrations of meaning through ensembles of modes. However, it requires a further layer of complexity. In the following paragraphs, I supplement Kress's theories of the frame (as a social-semiotic and rhetorical process that contextualizes meaning) with concepts from art history and medieval studies, both of which provide insight into the historicity of multimodality.

Current discussions of the frame's position in meaning making in art history and medieval studies explain the ways in which the frame reveals and reinscribes the social environment in which it was composed, similar to Kress's own theory. Oleg Tarasov, for instance, theorizes the frame in art, making the claim that, "the frame lets us know where we are in contemplating the art object," and more importantly, that the frame "locates the image within a distinctive web of ideas and beliefs" (7). From this perspective, the frame is both a material and ideological space that holds the image/art object in place while simultaneously framing the way in which is to be received by an audience. Similarly, Herbert Broderick claims (specifically of medieval manuscript art around the historical moment of the Hexateuch) that "during the tenth and eleventh centuries, three things happened to the frame in Anglo-Saxon manuscript art - it becomes tangible, in order to heighten the realism and immediacy of the images; it gets inhabited; and its potential as a narrative and expressive device is explored" (31). In these manuscripts, the frame is neither fully exterior to the images nor fully a part of them; it occupies a unique and frequently transgressed position on the border of two ideological spaces. Michael Camille continues this conversation (of the transgression of frames and their social position) in his book, *Images on the Margins*, asserting "if the edges [borders/frames] were dangerous, they were also powerful places...in charms and riddles, things that were neither this nor that bore, in their defiance of classification, strong magic" (16). That "strong magic" is the ability of the Hexateuch to materially embody values that its audience would have been expected to live.

Kress's discussion of frames and the capabilities of the visual allow us to explore the way that meaning is made within the frame, but it does not enable us to assess the function and meaning of the ways in which frames delineate as they simultaneously transgress the meaning of the images and the text. Combining Kress with medieval scholarship on the frame redressing this omission, in my analysis, I examine the frame as both graphic (a material, visual entity surrounding an image, derived from) and conceptual (an ideological, semiotic way of situating a text within a given context), combining Kress with the scholars mentioned above.

Looking at the ways in which frames are used as a part of the narrative within the Hexateuch (and how other scholars theorize the possibilities of the frame) can help fill in this gap in Kress's theories. Of the frames in the Hexateuch, Barnhouse informs contemporary scholars that "the

vast majority of the pictures [in the Hexateuch] is framed... [and] sometimes the artist plays with the frame, allowing the characters to appear outside of it or to peer around it" (*Text and Image* 34-5). This semiotic play with frames and framing visually defines the lived cultural practices acceptable for Anglo-Saxon Christians by shattering the frames between image and text and between the material book and the audience of reader-viewers, providing both history and example for the reader-viewer. The composers of the Hexateuch intentionally designed the book in this holistic, "neither-this-nor-that" manner, employing the available semiotic resources of manuscript culture. The "play" with frames in the Hexateuch, I argue, changes the way the images they encompass -- and the entire book, by extension -- are perceived: the images are neither fully within the book nor fully exterior to it. In this existence, the images are activated, according to Withers, who claims that the transgression of the frames, "pushes the frame backward onto the page while, in turn, the frame presses the [images] out toward the viewer," semiotically enabling the viewer-reader to identify with the text ("Secret" 57). This allows the images to formulate and reinforce a set of cultural practices sanctioned by the Word of God, constituting an affective, embodied literacy, for which contemporary perceptions of multimodality do not allow. Because the medieval audience would have been influenced by this hybrid position/existence, the Hexateuch would have been a very powerful book; it was both text and culture, word and Word, image and lived reality. In my analysis, these transgressions, both graphic and ideological, the interdependence of image and word, and the embodied/affective literacy they create serve as a supplement Kress's theory, providing a more nuanced understanding of multimodality, as the following analysis reveals.

Analysis

I organize my examination of the images in the Hexateuch according to the four different ways in which I perceive frame-play at work in Genesis, all of which embody a revised way of seeing images and frames through the supplementation of Kress's theories. For each, I address how frame- play reveals the interdependence of image and word and how image and word work together to impose the text on the reader, thereby defining (and mandating) acceptable cultural practices, social dynamics, and lived experiences. Those ways are: 1) the transgression of the semiotic boundary of the frame, which makes the words/Word an active part of the image; 2) the

visual codification of a word as a recurring image, revealing a literacy that operates at the intersection of image and word; 3) the imposition of the image out onto Anglo-Saxon culture through the shattering of the frames between image and text and the Hexateuch and its reader-viewer; and 4) the infusion of images with language, even on folios that have no text on them at all. All of these examples are a new way of conceiving of "image" and the frame, which allow us to see affective literacy at work in the Hexateuch.

Image Invading Word

The first way in which the Hexateuch utilizes the transgression of semiotic spaces between images and words and between frames is through the invasion of the images into the words, which, I argue, blurs the conceptual frame of the Old Testament by transgressing the material frame of the image. For example, the images on folio 11v show the life cycles of two patriarchs: Iared and Enoch. There are four images on this folio (two at the top of the page; two at the bottom). The top two show the life and lineage of Iared. In the left image, he is labeled, as is his offspring; the label distinguishes him from other male figures, both in this particular image and in comparison to other images, and directly positions him as a part of the lineage from Adam to Noah, making him a vital part of the biblical narrative. Without this label, the image would not have the specific meaning. In the right, he is wrapped in a shroud to convey his death. The two images juxtapose life and death, and they are also juxtaposed against the cycle of images depicting Enoch's life below. Enoch's left-hand image conveys Enoch "begetting" the next male heir (accomplished visually by directing his gaze at the heir), in the same manner as Iared's image directly above it. Essentially, the handwritten text on this folio, which describes Enoch's lineage, punctuates the images, providing space and spacing for the visual genealogies of patriarchal lineage conveyed within the images. At the same time as they are punctuated by the written text, the images function as a narrative link between Iared, Enoch, and the rest of the male patriarchs leading from Adam to Noah. The images convey lineage and Enoch's difference from the other patriarchs, much like the order of the textual narrative, discussed more substantially in the previous chapter, which walks the Anglo-Saxon reader viewer through the lineage between patriarchs rendered sequential via the discursive text Kress would contend that these two modes work together in a complementary framing, each repeating and reinforcing the

other. However, I contend that the visual (as a graphic, material representation of the narrative) constitutes a conceptual frame positioning the text as both history and parable and thereby implicating the Anglo-Saxon audience within the text. In the bottom right image, Enoch ascends a ladder into heaven, one hand lifted in exaltation; the Almighty, positioned in the clouds at the top, right corner of the image, reaches down and grasps Enoch's other arm, greeting him as a friend. Applying Kress's visual grammar rubric, the way that visuals operate semiotically in the processes of framing, we notice that the Almighty is positioned within the "new/ideal" position of the frame, while Enoch (in the lower, left side of the image) constitutes the "given/real." However, their physical interaction (God grabbing Enoch) occurs at the intersection of all four: it is new and given, real and ideal simultaneously. Visually, this constructs God and His interactions with His followers as always and already present through the visual narrative *within* the graphic frame: the visual logic reinforces His existence as the Alpha and the Omega for the Anglo-Saxon audience.

While this can be deciphered from an analysis within the graphic frame, there are also several other frames, both graphic and conceptual, that are being blurred simultaneously on this folio that we can identify through an enriched methodology. For example, the ladder and the physical interaction between Enoch and Almighty blur the boundaries between the earthly and the divine. Rachel Crabtree suggests that "distance in spatial terms [in medieval manuscripts] is an indication of distance in spiritual terms" (47). Compared with other images and other depictions of God, Enoch is one of only a few characters in the Hexateuch who is visually afforded this close, spiritual connection.[22] Iared, for example, never visually crosses the boundary between heaven and earth; he remains neatly within his frame and wrapped within the shroud. Contrasted with Iared, Enoch's escape of a physical death in addition to his evident joy make him the hero of the page, soliciting the audience of the Hexateuch to believe and behave in a similar manner. The frame-play implies to the Anglo-Saxons: live like your ancestor Enoch, and you too can

_____

[22] The Almighty is depicted in several different ways in the Hexateuch, mostly as the *manus dei.* However, a few of the images in Genesis depict a fully physical God, always closely depicted to His most devout and important followers, making Him more accessible to both those followers and to the Anglo-Saxon viewer-readers who would have had access to the text. Notably, Adam, Abraham, and Noah are the others privileged with this "closeness."

escape the shroud. A visual grammar, like Kress's, which only examines the ways in which images make meaning within the frame and as a semiotically discrete from other modes cannot account for the transgression of these conceptual and graphic frames.

Additionally, on this folio, there is no clear semiotic distinction between the word and the image. God's *mandorla*, a visual symbol of his authority and difference from mortal Enoch, extends beyond the uppermost border of the image, into the text above, which reads

> for þam þe Drihten genam hine mid sawle & mid lichaman/
>
> because the Lord took him, soul and body. (Crawford 98)

The last letter of *lichaman*, the Old English for body, is stretched to fit the space above the image, to make that material space seem more complete, more whole. The Almighty extends into this word, into the text of/and Enoch's body. This does two things semiotically: 1) The text of *lichaman* becomes a part of the image, written in such a way that it conveys the mystical nature of Enoch being drawn from the physical world into the spiritual world without losing his physical body: the N is ethereal, and it is fundamentally different than the letters around it, which invites the audience to see the word it conveys differently; and 2) by extending beyond the frame, the head of the Almighty becomes a part of the text as well as the image and simultaneously restructures the written text as a part of the image. The implications of the transgression of the frame and the semiotic revision it performs are twofold: 1) it blurs the semiotic boundaries between the images and the written word/Word; and 2) it reveals that the frames here (and frames in general) are fluid, permeable boundaries and not discrete semiotic markers that Kress claims they are, and that semiotic fluidity invites the audience to embody the text.

Both of these effects are compounded by the fact that the artists depict God holding a codex, His Word, in the crook of His left arm. This visually reinforces the authority of the Word (because of the transgression) and makes the Word present in the image (as its exigence). This is imageword. At the conjunction of image and word through the transgression of the frame, this folio reflects and reinforces the benefits of a (physically and spiritually) close relationship with the Almighty, the human potential to escape the shroud in body and spirit (reflected in the ethereal nature of Enoch's body in both *lichaman* and the image). Kress's concept of the frame

and of visual grammar simply does not allow for the blurring between heaven and earth or between image and word, both of which are reflected by the extension of God into Enoch's textual body. His theories only allow us to describe and interpret that there is/was a spiritual connection between Enoch and the Almighty.

In this folio, the frame-play, as a part of the narrative of Genesis, transgresses the semiotic boundaries between image and word. There is no difference between the two in the Hexateuch. It also reveals the way in which the frame is a fluid, permeable space. This kind of semiotic play challenges 1) our understanding of multimodality as discrete modes and 2) our perception of literacy both in the Anglo-Saxon time period (before Kress's semiotic "revolution") and in our own perception (in which words and images are separate entities that might be used together).

Visual Codification of the Word

The visual codification of the written word in the Hexateuch blurs the *conceptual* frame between the text and the images, illustrating that, for the Anglo-Saxon composers, literacy operated at the intersection of the two. Folio 27r is an example of this. (See Figure 3.5) At the bottom of the folio, there is an image in which God and Abraham shake hands, visually signifying the seal of the Abrahamic covenant. Not only is it another physical interaction between the Almighty and a devout follower, but Barnhouse asserts that "the word [for] the idea of covenant, pledge or agreement seems to have had certain visual connotations for the Hexateuch artist. Although *wedd*, translating *feodus*, appears many times throughout the manuscript, often with no illustration, three times, each of them in Genesis, a handshake is pictured" (*Text and Image* 121). The visual consistency suggests that the artists of the Hexateuch had a very specific understanding of the meaning of *wedd* and a codified way of conveying that meaning to the Anglo-Saxon reader-viewer. Even if the audience could not read the word, there is a consistent way of portraying the covenant through handshake, visually signaling the idea of "covenant" each time it appears in the text and image. This continuity displays a kind of literacy in which there are no clear distinctions between image and word: in the Hexateuch *wedd* is both. The image has its root in word: it typologically conveys one distinct idea (that of covenant, pledge, or agreement), making it clear that these images are born of words and the Word, and the words themselves are images. *Wedd* has an indexical visual meaning that makes it a uniquely

Anglo-Saxon interpretation (one intended to allow reader-viewers who could not make meaning from the discursive text to access the narrative of Genesis through the visual meaning from the handshake).

This is an understanding of literacy in which image and word are inextricable, which current theories of multimodality elide. I argue that it develops from the frame-play in the material (the graphic frame), ideological (the Old and New Testaments), and semiotic (image and word) on this particular folio. Returning to Kress's visual grammar rubric, which explores how visuals make meaning within a frame, we see that the handshake occurs at the intersection of the "real" and "ideal" in the "given" section of the image. Conversely, in the "new/given" portion of the image is Abraham's abode. Within this frame, the Anglo-Saxon audience is shown that the Abrahamic covenant is/was already occurring; when read as an example for the Anglo-Saxon audience, it is something that the reader-viewer should already be living through an affective literacy. Thus, the image conveys the continued importance of the Abrahamic covenant and living like Abraham, which will result in security, portrayed by Abraham's abode and salvation in the "new" portion of the image. Here, as in the previous example, the transgression of the graphic frame is used to reflect and reinscribe the authority of God and an Anglo-Saxon society centered on Him and His word. Abraham remains entirely within the confines of the frame of this particular image. In fact, his back is hunched in a submissive bow to the Almighty; he is contained by both the frame and the authority of God, who conversely stands confidently with His feet on the bottommost border of the frame and His head and *mandorla* extending above the uppermost. Like on folio 11v (See Figure 3.4), this transgression reinforces the presence of the Almighty in all parts of the Hexateuch, specifically in the written text conveying His Word. Again on this folio, God carries a codex, a visual depiction of His Word. In this image, however, there is a prominent cross of the cover of the book. This blurs the lines between the conceptual frames of Old and New Testament faith. Visually, the cross on the codex situates Christianity within the pre-Christ context of Genesis. Also, it helps to alleviate Aelfric's anxiety about the translation of the Old Testament into the vernacular: as mentioned in the previous chapter, he feared that the existence of the text in a more accessible language than Latin would lead to improper (read: literal) readings and understandings of the Bible, especially because of the

inherent tensions between the Old and New Testaments (like circumcision in the Abrahamic covenant). The cross on the Word of the Almighty reminds the reader-viewer of the New Testament, simultaneously revising the Old. While Kress's visual grammar allows us to see the presence and authority of God (He and His word are given, real, and ideal), it does not account for these multifaceted transgressions. In this folio and the one above, the Word is present in the image, and the transgression of the graphic frame makes it very difficult to distinguish between the conceptual frames of Old and New Testament. In the orthopraxis of the Anglo-Saxons, the affective literacy they were to embody as a result of experiencing the Hexateuch, there was no difference between the two.

The Frame as Text

The frame can also be a part of the discursive text, of the semiotic processes of the modes it encompasses. Thereby, the material transgressions can have semiotic implications for the meaning the text makes. For example, the destruction of Sodom, as it is visualized in the Hexateuch, portrays the consequences of not adhering to the Word and failing to embody the kind of spiritual devotion portrayed therein. The image occurs on folio 32v (See Figure 3.6) and depicts chaos: orange lines on top of the buildings portray fire; most of the characters grip columns or each other for stability; others have fallen over already deceased. Kress's visual grammar would define the image like this: in the top of half of the image, the "ideal," are the buildings in flame in addition to a calm blue sky. The buildings and the sky, however, are separated by red horizontal lines; heaven is unattainable. At the bottom of the image, in the "real," are the sinners, the victims of God's wrath. Both halves of the images cross the boundaries between "given" and "new." In this "framing," the chaos resulting from sin consumes the image: it is a part of the past and the present, and its position within the "ideal" makes it desirable. The separation of the serenity of heaven from the fire below by the red border constructs it as inescapable: sin must and will be punished. However, this interpretation using only Kress's theories of the visual is incomplete because of the ways in which the frame of the image itself is also used as a narrative device.

Two characters in the bottom left of the image cling to the frame in an attempt to escape the destruction, as if they can escape the wrath of the Almighty by escaping the Hexateuch itself.

59

Here, like before, the frame becomes inhabited, becomes a part of the story; and in so doing, it is shattered, which simultaneously shatters the conceptual frame separating the Hexateuch and the life of the reader-viewer. Of these particular characters' actions, Benjamin C. Withers asserts that "their transgression of the visual barrier pushes the frame backward onto the page while, in turn, the frame presses the figures outward toward the viewer" ("Secret" 57). By having these characters cling to the frame, the artists impose the image and its ideological implications (the punishment of sin) out onto the reader-viewer's lifeworld simultaneously shattering the (comfortable) boundary between text and reader. This visually conveys the threat of living outside the Word (as a set lived practices): sin, and you will be punished. Through this supplemented perception of the visual and of frames, we can see how the Hexateuch embodies an affective literacy, which invites the Anglo-Saxon audience to embody the conceptual frames, the lived practices, visually framed therein.

However, this image is also steeped in the language of the Hexateuch. The shattering of this frame was most likely an intentional strategy because of the composers' perception of the sins that occurred in Sodom. Barnhouse addresses this perception in her dissertation by acknowledging and translating the following:

> Se leoðscipe wæs swa bysmorful, þæt hi woldon fullice ongean gecynd heora galnyssae gefullan, na mid wimmanum, ac swa fullice þæt us sceamad hyt opelice to secgenne, & þæt was heora hream, þaet hi openlice heora fylde gefremedon

> The people were so shameful that they intended dissolutely, in a way contrary to nature, to fulfill their lust, not with women, but so foully that it is shameful to us to say it publicly, and that was their sorrow, that they openly performed filth. (*Text and Image* 47)

These lines in the Hexateuch stand in place of the verses of Genesis which detail Lot's willingness to let the Sodomites rape his daughters instead of raping the angels who have come to visit them. They serve as an emendation to the biblical text that explains away and re-frames what they would have interpreted as a moral discrepancy between Lot's behavior in this scene and his existence as a moral exemplar and patriarch in the narrative of Genesis. They also explain the need to visualize the destruction of Genesis: the sin is so foul that they can neither

write of, nor show, it. They can, however, depict the punishment. These lines, composed specifically for this particular translation, manifest within the image through the shattering of the graphic and thereby conceptual frame, a semiotic capability neglected by current theories of multimodality.

The text on this page also conveys this:

> God towearþ þa swa mid granum da burga, & ealne þone eard endemes towende, & ealle þa burhward forbaernde aetgaedere/
>
> God then so scattered with fury the cities, and all the land overthrew, and all the inhabitants of the cities burned up together. (Crawford 133)

This verse and the unspeakable nature of the sins of the Sodomites are written texts that saturate the image. Thus, this image cannot be semiotically separated from the words that inspired/begat it, because these frames, both conceptual and graphic, are permeable boundaries. The shattering of the frame on this particular folio pushes that threat out into the Anglo-Saxon audience (making it of the utmost importance to follow God's will and Word to avoid the fires of His wrath), to embody the piety portrayed by figures like Noah and Abraham. That frame-play is an integral part of the narrative, because it implicates the audience within the text as it simultaneously threatens that audience with the punishment of sin. As both history and parable, the destruction of Sodom was clearly still extremely relevant to an Anglo-Saxon audience: the image visually defines the consequences of living outside of God's will and Word. Kress's perception of visual grammar and his perception that image and word can be separated elide the way in which this image begins and ends with the Word. By perceiving the frame as only a way to separate texts from other texts (sentences from other sentences, and images from other images), we cannot see the way in which frames themselves can also be a part of the text as a whole. Here, the frame is a part of the visual narrative and thus a part of the Word, calling into question the Kress's neat, semiotic boundaries.

Folio 14r utilizes this same style of frame transgressions (shattering the *graphic* frame and imposing outward the lived practices presented in the book), and, in so doing, it constructs a

visual covenant between the Hexateuch and its reader-viewers (covenant as a set of lived practices). This folio depicts two particular scenes: 1) a conversation between God and Noah and 2) the beginning of Noah's time on the ark. The page is visually aggressive: only a few lines of prose appear on the page, crammed on top of and beneath the frame of the images in addition to some later annotations re-forming a barrier between the upper and lower images. In the upper image, God and Noah are physically close, exemplifying the piety of Noah and the spiritual connection between the two. God carries His codex, infusing His visual depiction with the authority of the Word. In the lower image, the ark spatially extends beyond the left and right graphic frame of the image. Unlike in the image in which God and Abraham shake hands to seal the Abrahamic covenant, in the upper image, the Almighty is on the left side of the frame and Noah in the center. At the left, according to Kress's visual grammar, the Almighty constitutes the "given," "real," and "ideal." In the visual logic, His Word embodied by the codex is in the given ideal. Thus, Kress's theory allows us to see the authority of the Word as the beginning -- the inception -- of the narrative of this image; it is an image predicated by and growing out of the words that formulate the Word. Noah, as both historical figure and moral example, is at the intersection of all four regions: given, new, real, and ideal. While the Word is the subject, Noah is the object receiving instruction from God's Word and/or establishing that he is righteous enough to receive that instruction, thus reinforcing the kind of behavior (pious obedience) expected both in the Hexateuch and out of it in Anglo-Saxon society, thereby constructing a conceptual frame within the graphic.

Additionally, the ark in the lower image is noteworthy for two reasons, both connected to the way it interacts with frames. First, the ark transgresses and thereby shatters the frame; the composers clearly believed that this part of Genesis warranted visual emphasis enough to "play" semiotically with the frame like the characters on 32v. (See Figure 3.7) This is most likely because the story of Noah serves as a parable of the blessings that can be derived from obedience. All Anglo-Saxons, according to those composers, should strive to be like Noah and imitate his closeness to God; shattering the frame pushes that image and the moral contained within out as it draws the Anglo-Saxon reader-viewer into it. Second, the head of the ark is a

dragon, Scandinavian in design.[23] This design reveals a uniquely Anglo-Saxon interpretation of the story of Noah, and the ark disintegrates the temporal boundaries between the Anglo-Saxon audience and the characters of Genesis, bringing Noah's obedience into an Anglo-Saxon context, which makes it more accessible and more easily embodied/lived. The Anglo-Saxon audience would have been held accountable for that kind of obedience, because all of these transgressions culminate, shattering of the frame of the Hexateuch as text and object and dismantling the boundary between text and audience. Noah's obedience is a part of their history and a part of their lifeworld. These are methods employed by a team of Anglo-Saxon artists and scribes who were making meaning at the intersection of image and word, providing a counter-narrative to Kress's assumption about the recent semiotic revolution and proving the rich history of multimodality. These Anglo-Saxon scribes used images to revise the story of Genesis and make it more relatable in an Anglo-Saxon context and shattered the frame to share that revised version of Genesis (and the social dynamic presented therein) to the reader-viewers.

These two examples of the shattering of the frame have revealed two nuanced revisions to understandings of multimodal meaning-making (both in the Anglo-Saxon context and in our own digital milieu). The first is that the transgression of frames can have implications for the interpretation and reception of a text, which current theories of multimodality elide. The second is that, when the frame is accepted as a permeable boundary, we can see the ways in which ideological frames can be blurred through the material transgressions (like Anglo-Saxons being brought into the context of Genesis in folio 14r and vice versa). These nuances, I argue, need to be incorporated into multimodality, and they lead me into my final example in this chapter.

Word as Omnipresent

The final example and best illustration of the transgression of frames and the inextricability of image and word is the presence of language, specifically the Word (written language prescribing a set of lived practices) in all images in the Hexateuch, even on those folios that do not include any written text: these textless pages still exemplify the interdependency of image and word. On folio 2r (see Figure 3.9), for example, there is no written text, but the folio is still filled with the presence of the Word. This folio, a full-page image, occurs after the first six

---

[23] Milton Gatch, "Noah's Raven in Genesis A and the Old English Hexateuch"

lines of Genesis folio 1v and before the continuation of the story on 2v, thereby seemingly interrupting the story of Genesis itself. It depicts the Fall of Lucifer and the rebellious angels. Lucifer and the Almighty are both depicted within *mandorlas* (which themselves constitute micro-frames) but in two very different ways: God owns the space of His, comfortably and serenely positioned within as He faces away from the Fallen; conversely, the faceless depiction of Lucifer grips the edges of his, which is lopsided and in the jaws of a great serpent, like the Sodomites clutching the frame seeking safety. Through this depiction, the folio constructs and establishes several dualities: heaven and hell, stability and chaos, good and evil, obedience and sin.[24] When "read" through the lens of Kress's visual grammar, those dualities are reinforced. God, His angels (all of whom are facing Him), and Heaven are at the top of the image, in the "ideal." Lucifer and the rest of the Fallen compose the "real." Automatically, before the fall of Adam and Eve and any of the other failures of humankind, the Hexateuch defines hell and sin as both real and present. Also, in the "ideal" presence of God, there is symmetry between the "given" and the "new": an equal number of angels on either side of the Almighty face Him, and their serenity in their servitude is evident. However, in the "real" hell portrayed at the bottom on the image, Lucifer is the given and the serpent constitutes the new, visually providing a history and homily on the dangers of hell.

This image also uses the transgression of the graphic frame as a part of the narrative, which blurs the conceptual frame between the image and the words/Word in the Hexateuch, infusing the image with the Word. For instance, the feet of the angels, both holy and wicked, transgress the ornate graphic frame of the image. Shattering the boundary (between the image and the text of Genesis that it interrupts) allows the dualities established and constructed within the image to permeate Genesis and the rest of the Hexateuch. The very presence of this image -- compounded by its full-page treatment -- saturates the remainder of the text with both the possible stability of heaven and the threat of the chaos of hell and thereby creating the immediate necessity to adhere to the Word and the words surrounding the image, to live accordingly.

---

24 Benjamin C. Withers explores these dualities extensively in his article "A Secret and Feverish Genesis."

Even more threatening than the transgression of the frame by the feet of the angels, though, is the serpent attempting to engulf Lucifer and his mandorla. The style of this particular serpent is Scandinavian in origin, making it a uniquely Anglo-Saxon image and interpretation of the Fall. Ruth Melinkoff contendss that "the uncustomary serpent does not reflect any special interpretation of the text; the serpent designs do not alter the biblical meaning. This imagery does, however, divulge aesthetic preferences, and it shows how Scandinavian styles were absorbed into Anglo-Saxon art" (52). However, I disagree. The presence of Scandinavian imagery contextualizes the Fall, the narrative of Genesis, and the rest of Hexateuch for a uniquely Anglo-Saxon audience; like the Anglo-Saxon ark, it re-frames conceptually the biblical story and positions the Anglo-Saxons within the text. It is an image made for and by Anglo-Saxons in the early eleventh century, blurring the chronological and historical boundaries between the Anglo-Saxons and the patriarchs described in Genesis; the graphic imagery serves conceptual purposes, which makes the cultural practices and spirituality described therein more accessible and more easily absorbed, because, according to Withers, images like these "provided exempla -- of threatened judgment, national sin leading to national disaster -- by which the conditions of the past and present could be read" ("Secret" 59). The image becomes a conceptual frame by which the Anglo-Saxons interpreted the story of Genesis, the message of the Hexateuch, and their own socio-cultural conditions. By viewing the image, they are drawn into the text of Aelfric's preface and of the narrative of Genesis; by being drawn into the text, they are held accountable for it.

The frames here constitute a particular conceptual framing of the biblical story found within the Hexateuch. The Fall does not actually occur in Genesis. This framing is one that current theories of multimodality do not allow us to see because they do not account for the transgression of frames and inherent interplay between image and word. Even with no Old English words on the page, the authority of the Word is still present and a presence within this image and, thus, within the rest of the Hexateuch; because of that, the text performs an affective literacy, prescribing a way of living for its reader-viewers.

Conclusion

Kress and others have sought to theorize the way in which the "new" media technologies of composing have affected meaning-making processes. However, in their attempt to do so, they have, unawares, limited the explanatory power of modes, multimodality, and literacy. Digital technologies have definitely made multimodal composing easier, more available, and more visible; they have not, however, changed the semiotic realm itself. In this chapter and in this project, I have argued that modes are not discrete semiotic entities which can be easily separated and codified, and multimodality is not the additive combination of those discrete entities. Modes are interpenetrating and interdependent literacy tools that are always already working together in the Hexateuch.

The analysis of these few images from the Hexateuch in this section highlights the inconsistencies of multimodality as a theory and description of communication. Kress's theory of visual grammar, succinctly embodied by the graph I have used in this chapter, can be a useful tool of analysis, even for historical images. It does not, however, allow for a full understanding of images because of the way it implicitly limits the frame and its position in the processes of meaning-making. I do agree with Kress: there is definitely no meaning without framing. However, the social-semiotic spaces constructed by those frames are not limited to the texts encapsulated therein; the frame itself, writ large to include the spatial and the temporal, the physical and the ideological, is intertwined with the meaning made within the frame. This is why the images in the Hexateuch cannot be so easily separated from the text they accompany: the images do not merely illustrate or inform; they are inextricably connected to the Old English text. In the Hexateuch, visually, the transgression of conventional frames and boundaries of time periods, spaces, and ideological systems intentionally and inevitably dissolves the boundaries between text, image, and reader-viewer. As such, those transgressions awaken the ideological space of the manuscript page, pushing the narrative out into Anglo-Saxon audience and imposing the belief-system described and constructed therein on that audience. Thus, the visual narrative of Genesis is revised from history and genealogy to a parable just as the written text is; that narrative visually sanctifies a set of behaviors and beliefs and simultaneously codifies those beliefs through the transgression of boundaries of both frames and modes. The Word and the

images cannot be separated; the Word is always the beginning and the end of these images. Additionally, by conceiving of the frame as a graphic and conceptual entity that can be and frequently is transgressed, we can see how a reader-viewer is implicated within a text, invited to embody it, constituting an affective literacy that is currently absent from theories of multimodality.

In this chapter, I have outlined four ways in which the frame is used as a narrative-rhetorical device in the meaning-making processes of the Old English Hexateuch. Each way points to the inextricability of image and word and of the body and meaning-making in literacy. In so doing, I have provided a counterclaim to both the logic of binaries and the selective reading of history that Kress employs in his scholarship concerning multimodality. From this perspective, I do not contend that the categories that I have suggested are not discrete. My analysis has shown the ways in which they overlap and combine to make meaning. Kress's method does allow us to do two very interesting things with multimodal texts: 1) see how modes interact with one another to form a complete, framed text and 2) understand how those framings reveal/reinscribe social dynamics in process. However, at the same time, these theories of multimodality treat both modes and frames as concrete, fixed boundaries.

I argue for a different perspective, one similar to Mary Olson's claim of image and word: "that they refuse to stay contained within their taxonomic spaces. They continually climb over, under or around boundaries that are erected to control them. The same is true for every classification scene or dichotomy that is offered in explanation or description of how marks made in graphic fields are to be viewed, read or interpreted" (xix). Olson contends that, historically, the distinctions between modes and frames, as my analysis has shown, have not been so clear. Written words themselves are images and language is the tool with which humans define, describe, and interprets the world just as much as it is the tool with which they separate themselves from it – it cannot be separated from image This is the kind of perspective from which multimodality should be theoretically revised. In this way, we can see literacy (as well as multimodality) differently. Multimodality, then, becomes the implementation of a set of interpenetrating and interdependent semiotic resources with which we shape and frame meaning. Simultaneously, literacy is the process by which use and understanding those semiotic resources

to frame the kinds of meaning we can make. From this perspective, image and word cannot be separated, just as the frame cannot be separated from the text it surrounds, just as a "text" cannot be separated from the body which makes meaning from it, which *lives* it.

CHAPTER 4

CONCLUSIONS

Throughout this work, I have had two major goals: 1) to revisit and revise our accepted understandings of multimodality and its position within literacy; and 2) to place those revisions in an historical context prior to the current digital moment. To accomplish both goals, I have furthered Gunther Kress's argument that multimodality is an inextricable part of the meaning-making process to emphasize that is has *always* been a part of literacy even though we have only begun to define and discuss it in the past two decades. I fully agree with his claim that all meaning is inherently, inevitably multimodal. This is, in part, why I have intentionally selected a medieval manuscript as the focus of this project. Illuminated manuscripts are irrefutably multimodal and reveal that multimodality indeed flourished before the prevalence of digital technologies. Image and word were one on the manuscript page of the codex. Through the preceding examination of the Hexateuch as a part of the history of literacy and multimodality, I hope to offer new insights concerning the position of multimodality as theory and practice. In this concluding chapter, I summarize the argument that I have made and end with the claims that this project invites me to make, extrapolating the implications of those claims.

Questioning Multimodality

In recent years, an overwhelming amount of scholarship has been conducted on multimodality, and overwhelmingly that scholarship has privileged digital technologies and (con)texts. Anything that receives such a place of privilege ought to be questioned and re-examined. At the beginning of this project, I raised the questions, "how might we supplement current theories of multimodality to account for and include the embodied literacy emerging from more historical technologies of composing, and what enlarged picture of literacy might we gain from that investigation?" To answer those questions, I looked to the Old English Hexateuch, a historical text from the eleventh century, well before the "semiotic revolution" that some contend has occurred as a result of the increasing prevalence and availability of digital technologies. My argument has been, in essence, an answer to those questions, one that

constitutes a counterclaim to the fixedness of the concepts of multimodality. That argument has developed from two points: the first concerns the semiotic fluidity of modes, frames, and boundaries between reader and text, and the second, which weaves throughout the first, involves the embodied responses invited by that fluidity.

The first premise of my argument is that modes are complex, shifting, and interdependent. Current perceptions of the word, for example, offer that "text" makes meaning only though sequentiality and linearity. Yet written text is always inherently imagistic, and its visuality inevitably impacts the way that it is read, because the way it *appears* on the page visually emphasizes, complicates, and/or enriches the meaning of the text just as much as the *order* of the words on the page. For instance, ornate rubrications and red, non-biblical introduction begin the narrative of Abraham in Genesis. These visual elements of the text invite the audience of Anglo-Saxon (and contemporary) reader-viewers to see the text differently, to distinguish that particular narrative from the others. Thus, word is always imageword. At the same time, in the Hexateuch, word is always Word: handwritten biblical text that defines, sanctifies, and solicits a way of *living* in accordance with the text for the reader-viewer. By visually emphasizing the written narrative of Abraham, the Hexateuch invites the audience to replicate Abraham's piety in their own lives. The mode of text operates at the nexus of sequential order, visuality, and the embodied response their combination invites.

Similarly, this premise suggests the mode of image is more complex than currently theorized within multimodal scholarship. Those theories contend that the logic of image is determined by spatial arrangement, because images reveal all semiotic material at once (unlike written text which is dependent on a linear unfolding of semiotic material). Kress even offers a rubric for analyses of that kind of logic. However, such a proposal does two things: 1) it confines the image to meaning that can only be made within the frame; 2) it conceptualizes the frame as a fixed boundary (that isolates both image and text). However, images are always implicated by the language of the cultural context in which they are produced, and this is semiotically possible because the "frame" separating image and word is always permeable, a characteristic especially manifested within the Hexateuch. Additionally, while I do agree with Kress that there is no meaning without framing, I call for a revised understanding of the frame, one that includes the

process by which modes frame one another (and work together to contextualize the text for the audience) and the process by which a frame's a material and ideological space is frequently transgressed. In those transgressions, the frame is shattered. For example, the Almighty's *mandorla* extends into the textual body, *lichaman*, of Enoch on folio 14r. The image transgresses the frame that surrounds it and the boundary between image and word. The imageword constructed by the extension of the Almighty into Enoch's *lichaman* reveals the importance of a "close" relationship with God; the transgression of the graphic frame pushes that relationship out from the Hexateuch onto the reader-viewer, inviting the audience to embody that relationship as well. These more capacious understandings of word, image, and frame offer an understanding of multimodality as a fundamental part of an embodied literacy. Through an examination of this text from a different historical period, we see the ways that our understandings of multimodality should be more fluid, ways that I describe more fully in a following section.

Constraints, Implications, and Future Possibilities

Before I address the implications of my study, I must first address how are the insights I derive here limited by my selection of this text and this period. In my analysis of the Old English Hexateuch, I have limited myself to only two modes of meaning, the textual and the visual. However, there are several other modes at work in the book: the color of the images, the sound of the Old English words as they would have been read aloud for the audience, emphatic gestures that may or may not have been utilized by the performer of the text, and so forth. These would have inevitably affected the meanings that were made from the text, and more work might be done on these others modes to construct a more robust understanding of how the Hexateuch means through the lens of multimodality. Also, while my investigation of Genesis can allow insights about the multimodal construction of the inception of humankind's relationship with the Almighty, there are five other books within the story that I have not included: Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, and Joshua. These books, while they might, even probably, make meaning in the same way as Genesis, would have different implications for the lived practices invited by each text. A complete *orthopraxis* could only be developed by a thorough investigation of imageword and frame-play in all six of the Books.

71

Additionally, my experience with the Hexateuch as a material object has been, at best, secondary. Most of my time spent with the folios I describe and analyze in this project was mediated through the computer screen, which has inevitably colored my interpretation of the pages. Through digital technologies, I was able to zoom in, enhance, and brighten images, which allowed me to see things I would not have been able to otherwise. While I did spend a significant amount of time with a facsimile, that facsimile is an edited version by C.R. Dodwell and Peter Clemoes, a selected *framing* of the Hexateuch that included scholarly sources and that has been printed on glossy paper. Inevitably, my interpretations would have been different if I had been able to hold the actual manuscript in my hands, feel the binding, smell the parchment, for these elements too are part of its multimodal meaning-making process. I am also limited by the genre of the Hexateuch, an illuminated biblical text. While the monastery and the Church were definite forces of knowledge-making in the Middle-Ages, there are hosts of other genres that could be explored for an understanding of medieval multimodality: Books of Hours, bestiaries, miscellanies, and so forth.[25] Finally, while my project situates multimodality within the eleventh century, adding one thousand years to the history of multimodality, this is still a fairly recent application considering the history of literacy. There could be work done even before the invention of the codex and/or outside of Western contexts. For example, my research question (how did multimodality function in the eleventh century in the Hexateuch?) could also be transferred to Ancient Egypt and the technologies associated with composition on papyrus, an example that leads me into the implications of this study: how we might re-conceive of multimodality in a way that will allow us to study other technologies, eras, and cultures?

From the research and the analysis done in this project, I contend that our perspective of multimodality needs to be revised. I further the claims of Paul Prior, Anne Wysocki, and Christopher Carter in regard to contemporary theories of multimodality, which they perceive as ahistorical and unnecessarily dichotomous. That is not to say, however, that theories of multimodality have not greatly impacted our understanding of the modes of communication.

---

[25] These genres of manuscripts have, of course, been given considerable treatment in the fields of Medieval Studies and Art History. They have not, however, been examined from a multimodal perspective that explores them with the goal of understanding the history of literacy so that we might develop more nuanced pedagogies for contemporary students.

Gunther Kress and the New London Group have definitely changed the way we conceive of literacy, semiotics, and composition. Their call for a pedagogy of multiliteracies introduced concepts of the visual and the digital, vernacular literacy tools that were once left out of the study of language, into the conversation. The term itself, "multiliteracies," encapsulates the multifarious and ever-changing literacy practices that composers use through the emergence of technologies. Kress especially has provided a social-semiotic way to approach communication, a method that emphasizes the contextualized nature of communication, how context determines technology, genre, modal selection, and the way in which a text is framed. With those benefits in mind, the suggested revisions I make in the following section are geared toward further enriching our understanding of the position of multimodality in literacy: 1) multimodality should be historicized even more extensively than I have done here; 2) our definition of multimodality should be more fluid; and 3) the way in which materiality impacts multimodality should be explored in different ways.

Multimodality, I believe, has yet to be placed within sufficient historical contexts. Literacy, as I illustrated in Chapter 1, is imbricated; the way we produce, consume, and transmit texts is inherently connected to previous historical moments and the past technologies of composition. Kress contends that all meaning-making is multimodal. His (and others') overwhelming emphasis on recent iterations of multimodal meaning-making undercuts the significance of that claim. The work I have done in this project has attempted to bridge the gap between the implications of the claim and its treatment in scholarship. If all meaning-making is multimodal, all literacy is as well. Thus, multimodality should be considered in other historical moments. As mentioned above, I have only outlined the way multimodality functions in one historical moment, in one genre, in one specific text. However, to further nuance our understanding of the inextricability of multimodality and literacy (how they function socially, how they impact knowledge formation, how they affect the ways in which meaning can be made in the world), we should consider a plurality of moments, genres, texts, and modal interactions. The examinations of the Hexateuch that I have provided here suggest that we move away from the dichotomous frameworks that have been assigned to multimodal texts in an attempt to theorize them. Thus, the work that might be done in any multimodal analysis of historical text should be careful to undo

the clear semiotic boundaries that have been placed onto modes. If image and word cannot be kept separate, discrete, or finite, neither can color, sound, gesture, and so forth. The first step in this research might focus on moments of transition throughout the history of literacy: the shifts from oral culture to the written word, from the scroll to the codex, from the handwritten codex to the machine-pressed print, and from print to the digital. In these moments, multimodality, as an inextricable part of literacy and processes of meaning-making, is may be carried over, revised, and repurposed in different ways that continue to have implications on our own understandings of literacy.

My second claim is that, to do this kind of work, our new definition of what constitutes multimodality should be, paradoxically, both more structured and fluid. That is, it needs to be able to reflect what we know about literacy across historical periods at the same time that it invites further revision as we study multimodality historically and currently. Modes, as Kress asserts, do semiotic work in the meaning-making process. However, while each mode has its own limitations and affordances, modes are always already working together in texts. A painting, for example, is steeped in the language and epistemology of the sociohistorical moment in which it was composed. The first step, then, in this process of redefinition might be to question the term "mode." As a term, I find mode problematic, because it implies that one single mode can be isolated from the others within a text. As I have illustrated in my discussion of image, word, and imageword in the Hexateuch, this is impossible. One option is that I would offer is that the term "mode" might be revised to "multimode," a term that Kress uses sporadically in his work. Using multimode as a key term in a revised theory of multimodality could allow us to look at different parts of a text or composition while simultaneously reminding us that those modes cannot be separated. This is a seemingly simple revision, which can change our understanding of multimodality itself. Multimodality, then, is not the combination of discrete semiotic tools; it is the interplay of interpenetrating and interdependent literacy tools that are always already working together in any literate act. This nuanced definition also emphasizes the long history of multimodality as an inextricable part of literacy with significant implications for our teaching. Should we accept this historical and fluid understanding of multimodality, we can teach our students its long history: how the rhetorical selection of technologies and modes of composition

in Ancient Greece and Anglo-Saxon England continues to inform their own choices as multimodal composers and to demonstrate how their writing, both vernacular and academic, is always already multimodal. Armed with this knowledge, they can become more adroit and aware composers in contexts.

My third and final concern is the need to reconfigure materiality within multimodality. As it currently stands, the materiality of literacy objects only impacts the meaning-making process as a part of the experience of the text. That experience is limited to the interaction of the composition and its audience. For example, Kress discusses the weight and texture of chess pieces impacting a game of chess he plays. However, in my analysis the Hexateuch, I have emphasized the way in which the text solicits a lived response from the text. That way of living, defined as *orthopraxis*, continues after the reader-viewer-listener moves away from the text. The audience of the Hexateuch in Anglo-Saxon England would have been held accountable for the social dynamic defined therein as they led their daily lives. By aligning theories of multimodality with the concepts of embodied and affective literacies as *orthopraxis*, we can understand the ways in which the body is the vessel by which we experience and live texts, and we do so because of their material existence. All texts solicit a kind of embodied response to them through their materiality. For example, in the Hexateuch, the manuscript page constitutes the material intersection of image and word, wherein image and word act together, through their simultaneous sequential and spatial ordering, to delineate and enforce social dynamics predicated on the authority of God's Word. Additionally, that material page is activated by the transgression of the frames of the images, pushing those social dynamics out onto the reader-viewer-listener and making those reader-viewers a part of the text itself. Thus, texts are lived just as much as they are read or written. I suggest that multimodality, the materiality of multimodal texts, and their impact on our understanding of literacy should be addressed in terms of embodiment further than their current treatment. We might return to digital contexts, technologies, and compositions to examine the ways in which multimodal interactions on the screen delineate, perform, and invite embodied responses from their audiences. If the semiotic boundary of the manuscript page can be transgressed and thus implicate the body in processes of meaning-making, then so too can the computer screen. In fact, I could later return to this project to examine how my embodied

responses to the Hexateuch were colored by the fact that I interacted with both a facsimile and an on-screen version of the text.

These three implications could culminate in future research that continues the historical trajectory approach that Kress has utilized tracing what he argues to be the increasing visuality of science textbooks. For example, a future study might trace different iterations of the same text, like Genesis, which I have utilized in this project, by looking at an illuminated, handwritten version of the Bible in comparison with the Gutenberg Bible produced by the printing press, asking the questions, "how does multimodality shift with the technologies of production, and how do those shifts affect the kind of embodied responses that the text invites?" In fact, work could even be done to compare these moments with a digital, hyperlinked version of Genesis or perhaps with the Creation Museum in Kentucky as a physical, multimodal iteration or expression of Genesis. At each of these moments and with each of these technologies, multimodality and its impact on an embodied literacy is revised, repurposed, and carried over in ways that continue to inform our own multiliteracies.

Looking Forward

At the end of this project, it is prudent for me to acknowledge Gunther Kress and his commitment to theorizing multimodality and its implications for pedagogy. This project is both an affirmation and an enrichment of his theories. He has provided this project and the fields of semiotics and literacy studies with a term and a framework for understanding different modes of representation. Without his scholarship, it would not have been possible for me to raise the questions, perform the analysis, and offer the suggestions that I do here. What is necessary to continue the work that he has started, then, is to continue to accrue more detailed studies of multimodality, in other historical eras, even in other cultures, so that we are able to construct more robust depictions of literacy, depictions that can only aid us as we create pedagogies that teach literacy in all its myriad forms. As it currently stands, multimodality is unduly restricted to the current moment. In an attempt to understand the "new" technologies with which we compose, we have conflated the multimodal with the digital, hindering our understanding of its crucial position in literacy. The way we theorize, discuss, and teach multimodality should be

76

nuanced to include the revisions I have sketched here, revisions that include its long history, a new understanding of what and how multimodality means, and the impact of materiality on that process of meaning-making. In so doing, we open ourselves up to an enriched, more encompassing understanding of literacy.

REFERENCES

Aelfric, William Lisle, and S J. Crawford. *The Old English Version of the Heptateuch: Aelfric's Treatise on the Old and New Testament and His Preface to Genesis*. London: Pub. for Early English Text Society, by H. Milford, Oxford University Press, 1922. Print.

Amsler, Mark. "Affective Literacy: Gestures of Reading in the Later Middle Ages." 18 Vol. Muse Project, 2001. 83-109. *JSTOR.* Web. 08/15/11.

Barnhouse, Rebecca, and Benjamin C. Withers. *The Old English Hexateuch: Aspects and Approaches*. Kalamazoo, Mich: Medieval Institute Publications, Western Michigan University, 2000. Print.

Beal, Peter. *A Dictionary of English Manuscript Terminology, 1450 to 2000*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008. Print.

Bernhardt, Stephen A. "Seeing the Text." *College Composition and Communication* 37.1 (1986): 66-78. *JSTOR.* Web. 08/19/11.

Carruthers, Mary J. *The Book of Memory: A Study of Memory in Medieval Culture*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2008. Print.

---. *The Craft of Thought: Meditation, Rhetoric, and the Making of Images, 400-1200*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998. Print.

Carter, Christopher. "Writing with Light: Jacob Riis's Ambivalent Exposures." *College English* 71.2 (2008); 117-141. Web.

Cope, Bill and Mary Kalantzis. "Designs for social futures." *Multiliteracies: Literacy Learning and the Design of Social Futures*. Ed. Bill Cope and Mary Kalantzis. London: Routledge, 2000. Print.

Camille, Michael. "Gothic Signs and the Surplus: The Kiss on the Cathedral." *Yale French Studies*. (1991); 151-170. Print.

Faigley, Lester. "Material Literacy and Visual Design." *Rhetorical Bodies: Toward a Material Rhetoric*. Ed. Jack Selzer and Sharon Crowley. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1999. 171-201. Print.

Fleckenstein, Kristie S. *Embodied Literacies: Imageword and a Poetics of Teaching*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2003. Print.

---. *Vision, Rhetoric, and Social Action in the Composition Classroom*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2010. Print.

---. "Words Made Flesh: Fusing Imagery and Language in a Polymorphic Literacy." *College English* 66.6 (2004). 612-631. Web.

Foucault, Michel, and Richard Howard. "Ceci n'Est Pas Une Pipe." *October* 1.Spring (1976): 6-21. *JSTOR.* Web. 08/17/11.

George, Diana. "From Analysis to Design: Visual Communication in the Teaching of Writing." *College Composition and Communication* 54.1 (2002): 11-39. *JSTOR.* Web. 08/15/11.

Grounds, Amelia. "Evolution of Manuscript: The Pavement Hours." *Design and Distribution of Late Medieval Manuscripts in England.* Ed. Margaret Connolly and Linne R. Mooney. York, England: York Medieval Press, 2008. (page range). Print.

Haas, Christina. *Writing Technology: Studies on the Materiality of Literacy*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., Publishers, 1996. Print.

Hocks, Mary E. "Understanding Visual Rhetoric in Digital Writing Environments." *College Composition and Communication* 54.4 (2003): 629-656. *JSTOR.* Web. 07/19/11.

Jacobs, Dale. "Marveling at "the Man Called Nova": Comics as Sponsors of Multimodal Literacy." *College Composition and Communication* 59.2 (2007): 180-205. *JSTOR.* Web. 08/15/11.

Karkov, Catherine E. "Manuscript Art." *Working with Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts*. Ed. Gale R Owen-Crocker and Maria Cesario. Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 2009. Print.

Karkov, Catherine E. "Text and Image in the Red Book of Darley." *Text, Image, Interpretation: Studies in Anglo-Saxon Literature*. Ed. Alastair Minnis and Jane Roberts. Turnhout: Brepols, 2007. 135-148. Print.

Karkov, Catherine E. *Text and Picture in Anglo-Saxon England: Narrative Strategies in the Junius 11 Manuscript*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2001. Print.

Kress, Gunther. "Gains and Losses: New Forms of Texts, Knowledge, and Learning." Computers and Composition 22.1 (2005): 5-22. Web.

---. "Internationalization and Globalization: Rethinking a curriculum of communication." Comparative Education 32.2 (1996): 185-196. Web.

---. *Multimodality: A Social Semiotic Approach to Contemporary Communication*. New York: Routledge, 2010. Print.

---. "Multimodality: Challenges to Thinking about Language." *TESOL Quarterly* 34. 2 (2000): 337-40. Web.

---. "Multimodality." Multiliteracies: Literacy Learning and the Design of Social Futures. Ed. Bill Cope and Mary Kalantzis. London: Routledge, 2000. Print.

Mirzoeff, Nicholas. *An Introduction to Visual Culture*. 2nd ed. New York: Routledge, 2009. Print.

Mitchell, W. J. T. "The Future of the Image: Raciere's Road Not Taken." *The Pictorial Turn.* Ed. Neal Curtis. New York: Routledge, 2010. 37-48. Print.

Olson, Mary C. *Fair and Varied Forms: Visual Textuality in Medieval Illuminated Manuscripts*. New York: Routledge, 2002. Print.

Ong, Walter J. T*he Presence of the Word: Some Prolegomena for Cultural and Religious History*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1967. Print.

Prior, Paul. "Moving multimodality beyond the binaries: A response to Gunther Kress' 'Gains and Losses.'" *Computers and Composition* 22 (2005): 23-30. Web.

Shipka, Jody. "A Multimodal Task-Based Framework for Composing." *College Composition and Communication* 57.2 (2005): 277-306. *JSTOR.* Web. 08/15/11.

Stock, Brian. "History, Literature, and Medieval Textuality." *Yale French Studies* 70 (1986): 7-17. Web.

---. *The Implications of Literacy: Written Language and Models of Interpretation in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries*. Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press, 1983. Print.

---. "Medieval Literacy, Linguistic Theory, and Social Organization." *New Literary History* 16.1 (1984): 13-29. Web.

---. "The Self and Literary Experience in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages." *New Literary History* 25.4 (1994): 839-852. Web.

Treharne, Elaine. "Manuscript sources of Old English poetry." *Working with Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts.* Ed. Gale R Owen-Crocker and Maria Cesario. Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 2009. (page range). Print.

Vandendorpe, Christian. *From Papyrus to Hypertext: Toward the Universal Digital Library*. Trans. Phyllis Aronoff and Howard Scott. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2009. Print.

Withers, Benjamin C. "A 'Secret and Feverish Genesis': The Prefaces of the Old English Hexateuch." *The Art Bulletin* 81.1 (1999): 53-71. Web.

---. The Illustrated Old English Hexateuch, Cotton Claudius B.iv: T*he Frontier of Seeing and Reading in Anglo-Saxon England*. London: British Library, 2007. Print.

Wysocki, Anne. "awaywithwords: On the possibilities in unavailable designs." *Computers and Composition* 22 (2005): 55-62. Web.

Yancey, Kathleen Blake. "Made Not Only in Words: Composition in a New Key." *College Composition and Communication* 56.2 (2004): 297-328. *JSTOR.* Web. 08/17/11.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Logan Bearden is a native of Florida and spent the first seventeen years of his life in Crestview. He graduated with his B.A. in English Literature with a minor in History in 2010. Under the direction of Dr. Kristie Fleckenstein, he earned his M.A. in Rhetoric and Composition from Florida State University in the summer of 2012. He is currently pursuing his PhD at the same institution. Professionally, his interests lie in the histories of rhetoric and the technologies of composition, specifically the ways in which those technologies impact what can be known and said within a given historical moment. In his spare time, he drinks copious amounts of coffee, watches horrible reality television, spoils his wonderful dog, Bubba, and does as much yoga as possible.